## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND INTRODUCTION

### Select Activities and Accomplishments:

#### GOAL 1

- **Goal 1:** Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to ensure that all students have access to the general curriculum aligned with statewide learning objectives and are effectively prepared for transitions, including to school and community settings, higher education, and employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | Professional Development  
Goal 1.Section 1 Attachments |
| 2       | Integrated Service Delivery in the Department of Youth Services  
Goal 1.Section 2 Attachments |
| 3       | Educator Mentoring Program  
Goal 1.Section 3 Attachments |
| 4       | Social Emotional Learning Curriculum Resources  
Goal 1.Section 4 Attachments |
| 5       | Curriculum and Planning at the Massachusetts Hospital School  
Goal 1.Section 5 Attachments |

#### GOAL 2

- **Goal 2:** Implement efficient and effective management structures to ensure appropriate services are provided to all eligible youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | Technology  
Goal 2.Section 1 Attachments |
| 2       | Aspen Student Information Management System  
Goal 2.Section 2 Attachments |
| 3       | Promethean Technology  
Goal 2.Section 3 Attachments |
| 4       | Department of Mental Health Program of Studies  
Goal 2.Section 4 Attachments |
| 5       | Teacher Evaluation System  
Goal 2.Section 5 Attachments |

#### GOAL 3

- **Goal 3:** Ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Youth Services  
Goal 3.Section 1 Attachments |
| 2       | Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Mental Health  
Goal 3.Section 2 Attachments |
| 3       | Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Public Health  
Goal 3.Section 3 Attachments |
| 4       | Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the County Houses of Correction  
Goal 3.Section 4 Attachments |

---
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INTRODUCTION

Since July of 2008, the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) has worked with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in the coordination and delivery of special education services to students in the care of the Department of Youth Services (DYS), the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Department of Public Health (DPH), and the County Houses of Correction (CHC).

CES’s major responsibilities for the contract include the following:

- Providing special education in accordance with students’ Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), integrating students’ special education services with their general education program, and creating high expectations for student achievement
- Recruiting, hiring, supervising, and providing ongoing professional development for educators
- Developing and delivering content-based curriculum aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks
- Managing communication with school districts regarding IEPs and student progress
- Ensuring compliance with federal and state special education regulations
- Administering program and statewide assessments
- Collaborating with host agency leadership in education program improvement that results in positive student outcomes
- Developing efficient and cost-effective management processes
- Supporting coordinated technology development and improvement, including the design and implementation of a statewide web-based student information management system
The context, educator roles, opportunities, and challenges vary significantly across the four host agencies in which SEIS educators work:

In **DYS programs**, SEIS educators work collaboratively with general educators to develop and deliver effective instruction for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The SEIS teachers consult with general educators about student accommodations and modifications, provide direct instruction as co-teachers in general education classrooms, or work in pull-out sessions with individual students.

In **DMH programs**, SEIS teachers provide special education and standards-based content-area instruction to all students.

In **CHC programs**, SEIS educators consult with the general educators and provide special education to students.

At the **Massachusetts Hospital School** (MHS—managed by the Department of Public Health), CES hires and supervises the paraprofessionals who work with state-employed teachers in the classroom, as well as the music, art, and library educators and the educational technology specialist.

For each host agency, CES employs SEIS Coordinators who collaborate with host agency program directors, have expertise in working with the student population and the program context, supervise teachers, and work closely with Instructional Coaches to support consistent, quality special education service delivery in compliance with state and federal regulations.

The student population served through SEIS presents complex challenges for educators. Learning challenges may be any combination of physical, cognitive, behavioral, and/or psychiatric. Educators must find ways to help students access the academic content and demonstrate what they have learned. SEIS teachers receive specialized professional development to ensure that effective instructional delivery is aligned with the IEP, promotes access to the general education curriculum, and supports readiness for transitions back to school districts or other community settings.

Tables 1 and 2 depict the number of students served in each host agency setting, as well as the number of instructional and administrative staff involved in the SEIS initiative. Over the five years of the project, SEIS educators served an average of 1,079 students per year. About two-thirds of these were served in DYS program settings (annual student counts ranged from 554 to 825). SEIS educators work in approximately 56 DYS programs, although the total number of programs has varied over the past five years. The DMH education settings include nine programs serving elementary and secondary students, as well as several adult programs for young adults with IEPs. The average annual student population in DMH programs was 166. SEIS educators provided consultation and direct services in twelve CHC institutions statewide, serving an average of 158 students per year over the five years of the contract. At MHS, SEIS educators and specialists served an average of 105 students per year. In many of the host agency settings, there is a significant amount of student transition between programs or in and out of residential treatment. Therefore, the number of students served at any one time is significantly lower than the annual totals for each host agency. For example, in a typical month at DYS, SEIS educators may support about 400 students with IEPs.
### TABLE 1: SEIS Student Totals by Agency: 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOST AGENCY</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHC</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>157.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>165.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYS</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1079.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: SEIS Staffing: 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CES State</td>
<td>CES State</td>
<td>CES State</td>
<td>CES State</td>
<td>CES State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES/STATE TOTAL</td>
<td>124.70</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>126.10</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>118.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161.30</td>
<td>159.60</td>
<td>154.30</td>
<td>140.14</td>
<td>147.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Program Support includes custodial staff and MHS Transportation/Lunch Monitor.**

** Specialists include physical therapists, occupational therapists, and a Speech and Adaptive Designer. During FY12 and FY13, these positions were covered by outside agencies.
During the first year of the contract, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s SEIS leadership developed goals and objectives for 2008 to 2011. In collaboration with the CES SEIS Contract Administrator, the SEIS Director developed a three-year work plan with activities aligned with overarching goals. The goals and objectives were modified somewhat for the last two years of the contract (2011 to 2013), and SEIS leaders developed a corresponding work plan with activities aligned with the goals. The two work plans are presented on pages 7 through 11. The goals defined in the most recent work plan were as follows:

- **Goal 1:**
  Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to ensure that all students have access to the general curriculum aligned with statewide learning objectives and are effectively prepared for transitions, including to school and community settings, higher education, and employment

- **Goal 2:**
  Implement efficient and effective management structures to ensure appropriate services are provided to all eligible youth

- **Goal 3:**
  Ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students

This report is divided into three sections corresponding to these overarching goals. While most of the activities described in this report were carried out by CES employees, many of the accomplishments made during the contract period result from the ongoing collaboration between CES, DESE, and host agency leadership and instructional delivery staff.

This report presents highlights of some of the critical activities and accomplishments of this coordinated effort over the previous five years. It is not meant to be a comprehensive review of all the projects. Rather, we have drawn from a variety of initiatives that exemplify CES’s efforts to address all three goals: quality, efficiency, and collaboration.

On the following two pages are some highlights of the progress we have made. These are described in more detail throughout this report.
Progress Highlights

Goal 1: Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students

- Implemented a consistent, high-quality professional development system, bringing best practices, aligned with DESE requirements for all school districts, to teachers in all host agency settings
- Designed a mentoring program for new teachers
- Disseminated standard curricular resources and instructional guides across host agency settings
- Improved collaboration between special education and general education teachers in DYS settings, as evidenced by collaborative instructional planning and regular meetings of learning teams, to which special educators bring their lens of IEP goals and the necessary accommodations and modifications for students to access the general curriculum

Goal 2: Implement efficient and effective management structures

- Designed, procured, and implemented system-wide use of a student information management system (Aspen)
- Improved sharing and management of student IEP and progress notes through Aspen and enhanced administrative practices of the Evaluation Team Liaisons
- Developed the infrastructure to provide universal access to the Internet for instructional and administrative use in all host agency sites
- Increased use of technological tools for efficient administration, communication, and instructional delivery
- Achieved substantial cost savings through efficient procurement processes

Goal 3: Ensure collaborative agency relations

- Provided orientation to host agency partners about SEIS policies and practices to enhance host agency staff understanding about how SEIS functions and to identify collaborative opportunities
- Facilitated development of a visioning process for collaboration with each host agency partner
- Undertook collaborative efforts with each host agency, including:
  - DYS: Shared professional development planning and curriculum resources with general education partners
  - CHC: Implemented tools for sharing instructional resources with general education partners
  - DMH: Developed joint training opportunities with DMH program staff
  - DPH: SEIS and DPH leadership identified transition planning and information sharing as priorities for collaborative planning
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Documents

The two documents that follow were prepared by SEIS leadership to define the goals and objectives for the periods 2008-2011 and 2011-2013.

Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)
2008-2011 Goals and Objectives

Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)
Work Plan Goals and Objectives: 2011-2013
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE)
Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)
2008-2011 Goals and Objectives

SEIS Goal #1: Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to support individual and statewide learning objectives.

Determine Quality Indicators and Measurements
Define performance indicators of high quality special education services for improving student learning outcomes, and identify how indicators will be measured.

Quality Assurance
Continue to ensure SEIS uniform compliance with special education laws and regulations for each host setting by:

- Implementing statewide SEIS practice and tracking measures of compliance
- Working with school districts and student Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams
- Collaborating with ESE’s Program Quality Assurance unit for Coordinated Program Review and technical assistance

Inclusion
Provide inclusion in the DYS general education program for students with disabilities and explore models for coordination with CHC general education programs by developing performance indicators and timelines to:

- Develop a continuum of models for integrated special education service delivery appropriate to meet student needs in each DYS setting
- Train teaching staff in DYS and SEIS in the strategies necessary for the implementation of integrated service delivery models
- Implement models for integrated special education service delivery in DYS sites as appropriate
- Identify potential areas of coordination with CHC educators and develop models for integrated service delivery for implementation through training and support

---

1 This document was developed by SEIS Leadership during the 2008-2009 school year.
Uniform follow up on DYS referrals

Work in coordination with DYS to develop a coordinated referral process for the DYS general education program to allow school district determination of eligibility for special education, as appropriate.

- Coordinate with school districts in their process to determine student eligibility for special education, as appropriate

Continued Development of IEP Team communication

Develop processes for IEP Team communication, and utilize tools for recommending goals to IEP Teams as a standard part of SEIS practice for each host agency setting. Provide training to SEIS teaching staff.

Uniform Curriculum Development

Develop curriculum in DMH and DPH settings that is connected across the host agency settings, aligns with Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, and coordinates with clinical services to improve students’ access to the general education curriculum. Provide training in the implementation of the curriculum. Determine measures that demonstrate improved student outcomes based on the delivery of the curriculum.

Curriculum Accessibility

Provide Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in host agency settings to increase student access to the curriculum by:

- Training teaching staff in all host agency settings in techniques and strategies that support UDL
- Implementing a framework of UDL across all host agencies
SEIS Goal #2: Operate an efficient and effective program that delivers services resulting in successful educational outcomes for SEIS students.

Determine Indicators of Program Efficiency and Effectiveness and Measurements

Define program efficiency and effectiveness in SEIS and indicators of program efficiency and effectiveness to result in successful educational outcomes. Identify how indicators will be measured.

Facilitate Reporting and Administration of MCAS

Administer MCAS in DMH, DPH, and CHC and coordinate with DYS to facilitate reporting and administration of MCAS in DYS sites.

Professional Development

Offer statewide professional development opportunities and develop a plan for web-based community learning tools for SEIS teaching staff relevant to SEIS responsibilities for education and host agency settings.

Communication

Develop clear and consistent methods to communicate regularly and meaningfully with SEIS staff, host agency partners, school districts, IEP Teams and families. Determine measures of student outcomes linked to improved communication.

Web-based Student Information System (SIS)

Develop a plan for an on-line SIS to collaborate on student programming and provide a secure, centralized system for high-speed and on-time access to student data as allowed by student record laws and regulations. Determine benchmarks and a timeline for development.

SEIS Student and Educator Data Reporting/Analysis

Review and report SEIS student and teaching staff data to promote statewide program and operational improvements by:

- Determining measures for improvements
- Defining data elements
- Determining the process for reporting
- Identifying a baseline from which to measure subsequent reports
- Determining necessary analysis for meaningful reporting
SEIS Goal #3: Ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students.

Determine Indicators of Collaborative Agency Relations and Measurements
Define indicators that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students. Determine indicator measurements for improved student outcomes specific to each of the four agency environments (DPH, DMH, DYS, and CHCs) and identify how indicators will be measured.

Long term plan for SEIS Technology
Develop a plan for internet connectivity or comparable technologically rich learning environment access for SEIS teaching staff and students in collaboration with host agencies. Determine the dimensions for the plan as internal SEIS to host agencies and/or external to ESE and HEC. Determine benchmarks and a timeline for development.

Statewide Advisory Group
Conduct ongoing meetings of host agency leaders, ESE and HEC to provide the collaborative vision and support for SEIS. Develop the group’s vision as both a shared vision for SEIS and a vision for each host agency.
Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE)

Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)

Work Plan Goals and Objectives: 2011-2013

SEIS Goal #1: Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to ensure that all students have access to the general curriculum aligned with statewide learning objectives and are effectively prepared for transitions, including to school and community settings, higher education, and employment.

Objective 1) Consistent compliance with special education regulations and processes.
Objective 2) Enhanced teacher practice in providing quality instruction to students
Objective 3) Effective communication with IEP Team on student needs, progress, and transitions

SEIS Goal #2: Implement efficient and effective management structures to ensure appropriate services are provided to all eligible youth.

Objective 1) Effective systems in place to support quality assurance, monitor compliance, and promote uniform practice
Objective 2) Effective use of technology to provide quality instruction, support communication among educators, deliver training, and promote effective program management
Objective 3) Enhanced management and utilization of data to facilitate sharing of information on student IEP status, progress, attendance, assessments, transfers, and census and to provide administrators easy access to data to inform program management and improvement
Objective 4) Clear and consistent methods to communicate regularly and meaningfully with SEIS staff so that staff are aware of SEIS objectives, policies, initiatives, and practices, and are informed in a timely manner about changes that affect their practice
Objective 5) Effective and efficient asset management (furniture, equipment, technology, curriculum)

SEIS Goal #3: Ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students.

Objective 1) Consistent mechanisms and practices are in place to support collaboration and communication with each of the host agencies
Objective 2) Effective communication with school districts to ensure that district staff understand: SEIS regulations, policies, and practices; information needed from districts to support SEIS service delivery to students; and roles and responsibilities (including shared responsibility for implementing IEP)

2 This document was developed by SEIS Leadership at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.
Select Activities and Accomplishments

1. **GOAL 1**

Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to ensure that all students have access to the general curriculum aligned with statewide learning objectives and are effectively prepared for transitions, including to school and community settings, higher education, and employment.
Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Purpose:

Since the inception of the Collaborative for Educational Services’ (CES) work on the SEIS contract in 2008, the SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Committee has guided SEIS Professional Development staff in crafting overarching goals for professional development, providing input into the design, and monitoring the effectiveness of professional development efforts. The Committee included the following:

- DESE Director of the SEIS Initiative
- DESE SEIS Assistant Directors and Principals
- CES SEIS Contract Administrator
- CES SEIS Contract Assistant Director
- CES SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator
- CES SEIS Host Agency Coordinators

In the first year of the contract, the Committee worked through a backward planning process to develop overarching goals and objectives for professional development across all host agencies (see the SEIS Professional Development Goal framework on the next page). The intended outcome of all professional development supports is to **improve outcomes for the youth served in host agency settings**. The professional development planning process highlighted the role of the educator in promoting youth educational, vocational, and social-emotional skill development to support effective transitions into school and community settings. To ensure teachers have the skills and resources to fulfill this role, the Professional Development and Curriculum Committee identified **five key areas for ongoing skill development**:

- Basic Instructional Techniques
- Assessment
- Differentiated Instruction
- Collaboration
- Special Education Policies and Practices
SEIS Professional Development Goals

SEIS educators provide special education services designed to give students access to the general curriculum in accordance with individual student’s IEPs. The SEIS Professional Development Committee has identified the following professional development goals:

Basic Instructional Techniques:
• Teachers will understand how to use the *Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*, the *DYS Instructional Guides* and the *Resource Guide to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for Students with Disabilities* to plan their standards-based lessons.
• Teachers will establish learning objectives for each lesson (Know, Understand, and Do) and will communicate those objectives with students for each lesson.
• Teachers will utilize a variety of research-based, effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of their diverse student population.

Assessment:
• Teachers will understand how to use diagnostic data, including results from screenings, assessments and evaluations in addition to informal assessments and inventories to adapt curricula, learning environments, and teaching styles.
• Teachers will know how and when to use a full array of assessment tools (pre-assessment, on-the-spot, interim, and summative assessments) to inform their instruction.

Differentiated Instruction:
• Teachers will use a variety of differentiation strategies based on student’s readiness levels, interests, and/or learning preferences.

Collaboration:
• Teachers will understand what it means to collaborate and be a member of a learning team and function effectively as a participant.
• Teachers will demonstrate skill in working collaboratively as a member of an educational and treatment team.

Special Education Issues:
• Teachers will know the elements of an IEP and how to use the information in instructional decision-making.
• Teachers will develop suggested IEP goals and objectives using data from previous educational records and evaluations, various assessment methods, and input from other educators.
• Teachers will use data from a full array of assessment tools to report student progress on IEP goals and objectives.
• Teachers will engage students in their own IEP process by sharing assessment data, goals and objectives, and suggested accommodations outlined on the IEP and will seek student input in writing the vision statement.

---

1 This document was developed in the spring of 2009 by the SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Planning Committee, and revised during the 2011-2012 school year.
Professional Development staff have used this framework to guide the development of training and support efforts with attention paid to the particular needs of four SEIS host agencies: the Department of Youth Services (DYS), County Houses of Correction (CHC), Department of Public Health (DPH, which manages the Massachusetts Hospital School), and Department of Mental Health (DMH).

**Professional Development Activities**

Professional development for SEIS educators across all host agency settings utilized multiple modalities. To promote consistency of message and learning objectives, the SEIS Instructional Coaching Model provided an overarching delivery framework that integrated several approaches to supporting teacher skill development. The Instructional Coaching Model focuses on supporting educator professional growth, aligned with best practices in Special Education, the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching, and Individual Professional Development Plans. This system relies on a cohort of five SEIS-specific coaches (four coaches prior to 2012) working in coordination with external professional development facilitators and DYS General Education coaches. SEIS and DYS Instructional Coaches collaborated on the planning and delivery of professional development events for DYS educators. The SEIS coaches included a dedicated instructional coach for the Massachusetts Hospital School (MHS), and three or four coaches supporting educators in DYS, CHC, and DMH programs.\(^2\) Instructional coaches served educators in all programs across the Commonwealth.

**The Instructional Coaching Model is comprised of the following four modalities:**

1. **Large Group Professional Development**

   In each year of the contract, all SEIS educators participated in day-long professional development sessions aligned with the SEIS Professional Development Goals and facilitated by a combination of SEIS instructional coaches and outside consultants. In between these day-long sessions, instructional coaches visited sites across multiple host agencies and provided professional development support and reinforcement to teachers on their coaching caseloads, both individually and in small groups.

2. **Specialized Trainings**

   In addition to planning and facilitating large group professional development, SEIS instructional coaches provided program-based mini-workshops and half-day professional development to cohorts of host agency-based special educators. Additionally, SEIS coaches planned and facilitated professional development for regular monthly DYS and DMH Teaching Coordinator meetings, and monthly cluster meetings at MHS (at which classroom teachers and specialists share information and work collaboratively to improve instruction).

\(^2\) The number of coaches varied over the course of the contract.
3. Site-based Instructional Coaching

Instructional coaching is job-embedded professional development. SEIS instructional coaches provided individual support to special educators according to a tiered classification of educator experience and need. Coaches provided feedback to teachers on their individual professional development goals through an observation and confidential debriefing process. In addition to classroom observations, the coaches provided suggestions for the use of appropriate instructional resources.

4. Learning Teams

The learning team model was refined from the work of Rick Dufour (2004; 2006), Jon Supovitz (2002), and other work on developing professional learning communities (PLCs). CES reviewed best practices and brought in expert consultants to adapt these practices to the unique needs of the SEIS environments. The learning team model was supported in large group professional development sessions and implemented across DYS and DMH programs. The approach was adapted to establish Classroom Meetings at MHS.

Site-based learning teams provide general and special educators in DYS programs and DMH special educators with a platform to collaboratively identify students’ strengths and respond to their teaching and learning needs. Learning teams used focus questions and structured inquiries to gather data to determine how students are doing as readers, writers, mathematicians, and members of the learning community. During the 2012-2013 year, CES provided learning teams with standard protocols to structure learning team meetings around common themes, including: reviewing a cohort of students, analysis of individual student work, new student planning, and mini-unit planning.

Instructional coaches provided support to learning teams in the form of learning team meeting observations and feedback. In addition, feedback was provided on electronically posted learning team meeting logs. Coaches modeled the use of learning team protocols and other tools designed to analyze student work, differentiate instruction, and refine mini-unit planning and track student progress.

Online Learning Opportunities

Online learning opportunities were provided to all SEIS educators through the professional development offered by the National Association of Special Education Teachers (NASET), Massachusetts Focus Academy, and Levels of Technology Innovation (LoTi) websites. Both Moodle and Aspen websites hosted curriculum, planning and assessment resources. Additionally, online subscriptions such as Discovery Education, Defined Stem, Brain Pops, Encyclopedia Britannica, Accessible Book Collection, Learning A-To-Z and the Marshal Memo supported the change of teacher practice across multiple host agencies. According to available data from the 2012-2013 school year, SEIS educators participated in an average of 2.35 professional development options delivered through distance learning. Almost all educators (99%) participated in at least one on-line learning opportunity, and 48 educators (45% of all SEIS educators) participated in at least 3 events. Teachers may also have accessed online resources recommended by coaches, facilitators, or
professional development materials and/or participated in events on their own or during the summer, but SEIS administrative databases do not capture all online learning activities.

Focus of Professional Development Activities

The design and implementation of professional development across host agencies was overseen by the Professional Development and Curriculum Planning Committee. In addition, CES Professional Development staff worked very closely with the DYS Professional Development planning staff and administrators to:

- ensure that DYS general educators and special educators were being trained in a common language and approach to supporting students in DYS programs; and
- share best practices and professional development resources across host agencies – ensuring that all SEIS educators were developing a common set of tools, resources, practices, and understandings of special education issues.

To maximize resources and ensure that all SEIS educators are working with a common set of tools, best practices, and resources, much of the training for SEIS educators was provided in a common forum for teachers across host agencies. At the same time, educators working in each of the host agency settings would also have opportunities to focus on the unique challenges and skill development needs relative to their setting.

Professional development for SEIS special educators in DYS programs was designed to ensure that SEIS special and DYS general educators were developing a common language, approach, and complementary set of skills. Professional development activities provided opportunities for SEIS special educators to share with DYS general educators their expertise in differentiating instruction, providing accommodations and making modifications, and providing access to the general curriculum for all learners. At the same time SEIS educators received training and planned collaboratively with their general education colleagues to deliver instruction aligned with curricula, which included the core content areas and Empower Your Future (EYF), a life and social skills curriculum developed for DYS.

Because many SEIS educators in CHC programs also work in other host agency settings, these educators typically received their professional development with their DYS or DMH colleagues. Professional development for SEIS educators in CHC settings was designed to ensure that these special education teachers were able to collaborate with general educators to ensure individual learning needs are effectively addressed.

SEIS educators in the DMH programs are both general and special educators in these programs. That is, they are content area instructors, as well as bringing the special education expertise to promote student access to the general curriculum. Professional development for these educators focused on curriculum, assessment, planning, specialized instructional strategies, and special education policies and practices.
Professional development for SEIS special educators in the DPH facility at the Massachusetts Hospital School (MHS) was designed to support best practices for curriculum, planning, assessment, and providing access to the general curriculum for all learners. Educators at MHS work with a wide range of learners. Professional development developed strands for educators working with students with college aspirations, as well as those transitioning to work or community living situations. MHS teachers also received training related to curriculum, planning, and access points; special education practices and resources; effective use of instructional technology; and positive behavioral supports.

While the Professional Development and Curriculum Planning Committee identified some unique learning objectives for educators in each host agency, across all host agencies, activities were aligned with the critical SEIS objectives for effective instruction. These were integrated into the design of the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching, which became the basis of the Teacher Evaluation System (TES) rolled out in 2011-2012 (see Goal 2, Section 5 for more information about the Standards and Indicators and the Teacher Evaluation System). Significant professional development resources were dedicated to ensuring teachers had a consistent understanding of the Standards and Indicators, as well as the necessary supports to meet these expectations. The table below highlights key learning objectives that were promoted across all four host agencies over the past five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Techniques</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Use of the MA Curriculum Frameworks and DESE’s Resource Guides to the MA Curriculum Frameworks for Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>• Formal and informal assessment tools (e.g., QRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of CES DYS Instructional Guides and Instructional Resources</td>
<td>• Analysis of work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Backward planning (Understanding By Design) of mini-unit and/or lesson plans</td>
<td>• Use of diagnostic, pre-assessment, formative, and summative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of the Know-Understand-Do approach (KUDs)</td>
<td>• Continuous planning cycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Issues</th>
<th>Differentiated Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reading and using the IEP to plan instruction</td>
<td>• Universal Design for Learning (UDL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current levels of performance</td>
<td>• Collaborative mini-unit and lesson plan development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standards-based IEP goals and objectives</td>
<td>• Specialized learning/accommodations and modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence-based and transition-informed IEP progress reporting and planning notes</td>
<td>• Differentiating for cognitive readiness, student interests, and learning preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each year of professional development offered a unique focus on specific learning objectives. Some of the special topics covered in SEIS professional development events include the following:

- IEPs, IEP Planning Notes, and Developing Effective Progress Notes (Sharon Faucher and coach/facilitators provided assessment and training over several years for educators in all host agency settings)
- English Language Learners (ELL) Category Trainings to ensure teachers had the skills and necessary certification to support ELLs
- Specially Designed Instruction: Providing Accommodations and Modifications (Coach/Facilitators)
- Assessment Strategies for Special Educators (Susan Bruce at MHS, Coach/Facilitators)
- Evidence Based Strategies in the Classroom (Pat Packard and Coach/Facilitators)
- IEP Frequently Asked Questions and Answers (Marcia Mittnacht and Diane Curran) provided for ETLs and Coordinators

In addition, SEIS educators in each of the host agencies received specialized training targeting host agency-based initiatives or the unique needs of the student populations served. For example, those in DYS settings received training together with general education colleagues in Culturally Responsive Practice, Positive Youth Development, and implementing the Empower Your Future curriculum, while those in DMH programs received specialized training in early literacy and science education (for the pre-adolescent programs), assistive technology, sensory integration, positive behavioral supports, classroom management, and specially designed instruction. MHS educators received targeted supports in IEP best practices, assessing and documenting student progress, effectively using instructional technology, and alignment of instructional planning with the curriculum standards. Professional development has also supported collaboration with the CHC educators by creating a Moodle platform for sharing educational resources between SEIS and general educators, giving all educators access to information and tools for curriculum and planning, assessment, and MCAS and GED preparation.

Professional development activities also focused extensively on building collaboration between SEIS educators and their colleagues in each host agency setting, including general educators, clinical staff, and other program staff. Because of the uniqueness of each host agency setting, collaborative processes have varying functions and structures in each setting. CES Professional Development designed a model for collaboration among educators that utilizes the learning team as a vehicle for structured inquiry, the analysis of student work and needs, and instructional planning. At MHS, supports were adapted to assist with effective classroom meetings. Learning teams in each of the host agency settings were developed as a process to promote both student-centered collaboration AND peer support for skill development, as well as sharing of best practices.

The initial learning team structure arose out of the Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) pilots in DYS program settings (see Goal 1, Section 2 for details on this effort). As CES learned from the ISD pilots
about effective practices and necessary supports, the organization rolled out learning teams across all DYS and DMH programs. While collaborative processes and learning team structures varied somewhat across host agencies, the essential components of the learning team process include the following:

- Consistent communication with educators, supervisors, coaches, and program staff to promote a common understanding of the learning team structures and expectations
- Regularly scheduled weekly meetings of at least 45 minutes that bring all educators at a program together to discuss individual students, groups of students, and/or planning and instruction
- Structured protocols or inquiry processes to guide discussion on these topics and to produce clear action steps coming out of meetings (see Learning Team Toolkit in the attachments for the guide to protocols currently in use in DYS)
- Common language (asset based) to facilitate educator focus on a common understanding of student strengths and needs, and ways teachers can build on student strengths to foster student achievement
- Documentation (learning team logs) to record key discussion points, findings, and action steps
- Follow-up and accountability structures to allow learning teams to reflect on their own strengths and needs and to assist supervisors and Professional Development staff in building learning team capacity

The DYS General Education Initiative and SEIS consistently collaborated on the design and implementation of learning teams in DYS settings. One of the critical needs this process addressed was to provide an expectation and structured activity to bring special and general educators together to plan for effective instruction. Starting in 2010, CES contracted with David Jacobson (of Cambridge Education, an expert in learning team frameworks) to develop an appropriate learning team framework for DYS settings and to help design and implement the necessary professional development supports. Over the next two years, this framework came to include clear protocols for different types of meetings, tools to support the use of these protocols, and recommendations for protocol use (targeting different program types), as well as documentation of learning team activity (see attached Learning Team Framework).

Learning team implementation in DMH programs utilized the same essential framework, activities, and tools to support program-based teacher collaboration. These teams were design to enhance educator understanding of student needs and strengths and strengthen collaborative planning to promote student achievement. During the 2012-2013 year, CES contracted with Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz to further support the specific needs of DMH programs and educators. Gleckel and Koretz supported the initial ISD pilots in DYS and offered expertise in educator collaboration to effectively serve students with IEPs.
Gleckel and Koretz conducted focus groups and site visits with eight program-based learning teams, in order to:

- assess how learning teams were operating in each program;
- determine the supports and barriers to effective functioning;
- discover the ways in which members reference IEPs, present students, plan to address needs, and define accountability for action steps;
- engage teacher voice to build trust and create ownership of project plans; and
- familiarize teams with consultants to facilitate on-site and remote interactions as the approach to professional development.

The consultants also provided professional development workshops for learning teams at Chauncey Hall and Centerpoint, and webinars with other learning teams to:

- use IEPs as starting points to identify student needs &/or generate questions;
- promote consistent use of asset-based descriptions to set direction for problem solving and progress monitoring;
- use work sample analyses to monitor student progress and make evidence-based decisions to inform individualized planning revisions;
- engage in cooperative brainstorming, data-based decision making, and action planning; referencing protocols;
- recommend revisions to individualized educational planning;
- provide additional support for learning team collaboration and problem solving; and
- track, collect, and discuss evidence regarding the form and function of each learning team.

Finally, they conducted observations and debriefings with learning teams at each program designed to:

- assess individual learning team strengths and areas for further development;
- help learning teams reflect on their practices and provide feedback to individual learning teams; and
- develop recommendations for further training and supports for learning teams at DMH.

Outcomes

The SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Committee, Professional Development staff, and the project evaluator utilized a variety of data sources to assess the impact of professional development on teacher learning and practice.

Results were reported at interim meetings and on an annual basis to the Professional Development and Curriculum Planning Committee. Selected reports are attached. A few highlights from these findings are described below for each host agency.

**DATA SOURCES**

- Teacher evaluations of Regional and Statewide PD days
- Coach and Coordinator interviews
- Mid-year & end-of-year teacher surveys
- Teaching Coordinator and new teacher PD feedback
- Site visits and teacher interview findings from external evaluation
- Learning Team logs
- Mini-unit evaluations
SEIS in the Department of Youth Services

At the end of 2012-2013 school year, SEIS in DYS educators responding to a web-based survey assessed their growth in skills and practice changes tied to professional development and aligned with the Standards and Indicators of Effective Instruction. The chart below shows the practice improvements most commonly identified by these educators.

CHART 1

Areas of Greatest Improvement from Professional Development
SEIS in DYS June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Improvement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation in planning and instruction</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Planning and co-teaching</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and using KUDs</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning -- backward planning, mini-unit and lesson plans</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation on learning teams (and related tasks)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual responsibility for professional development goals</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Youth Development (PYD) in planning and instruction</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP progress reporting (collecting evidence, documenting progress, etc.)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past three years of learning team implementation in DYS, SEIS special educators have consistently reported substantial gains in collaboration with DYS general educators, primarily through site-based learning teams, co-planning activities (within and outside of learning teams), and, in some cases, co-teaching. Data collected in surveys, feedback forms, and interviews indicated that SEIS teachers clearly value the structured opportunities to work with their general education colleagues to discuss individual students and to plan instruction. In 2012-2013, nearly two-thirds of SEIS in DYS educators chose co-teaching and/or co-planning from a list of indicators as an area in which they had most improved over the past year.
External program evaluation consultants (Karla Sarr and Rachael Lawrence) conducted site visits at five DYS programs and noted the following examples of collaboration between SEIS special and DYS general educators:

- In two programs, the SEIS special education and general education teachers co-plan regularly. One SEIS special education teacher explained that five of six periods are co-planned and co-taught.
- An SEIS special education teacher co-taught with a DYS general education teacher in a math classroom.
- DYS general education and SEIS special education teachers teaching an ELA class provided an extremely strong example of co-teaching grounded in co-planning. The teachers assisted one another with different parts of the lesson and looked to each other for assistance when needed.

“So, when we sit and co-plan, we sit and co-plan…We take every nuance of what we are doing and we are following the DYS manual…we still have a lot of materials that we've created and it's really hard at this point with [DYS general education teacher], to tell, where, in terms of the differentiation and so forth, where one leaves off and the other starts. Because, everything I've brought in to the differentiation equation, [DYS general education teacher] just picked up and started using throughout…”

~ SEIS teacher

During the first year of learning team implementation (2010-2011), CES evaluators used surveys administered at the beginning and at the end of the school year to track educators’ attitudes toward and participation in learning teams. As Chart 2 below shows, participants reported substantial increases in compliance with learning team practices and processes over the course of the school year (note that this chart includes results from DYS general educators as well as SEIS in DYS).

SEIS educators in DYS had high levels of agreement with statements regarding the impact of learning teams, and those agreement levels have remained high over time. While there has been a recent decrease in the percent of educators agreeing that learning team meetings lead to a better understanding of student strengths and needs, 80% of SEIS in DYS educators still agree with the statement (see Chart 3).
**CHART 2**

**DYS (General Education and SEIS) Responses to Tracking Survey Questions Fall 2010 and Spring 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-Survey</th>
<th>Post-Survey</th>
<th>% always</th>
<th>% frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our LT uses data and to assess strengths and needs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Survey</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use asset-based language when we discuss students</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Survey</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT uses a structured process to discuss student strengths and needs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Survey</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT mtgs lead to a better understanding of student strengths and needs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Survey</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHART 3**

**Learning Team Outcomes - SEIS in DYS**

| LT mtgs have supported my ability to provide effective instruction       | June 2013 (n=24) | Strongly Agree | 17% |
|                                                                          | June 2012 (n=31) | Agree          | 54% |
|                                                                          |                |                |     |
| LT mtgs led to a better understanding of student strengths and needs     | June 2013 (n=24) | Strongly Agree | 17% |
|                                                                          | June 2012 (n=31) | Agree          | 63% |
|                                                                          |                |                |     |
|                                                                          | June 2011 (n=30) | Strongly Agree | 17% |
|                                                                          |                | Agree          | 73% |
Department of Mental Health

When DMH SEIS educators reflect on their professional growth relative to the professional development offered over the last five years, they highly rate their:

- ability to de-escalate or redirect student behavior;
- knowledge of strategies to support social-emotional learning;
- ability to use the information on an IEP to plan instruction; and
- ability to collaborate with clinical staff to work effectively with students.

CHART 4

Strengths Reported by DMH Educators in June 2013

- I can teach other SEIS teachers
- I apply effectively in my teaching

SEIS teachers in DMH also indicated growing appreciation for the value of learning teams over the past several years. Seventy-five percent agree that learning teams are a valuable use of time, and 85% agree that learning teams lead to a better understanding of student strengths and needs. Large numbers of DMH educators (70% and 63%, respectively) reported that support from Teaching Coordinators and from learning team specialists Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz were useful or extremely useful in facilitating effective learning team meetings.
CHART 5

Learning Team Outcomes - SEIS in DMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Team Meetings</th>
<th>June 2011 (n=32)</th>
<th>June 2012 (n=21)</th>
<th>June 2013 (n=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Team meetings lead to a better understanding of student strengths and needs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Team meetings have supported my ability to provide effective instruction</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly Agree

Agree
Massachusetts Hospital School

During the course of the year and in end-of-year surveys, we asked educators to reflect on what they learned in professional development and how their practices changed as result of the professional development supports. Findings suggest that new practices are aligned with the critical professional development objectives for each year.

For example, in 2013 SEIS in MHS teachers reported gains in the following:

- Planning strategies reflecting the impact of the support for mini-unit planning aligned with the curriculum frameworks and standards
- Improved instructional strategies and classroom communication

On an earlier survey (June 2012), SEIS in MHS teachers reported gains in:

- Writing specific and measurable current levels of performance
- Writing measurable goals
- Applying knowledge of best practices for IEP content

The idea that the current performance and objectives need to be specific now makes more sense. It helped to hear from others and it especially helped to focus on a specific student. My IEP notes will be more detailed and [the] annual goal/objective will make more sense to me.

~ MHS educator

Next Steps

During the 2013-2014 school year, the multi-pronged framework of professional development supports for SEIS teachers will continue. Instructional coaches, supervisors, Teaching Coordinators and Head Teachers will provide job-embedded supports, and learning teams (classroom meetings at MHS) will continue to support peer-to-peer skill development. Each host agency will provide an educator orientation for teachers new to their agency. The instructional coaching model will be refined to provide for host-agency aligned assignments as follows:

- Two instructional coaches assigned to DMH teachers
- Two instructional coaches assigned to DYS and CHC teachers
- One instructional coach assigned to educators at MHS

---

3 Due to the small number of MHS educators participating in professional development events and responding to end-of-year surveys, evaluation of outcomes at MHS relies primarily on qualitative data and small scale quantitative analysis. Given the small cohort, data charts and graphs are not presented, as they could be misleading or misinterpreted.
Professional Development Plan Overview

An overview of the SEIS Professional Development plan for 2013-2014, including the objectives and major events for each host agency are outlined on the following pages.

SEIS in DYS:

Objectives:

- Introduce teachers to the Common Core and support integration into daily instruction
- Enhance transition planning in collaboration with General Educators
- Effectively implement the Empower Your Future Curriculum (supporting youth in establishing life and career goals and developing a plan to achieve those goals)
- Improve quality and consistency of progress reports and planning notes

Statewide Professional Development Series: Integrating the Common Core

- Transition Planning (Empower Your Future)
- Student Progress Monitoring
- Access for All

Integrating Common Core Webinar Series - Literacy and Numeracy across the Content Areas

- Webinar One: Common Core Instructional Shifts in ELA, Literacy, and Math
- Webinar Two: ELA/Literacy and Math Instructional Resources
- Webinar Three: Mini-Unit Exemplars from the Math and ELA/Literacy Instructional Resources

Two Regional Days: Integrating the Common Core

- Keys to Literacy
- PYD/CRP
- Technology Integration
- Empower Your Future

Specialized Training: Transition-Informed and Evidence-Based IEP Progress Reports and Planning Notes (two half-day professional development sessions)
**DMH:**

**Objectives:**
- Introduce teachers to the Common Core and support integration into planning and daily instruction
- Enhance literacy instruction through use of a tiered instructional model to support struggling readers
- Improve quality and consistency of progress reports and planning notes

Statewide Professional Development Series: Integrating the Common Core
- College and Career Readiness, 21st Century Skills, and Empower Your Future
- Tiered Instructional Model for Struggling Readers or Close Reading for Pre-Adolescent Readers
- Transition-Informed and Evidence-Based Progress Reports and Planning Notes
- Integrating Common Core with Mini-Unit and/or Lesson Planning

Integrating Common Core: Narrated PowerPoint Series on Literacy and Numeracy Across the Content Areas
- ELA Narrated PowerPoint Video Series: College and Career Readiness and Instructional Shifts, Instructional Resources, and Mini-Unit Exemplars
- Math Narrated PowerPoint Video Series: College and Career Readiness, 21st Century Skills, Instructional Shifts, Instructional Resources, and Mini-Unit Exemplars

**DPH:**

**Objectives:**
- Introduce teachers to the Common Core and understand implications for daily instruction
- Build knowledge of behavioral support strategies
- Enhance transition planning and aligned supports

Professional Development Series: Integrating Common Core in Support of Youth Transition
- Strategies for Managing Behavior in the MHS Classroom
- Common Core Integration
- Curriculum Instruction and Assessment in Support of Youth Transition
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Goal 1 | Section 1: Professional Development

1. SEIS Professional Development Goals (2009-2010)
3. SEIS Professional Development Evaluation Summary Findings:
   - Teacher Feedback: Content-Focused Strands (2009-2010)
   - Dashboard measures (2010-2011)
   - Professional Development for Educators in SEIS Programs: Evaluation Findings (2011-2012)
   - Perceived Value of Professional Development Activities (2011-2012)
   - DMH Professional Development (Fall 2012)
   - SEIS Professional Development Planning Group (Nov. 2012)
   - Regional Day Three Summary of Findings: SEIS in DYS (Jan. 2013)
   - Presentation to PD and Curriculum Committee (Jan. 2013)
8. Why Learning Teams are Important (2013)
SEIS educators provide special education services to students in institutional settings designed to give students access to the general curriculum.

**SEIS PD Mission Statement**

SEIS will work in partnership with ESE and host agencies to build a coordinated uniform system of professional development to improve student outcomes.

The SEIS Professional Development Committee has selected the following focus areas and goals for the school year 2009-2010

**Basic Instructional Techniques:** Standards-Based, Research-Based Effective Strategies

PD Goals:
Teachers will understand how to use the *Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*, the *DYS Instructional Guides* and the *Resource Guide to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for Students with Disabilities* to plan their standards-based lessons, as evidenced by unit and lesson planning linked to the standards. The evidence should be tangible unit and lesson planning in a plan book or other planning organizer with links to the Instructional Guides, Curriculum Frameworks Resource Guides, and the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

Teachers will establish learning objectives for each lesson (Know, Understand, and Do) and will communicate those objectives with students for each lesson as evidenced by written, posted objectives for each lesson and oral communication of the objectives to the students at the beginning of the lesson and review with the students, about attainment at the end of the lesson.

Teachers will utilize a variety of research-based, effective instructional strategies to meet the needs of their diverse student population as evidenced by examples of lessons utilizing various strategies, students’ work, and reflections based on these approaches.

**Assessment:** Using Data to inform instruction

PD Goals:
Teachers will understand how to use diagnostic data, including results from screenings, assessments and evaluations in addition to informal assessments and inventories to adapt curricula, learning environments, and teaching styles as evidenced by their participation in IEP meetings, instructional planning meetings with other educators and examples of their unit and lesson plans.

Teachers will know how and when to use a full array of assessment tools (pre-assessment, on-the-spot, interim, and summative assessments). They will also understand how to use the data from these assessments to inform their instruction as evidenced by their ability to make instructional decisions based on student performance data.
Differentiated Instruction:

PD Goals:
Teachers will begin to differentiate lessons based on students’ readiness levels, interests, and/or learning preferences as evidenced by their lesson plans and examples of student work reflecting differentiation. *Novice teachers or those new to DI*

Teachers will use a variety of differentiation strategies based on student’s readiness levels, interests, and/or learning preferences as evidenced by unit and lesson plans and examples of student work reflecting differentiation. *Veteran teachers familiar with DI*

Collaboration

PD Goals:
Teachers will understand what it means to collaborate and be a member of a team and function effectively as a participant as evidenced by being an active member of a learning team in their PD strand session.

Teachers will demonstrate skill in working collaboratively as part of an educational and treatment team as evidenced by their participation in developing and planning for the implementation of IEPs with other educators, working as part of the treatment team in their programs, and participating in IEP meetings.

Special Education Issues:

PD Goals:
Teachers will know the elements of an IEP and how to use the information in instructional decision-making as evidenced by differentiated lesson plans based on IEP objectives and identified instructional accommodations in addition to student work samples demonstrating alignment of instructional activities to the IEP.

Teachers will develop suggested IEP goals and objectives based on skill building using data from previous educational records and evaluations, various assessment methods, and input from other educators as evidenced by draft IEP planning notes.

Teachers will use data from a full array of assessment tools to report student progress on IEP goals and objectives as evidenced by IEP progress notes.

Teachers will engage students in their own IEP process by sharing assessment data, goals and objectives, and suggested accommodations outlined on the IEP. Student input will be sought regarding goals and objectives and will be used to develop a post-secondary vision as evidenced by increased students’ participation in writing the vision statement.
Curriculum Reports
Summary

Programs Serving Secondary Students

FEBRUARY 2010

Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)

Supported by the Hampshire Educational Collaborative on behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Contents

SEIS Curriculum Reports Summary

Recommendations for Programs Serving Secondary Students ...................... 3
Recommendations for ELA Classrooms ..................................................... 4
Recommendations for Math Classrooms ................................................... 6
Recommendations for Science Classrooms .............................................. 8
Recommendations for Universal Design for Learning (UDL) ................. 9
Curriculum specialists visited SEIS sites serving DYS and DMH sites functioning at high school levels during the period March through May 2009. The purpose of their visits was to gather data describing curriculum practices and needs in English/Language Arts, mathematics, and science.

Each consultant prepared a report and a list of curriculum materials recommended for purchase. Their findings are summarized below.

- Teachers in all content areas need additional materials that will support differentiated instruction: student texts that address state curriculum standards and are accessible to struggling readers as well as texts appropriate for students reading at and above grade level, and texts that speak to a range of student interests, learning styles, and prior knowledge.

- Teachers need professional resources that address instructional skills: differentiating instruction and routine use of informal assessment to sustain progress for students for whom interrupted schooling, frequent absence from class, and/or behavioral issues create obstacles to academic growth. In order to assure SEIS students of a 21st century education, teachers need routine access to technology in the classroom: document readers (ELMOs) for sharing student work, and computers for student research, report creation, graphic representation of concepts, and writing. Students need routine access to technology, e.g., a computer with CD rom and headset, to support the development of listening skills.

- Teachers need quick, effective ways to assess students’ specific academic strengths and needs upon entering the program and to monitor student progress while students are in the program.

- Teachers will benefit from additional exemplars, informal assessment tools, and routine opportunities to examine student work and plan together. They will benefit from consistent, ongoing supervision that asks, “How do you know that this is working for your students?”

- Teachers will benefit from complete sets of materials for student use and adequate storage to organize materials. New teachers coming into a program are especially in need of an organized curriculum resource space if they are to make appropriate use of materials and provide needed accommodations.
Recommendations for ELA Classrooms

Recommendations specific to ELA classrooms addressed a number of concerns, listed below and followed by italicized recommendations.

ELA (1)

Teachers rarely use visual supports for instruction such as word walls or scaffolding work for vocabulary. Instructions are given orally.

*Professional development is needed to increase teachers’ use of multimodal instruction and best practices in literacy learning for secondary students.*

ELA (2)

Teachers work with whole group instruction and use round robin reading; no partner or group work was observed in the classrooms visited.

*Teachers need to use instructional strategies that include working with individual students while other students are working independently. Teachers need professional development in the effective teaching of reading to secondary students.*

ELA (3)

When students had choice, through writing assignments, reading books, or research projects, active engagement increased markedly.

*Lesson design should afford students a high level of choice accompanied by clear criteria and exemplars for student work. Professional development should address these instructional management skills.*

ELA (4)

Teachers want quick, effective ways to assess students’ specific academic strengths and needs upon entering the program and to monitor student progress. The current pre assessment does not assess content-related writing or reading skills adequately. Teachers’ current assessment toolbox is limited in scope and lacks exemplars and clear criteria/expectations for student performance.

*Teachers need an efficient, accurate “intake” assessment that will provide a useful profile of the student’s reading and writing skills, and professional development in using these assessments. Teachers need professional development in (a) informal assessment, (b) linking assessment to instructional decisions making, and (c) using exemplars and explicit criteria for teachers and students assessing student work.*
ELA (4)

Student use of nonfiction materials is limited.

*ELA curriculum should include more opportunities to work with non-fiction materials.*

---

ELA (5)

Teachers’ opportunities to participate in ELL Category trainings have been limited, and classrooms lack resources that allow second language students to hear fluent language or replay parts of a piece of prose multiple times.

*Teachers should be encouraged to complete the Category trainings, often described as “simply good teaching,” lesson design and instruction that address reading, writing, speaking, and listening skill for all students. Classroom technology should include audio technology.*

---

ELA (6)

Instructional materials appropriate to SEIS settings are limited. Teachers need more texts with short segments, interactive material, technology, and differentiated curriculum to address students’ needs and support student progress. Teachers need time together – SEIS and general education – to plan use of new materials and to provide appropriate adaptations and accommodations. Moreover, most sites had dated version of many small texts, outdated reference books, and encyclopedias which limit students’ opportunities for authentic learning. Frequently, sites had limited space in which to store curriculum materials in an organized way. A new teacher entering the program would have real difficulty locating appropriate materials when s/he needed them. Many teachers use resource boxes, but the current literature and resource boxes are underutilized, as there is no easy way to know what is available or when materials will be returned.

*Curriculum purchases and joint planning time for integrated service delivery using the new materials will be a powerful lever for positive growth for teachers and students. Appropriate storage and a system for organizing use of resource boxes across sites will increase teachers’ use of appropriate and current materials, and will increase authentic learning opportunities for students.*
Recommendations for Math Classrooms

Recommendations specific to math classrooms addressed a number of concerns, listed below and followed by italicized recommendations.

Math (1)

Teachers’ mathematics knowledge and teaching experience vary widely; many have had little or no experience teaching math. Teachers lack a model for teaching math that will help them teach in the mode and spirit of the Massachusetts Framework.

*Teachers need mathematics content professional development in order to begin to develop an understanding of basic math concepts. Given the limited time available for system-wide professional development, teachers should be encouraged to pursue an Initial License in mathematics.*

Math (2)

Group work is rare. Current thinking about mathematics learning recognizes the social dimension of learning. Students in DYS math classes appeared to be grouped by their ability to get along, while students in DMH classes were grouped by ability. Teaching focuses on basic operations.

*Teaching focuses on basic operations. Teacher professional development should address pedagogy in the SEIS mathematics classroom: effective use of grouping in mathematics instruction, adapting the organization and philosophy of the state standards to the SEIS setting, teaching to the big ideas, and seeing math in action.*

Math (3)

Teachers want quick, effective ways to assess students’ specific academic strengths and needs upon entering the program and to monitor student progress. Baseline testing should identify the general level of mathematical skill and knowledge, and readiness for math learning, reveal major gaps in math learning, assess ability to solve word problems and to reason mathematically, and assess ability to apply math skills and knowledge to real life situations. Progress tests should meet the criteria listed for baseline testing and should serve as learning tools for content and for test-taking.

*Intake tests and progress tests should be identified and purchased. Training in the use of these tests to plan classroom instruction should be provided*
Math (4)

The philosophy and guiding principles of Massachusetts Mathematics Framework call for a shift in mathematics teaching. Problem-solving in real life contexts drives math thinking, through which students learn reasoning and analytical and critical thinking skills as well as basic operations. SEIS teachers currently use traditional texts and practice materials that are adequate for teacher basic operations and concepts, but near little relation to the Framework.

Teachers need a range of Framework-appropriate texts and other teaching materials, and training in the use of these materials. Criteria for these materials include:

(a) alignment with the state Framework
(b) focus on problem solving strategies and mathematical reasoning, including applications in everyday life and MCAS tests
(c) use of alternative representations and methods of solving to accommodate different learning styles
(d) lessons can be adapted to be more or less complex
(e) teacher books provide lesson plans, teaching tips, and worked out answers to problems, including alternate methods of solving
(f) layout is uncluttered, fonts are easy to read

Math (5)

Teachers do not have access to computers for use of web-based resources, presentation of lessons that may include sound and animation, and projection of student work.

A PC laptop should be available for teacher use. A document camera/projector should be available as well.

Math (6)

Students do not have access to computers for use of web-based resources, math tutorials, and online interactive math sites, and to develop a better sense of computer tools useful in the real world.

Math classes should have access to laptop carts equipped with Microsoft Office.

Math (7)

Students do not have consistent access to scientific and graphing calculators.

Each classroom should have a set of six of each type of calculator.
Recommendations specific to science classrooms addressed a number of concerns, listed below and followed by italicized recommendations.

Science (1)

Students are working on similar topics and subject content, but, except when topics are being introduced, students work independently because individuals’ abilities, prior knowledge, and academic goals vary.

*Professional development is needed to facilitate teachers’ use of effective group learning opportunities.*

Science (2)

Teachers rely heavily on worksheets copied from various sources, e.g., onsite resource books, CDs, and home internet connections.

*Purchase of interactive texts, e.g., Prentice Hall Science Explorer 2005, is recommended. This resource engages and motivates learners with activities, videos, and slide shows that make difficult concepts accessible, provides built-in support with audio, and offers instant feedback assessments.*

*Professional development should continue to introduce science activities that are hands-on, to share materials, techniques, and exemplars that support and/or complement current curriculum, and to give teachers time to explore new academic materials and software.*

Science (3)

Limited numbers of current student texts are available.

*Each site should have a Teacher Edition and six copies of each student book and ancillary materials.*

Science (4)

Classroom use of technology is limited.

*Classrooms should be equipped with microscopes and digital timing devices and cameras. Teachers need opportunities to become familiar with new academic software. Teachers need opportunities to see demonstrations of how new technology can complement existing academic content and practice. Teachers should be using document camera/projection device routinely to share student work and to share experiments. Equipment (ELMO) is needed as well as training to use the equipment.*
Science (5)

Students need more opportunities “to think about the possibilities.”

Continuation of subscription to Science World Magazine is recommended.

Recommendations for Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

Recommendations specific to universal design addressed a number of concerns, listed below and followed by italicized recommendations. The full report includes specific recommendations for the three-year implementation plan, grounded in a vision of all SEIS’ partnership with all host agencies in the provision of UDL for all students.

UDL(1)

Many teachers have worked to develop multiple ways of teaching. Not as many are familiar with the terminology of UDL or assistive technology tools. Teacher knowledge of UDL varies widely across the SEIS system.

Planning for training across the SEIS system must be tailored to the specific needs of each program.

UDL (2)

To have a viable UDL system that includes AT (assistive technology), students and teachers require easy access to technology and digital content that is aligned with the curriculum.

Upgrade of computer capacity, as described in the SEIS Technology Report, is essential. Hardware and software will be needed in many programs: laptops, LCD projectors, new computers, memory upgrades, and software packages. Ongoing technical support is essential to make sure that systems operate smoothly.

UDL (3)

Teachers’ awareness of UDL terminology, how they already implement UDL in their classrooms, and directions for UDL growth are limited. Students’ needs vary. Selection and appropriate use of UDL tools is limited by teachers’ varied levels of understanding of UDL principles and practice.
Meaningful training, organized in “do-able” pieces with ongoing individualized support is needed if teachers are to implement UDL in the classroom. shows that make difficult concepts accessible, provides built-in support with audio, and offers instant feedback assessments.

**UDL (4)**

Simply purchasing new technologies does not guarantee their effective use. Classroom use of technology is limited. An estimated 25% of the teachers are not computer literate.

*Teachers will need training in the instructional use of LCD projectors, Power Point, digital cameras, document readers/ELMOS, movie cameras, and various software packages.*

**UDL (5)**

Specialized software involving AT is more complex than most classroom software. Teachers lack the specialized training and onsite support needed for learning new programs.

*Introduction of software should be followed by opportunities to explore the use of the programs through structured examples and by creating lessons for students. Face-to-face follow-up is best, with homework assignments that are shared with other teachers/peers. Extensive training over time, including lesson development and using the software with real students, supported by coaching, will help teachers become adept in use of programs. Pilot Site Development Teams – teams from same type settings, e.g., Treatment, could work together to try out new tools and technologies. In the second year of the pilot, these teachers could support other novice teachers and sites.*

**UDL (6)**

Knowledge of specific assistive technology programs varies greatly across the SEIS network.

*Planning for training will need to be tailored to the specific needs of each program within the overall framework for training.*
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Teacher Feedback: Content-Focused Strands
SEIS PD GOALS

- Basic Instructional Techniques
- Assessment
- Differentiated Instruction
- Collaboration
- Special Education Issues
What Information Are We Seeking?

- Teacher reports on the value of the PD sessions and whether training affects practice
- Feedback to facilitators on strengths and areas for improvement
- The extent to which session content is aligned with the PD goals
- Teachers perceptions of their strengths and needs in terms of content and pedagogical strategies
## Content Area Strands: Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept. 22</th>
<th>Oct. 6</th>
<th>Nov. 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYS-Gen Ed</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS-DYS or CHC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS-DMH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not identify</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

SEIS teachers reported the highest skill levels in:

- Use of collaboration and communication skills with students and other educators
- Providing access for all students to the general education curriculum
- Writing and implementing measurable goals and objectives
- Following all program and agency guidelines for students’ safety and educational benefits
- Differentiating curriculum, instruction, and assessment
PERCEIVED STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

SEIS teachers reported the lowest skill levels in:

- Working in learning teams to analyze student work and plan instructional modifications
- Use of protocols to analyze student work
- Use of formative and on-the-spot assessments
- Use of diverse & aligned summative assessments
- Using student progress data to plan instruction
“Rate today’s session regarding its usefulness for you in your role”

DYS AND SEIS (combined)

- Sept. 22: 49% Generally useful, 28% Extremely useful
- Oct. 6: 48% Generally useful, 27% Extremely useful
- Nov. 17: 45% Generally useful, 32% Extremely useful
DYS vs. SEIS

“Rate today’s session regarding its usefulness for you in your role”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
<th>SEIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 6</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 17</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEIS ONLY

“Rate today’s session regarding its usefulness for you in your role”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sept. 22</th>
<th>Oct. 6</th>
<th>Nov. 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYS/CHC</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally useful</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely useful</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEIS Teachers: Perceived Value of Nov. 17 Strand Day in Supporting Specific Learning Objectives

- Differentiating curriculum, instruction, and assessment
- Using student progress data to plan instruction
- Providing access to the gen'l curr, through the use of modifications and accommodations
- Working in learning teams using protocols to analyze student work
- Collaboration and communication skills

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Extremely useful
Generally Useful
Somewhat useful
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Empowering Teachers, Inspiring Learners
VALUE OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SESSIONS

% of educators reporting that PD session was “useful” or “extremely useful.”

Usefulness of Workshop Day for Educator Role

Value of LT PD Day in Preparing Educators for Upcoming LT Work

Usefulness of PD Days for Educators in their Role: DYS and SEIS

DYS General Educators

SEIS Educators

LT Days do not include Ed Liaisons or ETLs. Nov. 18 and March 17 also do not include ELL group. March 17 SEIS data does not include ISTs. Workshop days include ETLs; Sept. 22 includes Ed Liaisons.
LEARNING TEAM TRACKING: ATTITUDES, UNDERSTANDING, PRACTICE

Value of Time in LTs

- % agreeing that LTs are a valuable use of time.
  - Mar. 17: 69%
  - Nov. 18: 73%
  - Oct. 7: 80%
  - Sept. 1: 81%

Weekly 45 Minute Meetings

- % reporting that activity occurs “frequently” or “always.”
  - Mar. 17: 98%
  - Nov. 18: 98%
  - Oct. 7: 100%
  - Sept. 1: 52%

Discussions of Student Work and Data

- % reporting that LT “frequently” or “always” uses data and student work to assess students.
  - Mar. 17: 90%
  - Nov. 18: 94%
  - Oct. 7: 72%
  - Sept. 1: 57%

Understanding of LT Roles and Process

- % assessing themselves as “proficient” or “advanced.”
  - Mar. 17: 83%
  - Nov. 18: 78%
  - Oct. 7: 72%
  - Sept. 1: 42%

Use of Structured Inquiry Process

- % reporting that LT “frequently” or “always” uses a structured inquiry process.
  - Mar. 17: 96%
  - Nov. 18: 97%
  - Oct. 7: 85%
  - Sept. 1: 30%

Use of Asset-Based Language

- % reporting that teachers “frequently” or “always” use asset-based language when discussing students.
  - Mar. 17: 93%
  - Nov. 18: 92%
  - Oct. 7: 75%
  - Sept. 1: 51%
Professional Development for Educators in SEIS Programs: 2011-2012

Evaluation Findings
Methods

- PD Day formative and summative paper surveys
- End-of-year web-based survey
- Coach reports
- Coach assessments of PD Final Products
- Administrative data regarding learning team and coach activities and documentation from professional development workgroup meetings
## End of Year Survey Participation

**Response rates:**  SEIS in DYS: 100% / SEIS in DMH: 71%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Teaching</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>n=29</td>
<td>n=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Teaching with SEIS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=51</td>
<td>n=29</td>
<td>n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Findings

• End-of-year findings confirm preliminary results.
• Most educators valued and learned from the past year’s professional development.
• SEIS in DYS educators were more positive on the end-of-year survey than were SEIS in DMH educators.
• Teachers would like more differentiation in professional development, and a clearer understanding of final product expectations.
Professional Development Supports

- Professional development days
- Coaching
- Learning teams
- Supervisory Supports
- Online learning (webinars, courses)
- Moodle resources
Value of Supports

Percent of Respondents Rating Each Support as “Useful” or “Extremely Useful”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Extremely Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Teams</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Days</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle resources</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online learning</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=55-57
Usefulness Ratings on Day of Event: SEIS in DYS

- Content Day 2 (n=27): 52% Extremely Useful, 48% Useful
- Content Day 1 (n=25): 20% Extremely Useful, 68% Useful
- Regional Day 3 (n=18): 17% Extremely Useful, 61% Useful
- Regl Day 2 (n=26): 31% Extremely Useful, 69% Useful
Usefulness Ratings on Day of Event: SEIS in DMH

- **Category Training Day 3**
  - Extremely Useful: 69%
  - Useful: 28%
  - (n=29)

- **Content Day 2**
  - Extremely Useful: 27%
  - Useful: 58%
  - (n=33)

- **Content Day 1**
  - Extremely Useful: 30%
  - Useful: 54%
  - (n=37)
Consistency of PD Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Element of Effective Instruction</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS n=28-29</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH n=21-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Mixed Messages or Conflicting Messages</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Somewhat Consistent or Very Consistent</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Mixed Messages or Conflicting Messages</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Somewhat Consistent or Very Consistent</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEIS in DYS n=28-29
SEIS in DMH n=21-22
Standards and Indicators
Areas of Greatest Improvement: Standard 1

SEIS in DYS Educators:
• The development of clearly defined KUDs
• Backward planning sequential curriculum units
• Collecting and documenting useful evidence for IEP progress notes
• Using the IEP as an assessment and planning tool for instruction

SEIS in DMH Educators:
• The development of clearly defined KUDs
• Collecting and documenting useful evidence for IEP progress notes
• Using the IEP as an assessment and planning tool for instruction
• Using CRP and PYD to define and plan specialized instruction
• Using summative assessment data to monitor student progress
Areas of Greatest Improvement: Standard 2

SEIS in DYS:
• Posting clear and measurable KUDs
• Implementing effective instructional strategies

SEIS in DMH:
• Posting clear and measurable KUDs
• Implementing effective instructional strategies
• Communicating KUDs throughout the lesson
Changes in Practice
SEIS in DYS

• “The use of a daily KUD greatly increased my ability to plan lessons”

• “Starting this year, I began keeping much more updated data on students which has proven to be beneficial when constructing IEP planning notes.”

• “We now review a student's IEP upon arrival/as soon as it's on Aspen rather than waiting until our Learning Team meeting to differentiate instruction as soon as possible.”

• “Spending more time in the planning of the lessons, collaborating with my co-teachers, using pre-assessment and IEP data to create the most effective learning experience for our students.”

• “Pre-tests for assessment to then differentiate lessons for students.”
Changes in Practice
SEIS in DMH

• “I have begun to be more aware of my KUDs. Last year I would post a KUD and read it at the beginning of class and never revisit it. Now I check in throughout the class. I reference it more often and sometimes use it as an exit ticket at the completion of a class.”

• “My KUDs are now shorter and more meaningful.”

• “At the end of a lesson, I have had students try to add onto the KUD - new facts that they know, understand, and whether or not we completed all of the "Do" list.”

• “Implementing approaches and practices to help my ELL students to develop reading skills, writing skills, and increase comprehension.”
Mini-Unit Plans
To What Extent Have You Collaborated with Colleagues in the Development of Mini-Unit Plans?

- **Collaboration with General Educators**
  - SEIS in DYS: 42% (A lot), 42% (Some)

- **Interdisciplinary Collaboration**
  - SEIS in DYS: 39% (A lot), 48% (Some)
  - SEIS in DMH: 29% (A lot), 43% (Some)

SEIS in DYS n=31
SEIS in DMH n=21
How Useful is Mini-Unit Planning in Supporting Your Delivery of Effective Instruction?

- SEIS in DYS: 16% Extremely Useful, 45% Useful
- SEIS in DMH: 10% Extremely Useful, 43% Useful

SEIS in DYS n=31
SEIS in DMH n=21
Learning Teams
Learning Team Practices and Processes

- Members of my Learning Team understand and execute Learning Team roles
  - SEIS in DMH: 43% Always, 29% Frequently
  - SEIS in DYS: 52% Always, 45% Frequently

- The structure of our Learning Team meetings made it easy to make progress toward our objectives
  - SEIS in DMH: 19% Always, 48% Frequently
  - SEIS in DYS: 32% Always, 52% Frequently

- My Learning Team crafts effective focus questions and agendas
  - SEIS in DMH: 24% Always, 62% Frequently
  - SEIS in DYS: 39% Always, 45% Frequently

SEIS in DMH -- n=21
SEIS in DYS -- n=31
Learning Team Effectiveness

- SEIS in DMH -- n=21
- SEIS in DYS -- n=29-31
Learning Team Outcomes

As a result of our work in Learning Teams this year, I have more effective working relationships with my colleagues at my program.

- SEIS in DMH: 19% Strongly Agree, 19% Agree
- SEIS in DYS: 30% Strongly Agree, 37% Agree

My Learning Team contributed to the skills and knowledge I needed to create a mini-unit plan.

- SEIS in DMH: 10% Strongly Agree, 14% Agree
- SEIS in DYS: 19% Strongly Agree, 42% Agree

SEIS in DMH -- n=21
SEIS in DYS -- n=30-31
Next Steps

Using the findings to improve future professional development efforts

Enhancing systems to dig more deeply into teacher learning and practice

Providing feedback to educators on what we’ve learned

Increasing teacher voice
SEIS Professional Development: 2011-2012

Perceived Value of Professional Development Activities

Teacher Gains and Areas for improvement
SEIS: Teacher Perceptions of Overall Value of PD Days

- MHS Staff-Day 1 (n=28)
- MHS Staff-Day 2 (n=28)
- MHS Staff Day 3 (n=28)
- Content Day 1 (SEIS in DMH)...
- Content Day 2 (SEIS in DMH)...
- DMH-Category Trng (n=29)
- Content Day 1 (SEIS in DYS) (n=25)
- Content Day 2 (SEIS in DYS) (n=27)
- Regl Day 2 (SEIS in DYS) (n=26)
What Teachers Value in PD

- Highly skilled facilitators who demonstrate an understanding of the program content and applicable expertise
- Moderate sized groups / Opportunities to work in small groups
- Opportunities to learn and share about effective practices.
- Specific, practical strategies and tools that have been used in institutional settings
- Differentiation by program type, teacher experience, etc.
- Reasonable agenda and objectives with flexibility to respond to teacher needs
Teacher Reported Gains in Understanding/Skills: DYS and DMH

- the standards and indicators
- tools and skills to effectively plan instruction
- their students (backgrounds, culture) and ways to effectively engage them
- structured (backward) planning
- effective use of KUDs
- student assessment
- intentional and focused collaboration with general educators
- writing measurable goals and objectives; ongoing collection of evidence
- facility with specific tools (text rendering, graphic organizers, etc.)
Teacher Reported Gains in Understanding/Skills: MHS

- Using information in the IEP
- Writing measurable goals and specific objectives/benchmarks; using appropriate language
- Assessment strategies/tools
- Collecting data based on evidence/student accomplishments to support progress/planning notes
- Increased focus on self-determination in assessment and transition planning
- Resources for transition planning
Teacher Perception of Need for Further Support: DYS and DMH

- Specific implementation strategies/activities for PYD and CRP (what does it look like in the classroom?)
- Promoting site-based collaboration
- Differentiated standards-based planning for the range of needs in a classroom
- Assessment tools and managing student data
- Developing quality progress notes
- Planning: clarifying role of SEIS, transient population, integrating IEP information into content-based planning
- Content-specific resources
Teacher Perception of Need for Further Support: MHS

- Assessment resources; data collection and data tools
- Improving measurable goals and objectives
- Easy access to instructional resources/materials (knowing what is available)
- Working as a team to develop progress and planning notes
- Transition goals and planning
DMH Professional Development: Fall 2012

Summary of Teacher Feedback on Professional Development Events

PD EVENT DELIVERY SUMMARY: 3 Regional Days (Sept, Oct, Nov.) offering specialized program supports:
- Behavioral supports
- Science
- Literacy
- Instructional technology
- Learning Teams

Value of Regional Professional Development Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Extremely Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Such Thing as a Bad Kid (Days 1 and 2) (n=42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Self Regulation (Day 1) (n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack and Three Rivers (Days 1-3) (n=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All DMH Regl Groups) (n=105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of Facilitation and Appropriate Content for the Population Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content was appropriate to the student population I work with (n=108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitators had good content knowledge (n=110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitators had good presentation skills (n=109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIGHLIGHTS:

- DMH teachers appreciated the smaller group professional development and the opportunities to address program specific issues.
- Almost all teachers participating in the “No Such Thing as a Bad Kid” (Charlie Appelstein) found the training to be very useful, and noted that the high quality of the facilitation.
- Teachers in “Tools for Self-Regulation” also reported that this workshop was very useful. The ETLs in this group on the second day noted that interesting information was presented, but suggested the content was not completely applicable to their work.
- Sandy Roth’s work was very much appreciated at Three Rivers. The teachers would like to have Sandy return to model, observe, and support in the classroom. Sandy’s work in Merrimack was not as well-received, with teachers noting poor alignment between the content and the program needs.
- Three Rivers teachers who participated in the Science training reported that the workshop was interesting and gave them some ideas for instructional practice, but felt it was not as useful or applicable as other trainings.
- Three Rivers and Merrimack teachers who participated in the Specialized Program Support training provided by Dale Gardner-Fox, Molly Edelen, and Bill Benjamin highly valued the hands on, practical nature of the tools presented. Several said they would need practice and perhaps support with some of the tools.
- Participants in the Specialized Learning Team Support with Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz (Chauncy Hall and CenterPoint) appreciated the quality of the facilitation, noting that it was “de-stressing,” and appreciated the flexible approach to learning team structures.

Impact of Regional PD Events on Teacher Practice:

Teachers Reporting That They Have Learned New Practices to Use in the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Such Thing as a Bad Kid (Days 1 and 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Self Regulation (Day 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack and Three Rivers (Days 1-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Learning Team Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (all Regl Groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESSION/Facilitator</td>
<td>Most Common Take-Aways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Such Thing as a Bad Kid/Appelstein</td>
<td>• Using humor and creativity to create a more positive, engaging environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Self-Regulation/Kesselheim and</td>
<td>• Specific tools and resources: e.g., brain gym, bouncy ball, and hand fidgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etheridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Workshops/Roth (days 1-3)</td>
<td>• Structured literacy routines, across content areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using reading and writing samples for assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Writing prompts and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack Specialized Program Support/Fox,</td>
<td>• Variety of tech tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edelen, Benjamin (days 1 and 3)</td>
<td>• Classroom Suite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Learning Team Support</td>
<td>• KWHL charts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tools and clarity in documenting learning teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being specific in discussing a student’s strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preliminary Feedback from Educators in SEIS Programs
# SEIS Professional Development Events and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Key Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Content Days (Sept)    | SEIS Educators in DMH, DYS, CHC                       | • Student data related to individual learner needs  
• Standard 3  
• Evidence-based IEP Progress Reporting and Planning Notes  
• Expectations for Regional Days |
| DYS Regional Day 1 (Oct) | SEIS and Gen Ed educators in DYS | Student Progress Monitoring: pre-assessment; assessment for learning; assessment of learning                                                    |
| DMH Regional Days 1 and 2 (Sept. and Oct) | DMH and CHC educators (including ETLs) | Program-specific targeted supports:  
• Behavioral supports  
• Science  
• Literacy  
• Instructional technology |
CONTENT DAYS: Overall Value

• About half of the general comments offered as feedback for the facilitators and staff were unqualified positives:
  – “Great info- very enthusiastic presenter.”
  – “You are putting it in very authentic, human, teacher-friendly terms (esp. spec. ed teacher friendly terms) and you clearly care about the staff and students.”

• Suggestions for improving in the future:
  – Bring back menu days
  – Offer more opportunities to share ideas
  – Reduce the quantity of information presented
Where to find student data related to individual learner needs (e.g., IEP)

How to use Aspen to access IEPs, report progress and write planning notes

Understanding of the (New) Student Review and Planning Protocol

Understanding of Standard 3: Professional Culture

Preparation for Regional Day Series

Collaboration and communication with Learning Team members, liaisons and supervisors

The connections between student and classroom data

SEIS Content Day One

Coverage of Content Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparing for Regional Day Series</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the (New) Student Experience</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the (New) Student Experience</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration and communication with Learning Team</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration and communication with Learning Team</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to use Aspen to access IEPs, report progress and write planning notes</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where to find student data related to individual learner needs (e.g., IEP)</th>
<th>SEIS in DMH</th>
<th>SEIS in DYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The connection between IEP Progress Reports and IEP and Planning Notes
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 38% | Covered adequately 63%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 32% | Covered adequately 53%

Understanding Protocol 5: Analysis of Student Work
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 9% | Covered adequately 45%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 10% | Covered adequately 47%

The connection between IEP Progress Reports and IEP Planning Notes
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 29% | Covered adequately 71%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 30% | Covered adequately 54%

Connecting IEP Goals to the general curriculum via standards-based IEPs
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 26% | Covered adequately 65%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 32% | Covered adequately 55%

Tools, strategies, and techniques for IEP progress reporting and writing planning notes
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 21% | Covered adequately 75%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 31% | Covered adequately 56%

Tools, strategies, and techniques to inform a continuous planning cycle
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 17% | Covered adequately 79%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 22% | Covered adequately 65%

Reflect on and improve practice
SEIS in DMH: Covered completely 25% | Covered adequately 58%
SEIS in DYS: Covered completely 21% | Covered adequately 71%
CONTENT DAYS: What teachers are taking back to their program

- Enhanced use of Aspen for accessing information and preparing planning notes and Progress Reports
- Tools and strategies for collecting and managing different types of information on student needs and strengths
- Increased focus on collaboration and sharing of information with colleagues
- Use of new protocols with learning teams
DYS Regional Day 1: Overall Value

• 79% of SEIS in DYS respondents found Regional Day One to be useful or extremely useful. SEIS educators in the Pre-Assessment workshop found somewhat less value (60%).

• 94% of respondents agreed that their facilitators were knowledgeable, engaging, professional, and had effective presentation skills.

• Highlights:
  – “Really appreciate the facilitators modeling so may of the skills they were teaching today.”
  – “Good teamwork!”

• Suggestions for improvement:
  – Increase opportunities for active learning and teacher sharing/interaction
  – Focus on practice more than theory (e.g., assessment toolkit)
  – Limit content to reduce information overload
DYS Regional Day 1: What will teachers do differently

- Assessment for Learning participants frequently mentioned specific changes, such as NEO-2, games, summarizers, and activators.
- Pre-Assessment: general ideas about ways to assess/understand new students.
- Assessment of Learning participants comments varied (no consistent theme), including: rubrics, variety of assessments, backward planning, unpacking standards, learning styles.
DMH, CHC, ETL Regional Days

Charlie Appelstein, No Such Thing as Bad Kid:

• “One of my favorite PD experiences. All teachers should be required to receive this PD. Charlie was fantastic.”

• **Value**: Two-thirds of educators who attended this workshop rated it as *Extremely Useful*, with another 31% rating it Useful.

• **High quality facilitation**: Virtually all attendees (93-95%) strongly agreed that the facilitator had good content knowledge and presentation skills, and the remainder agreed.

• **Applicable**: Virtually all attendees (93-96%) agreed or strongly agreed that the content presented was appropriate to their students.
DMH/CHC Regional Days

Charlie Appelstein, No Such Thing as Bad Kid:

• Training was very useful for:
  – Understanding students with emotional and behavioral issues.
  – Responding to students using positive, strength-based theories and techniques.
  – Understanding the power of and strategies for motivating at-risk students

• What will teachers take back to the classroom:
  – Strengths-based approach
  – Creating a positive environment: support, encouragement, celebration
  – Effective use of humor and creativity (rap, music, acting)
DMH/CHC Regional Days: Etheridge and Kesselheim, Sensory and Regulatory Needs

- **Value:** 68% of educators who attended this workshop rated it as Useful or Extremely Useful.

- **Quality of Facilitation:** All workshop participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitator(s) had good presentation skills and content knowledge.

- **Applicable:** 85% of educators felt the content was appropriate to their student population. A small subgroup disagreed.
DMH/CHC Regional Days

Etheridge and Kesselheim, Sensory and Regulatory Needs

• What will teachers take back to the classroom:
  • brain gym, bouncy balls, and hand fidgets
  • general comments, such as “I will try many of the practices presented”

• What will ETLs do as a result of the training:
  • Bring ideas/suggestions back to DMH teachers
DMH Program Specific: Three Rivers

LITERACY (Day 1 with Sandy Roth):

• “Organized, helpful, useful, engaging, appropriate, instructive, individualized, big picture, little picture, inspiring, tremendous, professional, inclusive, inquiry based, modeling, examples, student work, data driven”

• Will need more follow-up and recommended resources

SCIENCE:

• Mixed reaction regarding usefulness
• Good facilitation and interesting
• Not relevant for all
DMH Program Specific: Merrimack

INSTRUCTIONAL TECH TOOLS:

• Valuable
• Appreciate format and program-based work
• Interest in using new tools

LITERACY:

• Mixed sense of value and applicability
DYS Professional Development 2012-2013
Regional Day Three Summary of Findings: SEIS in DYS

How well did Regional Day Three meet the needs of SEIS in DYS educators?
Chart 1 shows the usefulness ratings given by SEIS in DYS educators to all three Regional Days. Regional Day Three was found to be the most useful of the three days for SEIS in DYS educators: all of the SEIS in DYS educators found Regional Day Three to be useful, and nearly half found it to be extremely useful.

During Regional Day Three, participants were divided into three workshops:
- The Audacity of Changing Beliefs: Developing a Foundation for Student Success through Culturally Responsive Teaching and Positive Youth Development
- Teaching in a Standards-Based Environment: Using Accommodations and Modifications to Teach All Students
- Maximizing the Potential for Student Success: Teach Like a Champion through Differentiation

SEIS in DYS educators in every workshop found Regional Day Three to be either useful or extremely useful. The distribution of these responses varied by workshop, however, with participants in the accommodations and modifications workshop most likely to report that the workshop was extremely useful, followed by the participants in the differentiation workshop and the participants in the CRP/PYD workshop.

Chart 1: Regional Days One, Two, and Three: Usefulness in Role for SEIS in DYS
Charts 2 and 3 show SEIS in DYS educator agreement with regard to two statements: (1) the content of each Regional Day was appropriate for the students they serve; and (2) they learned new practices at each Regional Day that they will implement in the classroom.

**Chart 2: Regional Days Provided Content That Is Appropriate to Student Populations Served**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Day One (n=35)</th>
<th>Regional Day Two (n=34)</th>
<th>Regional Day Three (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy/Numeracy/Arts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for All</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 3: Regional Days Helped Teachers Learn New Practices to Implement in the Classroom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Day One (n=35)</th>
<th>Regional Day Two (n=33)</th>
<th>Regional Day Three (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy/Numeracy/Arts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for All</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What will SEIS in DYS teachers do differently as a result of Regional Day Three?

The Audacity of Changing Beliefs: Developing a Foundation for Student Success through Culturally Responsive Teaching and Positive Youth Development: There were 11 SEIS in DYS educators who participated in this workshop. Of these, five (45%) responded to the question asking what they will do differently in their practice, although only one noted a specific practice to try in the classroom. Their responses follow:

- I found the info about how students who grow up in less affluent homes have different skills early on interesting;
- Use the web diagram;
- I will have a better set of tools for resources for creating mini units and lesson plans that will reflect my students culture and interests;
- Incorporate 2-3 strategies that were mentioned;
- I have a greater understanding of PYD/CRP from this pd.

Teaching in a Standards-Based Environment: Using Accommodations and Modifications to Teach All Students: Eight SEIS in DYS educators attended the workshop on using accommodations and modifications. Seven of them (88%) responded to the question of what they will do differently in their instructional practice, with four noting specific new practices they will incorporate. Their responses follow:

- I will add more visual manipulatives;
- Share info with others in my program;
- Hand out pre-filled-out graphic organizers to show. Post it note graphic organizers;
- Look into E2020 for certain students on and not on Compass but need other programming. Speak with fellow teachers about having graphic organizer folders;
- Collaborative- IEP/accom. more effectively with fellow teachers;
- If need modification, will know it needs to be formalized and approved;
- Use more visual and kinesthetic activities.

Maximizing the Potential for Student Success: Teach Like a Champion through Differentiation: Twelve SEIS in DYS educators attended the differentiation workshop. Of these, eight (67%) responded to the question about what they will do differently in their instructional practice, with all of them noting specific changes in their practice.

- Will try some of the technology ideas and bring info back to my colleagues re: tiering;
- Utilize power point. Create a facebook page;
- Build in more tiered instruction;
- Utilize technology;
- Use more of Bloom’s Level of Questioning in my lessons and collaboration;
- I will use higher order thinking skills in my plans and activities;
- Update my mini unit lesson. Try to start a "fake" blog and "podcast";
- Make use of planning templates more often.
How useful were workshop sessions in meeting learning objectives?

At the end of the day, the participants in each workshop were asked to rate the usefulness of their workshop for their understanding of each of three or four learning objectives related to the workshop’s content. Because of the small number of SEIS educators in each workshop, it is not possible to draw quantitative comparisons about the effectiveness of each workshop. Chart 4 shows the average ratings given by SEIS in DYS educators across all of the learning objectives for each of the three workshops on each Regional Day, on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being not useful and 4 being extremely useful.

Chart 4: Average Usefulness Ratings for Workshops in Each Regional Day in Meeting Specified Learning Objectives (Scale of 1 to 4): SEIS in DYS

SEIS in DYS educators gave generally high marks to the usefulness of their workshops at meeting the specified learning objectives, although the ratings varied somewhat from one workshop to another. SEIS in DYS educators found the Accommodations and Modifications workshop to be most useful at meeting the stated learning objectives; the CRP/PYD workshop was the least successful of the three at meeting stated learning objectives.

Teachers were given opportunities to make comments concerning the learning objectives and the workshops overall.

- Teachers in the accommodations and modifications workshop frequently noted that the workshop clarified learning objectives and ideas for them. They also appreciated the stations and the hands-on assistance.
- Teachers in the differentiation workshop were positive as well, although they thought that there was a lot of information for one day, and some commented on the number of paper handouts and the difficulty of keeping them organized.
- Teachers in the CRP/PYD workshop often asked for more specific examples and practical applications. One noted that she or he is just as confused about the topic as before the workshop.
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Presentation Excerpts: Needs Assessment Findings
SEIS Teacher Input:
Areas where teachers identified a need for more support
(2012-2013 Regional and Content Day Feedback)
SEIS in DMH:
1. Content-based collaboration with colleagues; planning and instructional delivery within the content areas
   • Program-based, population specific, grade-appropriate supports
   • Writing assessment and skill development strategies
2. Mini-unit planning; differentiation for the diversity of students
3. Integrating planning to address IEP and standards-based goals
4. Assessment, monitoring, data collection for progress reporting
5. Learning teams: practice; how to effectively document
6. Technology training
SEIS in DYS:

1. Co-planning and co-teaching (finding time to collaborate; what it looks like in the classroom; inclusion; roles/limitations of SEIS teachers in the classroom; support for non-IEP students)

1. Mini-unit and lesson planning

1. Specific special education issues:
   • Understanding the range of learners and needs: children with disabilities, sensory issues
   • Progress notes, planning notes, developing goals
   • Integrating planning to address IEP and content goals
SEIS in DYS:

4. Classroom/behavior management; how to engage students
5. Technology:
   • Administrative: increase skills in Aspen, particularly using it to access/manage assessment information to understand learners; Moodle
   • Instructional Tech: how to integrate into classroom work
6. Practical, hands-on applications (“make it and take it” in PD)
7. Assessment – administering, using informal and formative assessments. Assessment template on Aspen to compile assessment data
Everyone is a learner
The Learning Teams Framework for educators in institutional settings was supported by the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services and developed in partnership with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

CONTRIBUTORS:
Collaborative for Educational Services
(formerly Hampshire Educational Collaborative)
Cambridge Education

Massachusetts Department of Youth Services
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
DYS/SEIS Learning Teams Framework v.1

A shared understanding of relevant research regarding learning teams and implications for practice and professional development for educators working in institutional settings

INTRODUCTION

Beginning in the fall of 2010, as part of a multi-year effort, the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) and the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Special Education in Institutionalized Settings Program (SEIS), which serves the Departments of Public Health, Mental Health, and Youth Services, as well as the County Houses of Corrections, will institute learning teams across our educational programs for youth.

Learning teams, as we have defined them, are “groups of professionals who collaborate regularly in a structured inquiry process to enhance student learning and self-efficacy.” Learning teams comprise the professionals who work with students in DYS/SEIS programs. Embedded in this definition is a holistic, multi-faceted conception of student learning that includes academic, social/emotional health and wellness, and self-advocacy learning. “Self-efficacy” refers to a youth’s belief in his/her ability and capacity to accomplish a task or deal with the challenges of life—to succeed in a particular situation.

Learning teams build on the expertise of DYS/SEIS educators as well as on the extensive professional development and curriculum improvement efforts undertaken during the past several years. The strategy is based on the basic idea that teachers throughout DYS/SEIS settings can improve their effectiveness through ongoing, purposeful, focused collaboration with colleagues at their programs who share the same students. Learning teams are site-based program teams that use a structured inquiry process to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Informed by their analysis of student strengths and needs, team members work together to plan curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Team members can also work together to develop intervention plans for struggling students.

Organizing teachers into collaborative learning teams is a strategy that is supported by the research on educational improvement as well as by the effective practices literature. Further, it is a strategy that is particularly well-suited to the distinctive educational challenges we face in institutional program settings: small numbers of teachers who need to draw on each other’s experience, expertise, and ideas in order to provide high-quality support to students who exhibit wide ranges of strengths and needs, who have high mobility rates in and out of programs, and whose formal education in many cases has been interrupted.

The 2010-11 school year will be the first year of a multi-year process that will institutionalize learning teams as the central mechanism for professional collaboration at program sites. This document provides a framework that situates the initiative in the broader context of recent DYS/SEIS professional development efforts, outlines how structured meeting formats, coaching, and professional development will support teachers in improving teaching and learning, and delineates the roles and responsibilities educators throughout the DYS/SEIS systems will need to assume to ensure successful implementation.
DYS/SEIS teachers and administrators have carried out significant work in recent years to improve the quality of teaching and learning in our educational settings. These efforts include recruitment and retention measures, improved teaching conditions, new instructional guides, organized programs of professional development and coaching, co-teaching with artist educators, and technology integration, among others. Teachers have participated in a range of professional development that includes work in literacy, numeracy, universal design, special needs, positive youth development, culturally responsive practices, and effective instruction for English language learners, as well as work specific to their content areas.

Additionally, in many programs teachers are engaged in ongoing collaboration to improve teaching and learning as they share lesson ideas, discuss student achievement and behavior, and plan performances, special events, and projects. During the 2009-10 academic year two treatment programs formed Integrated Service Delivery teams in which special educators and general classroom teachers collaborated to support all students in accessing the general curriculum.

In sum, the hard work of individual teachers, instructional guides, a robust program of professional development, and significant informal and formal staff collaboration provide a strong foundation for extending the application of learning teams throughout the DYS and SEIS educational systems.

Teacher learning teams—also known as professional learning communities—are a specific instance of a broader trend toward collaboration within and across organizations and agencies (Applebaum et al., 2000; Bardach, 1998). This trend includes increased collaboration between general and special educators to serve the needs of struggling learners, an objective DYS and SEIS have identified as a priority and support through the implementation of learning teams, among other measures (Gleckel and Koretz, 2008; Rallis et al., 2009; Stroul, 2002).

Further, research strongly supports learning teams as an instructional improvement strategy. A consensus has emerged among school improvement experts -- influenced by studies of effective schools and practices in other countries -- that ongoing, job-embedded professional development of the type carried out by learning teams allows teachers to hone their craft as they jointly plan lessons and assessments, develop and implement teaching strategies, monitor the performance of students, and adjust instruction accordingly (Darling-Hammond, 2009). This consensus is supported by a growing number of evaluations and research studies that find that teacher teams lead to improve student achievement when participants focus on improving teaching and learning.

For example, in a study of teacher teams in Cincinnati, Supovitz (2002) found that the implementation of teacher teams with common planning time led to improved peer collaboration in most schools, but to improved student achievement only in teams that focused on improving teaching and learning, those that functioned as “communities of instructional practice.” Further Vescio et al. (2008) reviewed the existing research studies on professional learning communities and identified six studies that found significant achievement gains for students in professional learning communities characterized by an “intense focus” on student learning. Finally, in a recent methodologically rigorous quasi-experimental study of learning teams in California, researchers found that achievement rose 41% overall, and 54% for Hispanic students in schools in which learning teams used structured inquiry processes to guide their collaboration, were supported by trained peer facilitators, and worked in stable settings dedicated to improving student learning (Saunders, et al. 2009; Gallimore and Ermeling, 2010).
THE DYS/SEIS LEARNING TEAMS FRAMEWORK

Figure 1 represents the DYS/SEIS framework, illustrating the hypothesized cause and effect relationships that link coaching and professional development, effective team collaboration, quality teaching, quality learning, and educational impact. Beginning with the box at the bottom labeled **Educational Impact**, the goal of the learning team strategy—is to “enhance student learning and self-efficacy.” Meeting this goal requires that students have educational experiences in which they successfully engage in learning essential knowledge and skills and develop a positive identity and confidence in their abilities (labeled **High-Quality Student Learning Experiences** in Figure 1)\(^1\). Teachers support high-quality learning through **High-Quality Teaching Practices**. In this framework we characterize effective teaching as lessons that:

- Are designed to ensure that the school work students do prepares them for assessments of high priority content and skills
- Are engaging, culturally relevant, and support positive youth development
- Are differentiated to meet the needs of culturally, linguistically, and cognitively diverse learners
- Are adjusted based on frequent formative assessment, assessments that students and teachers use to monitor progress
- Support literacy development across content areas

Teachers can tap and build on their existing knowledge and skills as they collaborate with one another on learning teams using structured inquiry processes (**Teacher Collaboration**). Structured inquiry processes help guide and focus learning teams as they identify student strengths and needs, monitor student progress, solve problems, plan units and lessons, share teaching strategies and experiences, assess the effectiveness of units and lessons. Further, structured collaboration will lead to **Improved Program Culture and Informal Collaboration**, which in turn bolsters the development of high-quality teaching practices. Learning teams are supported in their collaboration through the **Professional Development, Coaching, and Oversight** that DYS/SEIS provides.

A subset of program-based learning teams will be more specialized in orientation in order to deepen specific types of collaboration and address specific needs. Some, for example, will work as Integrated Service Delivery teams that increase collaboration in planning and instructional delivery between general and special educators. Others areas of specialized focus will include arts-based learning and meeting the needs of English Language Learners.

CORE COMPONENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK

The core components of the learning team framework include structured inquiry processes, a system-wide instructional improvement focus, professional development release days, and support and facilitation carried out by instructional coaches, professional development facilitators, teaching coordinators, and administrative leaders. Each of these components is briefly described below:

---

\(^1\) For additional information on positive youth development see, “Positive Youth Development: A Shared Understanding of Research and Implications for Practice in the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services’ Educational Initiative.”
Structured Inquiry Processes

Structured inquiry processes serve as discussion guides that support teachers in conducting respectful, constructive meetings focused on improving teaching and learning. Structured inquiry processes are commonly used in educational settings across the United States to guide teachers as they examine student work, analyze other student data, identify instructional challenges, design and score assessments, solve problems, and share teaching strategies. (McDonald et al., 2007; Gallimore et al., 2009)

Structured inquiry processes outline a series of steps—including discussion prompts—that promote constructive conversation. These steps provide a focus for each meeting, help team members establish and maintain a respectful tone in their discussions, and ensure that all team members contribute to conversations and that “air time” is shared among participants in a reasonably equitable fashion. Structured inquiry processes support Learning Teams in developing collaborative routines that lead to the effective use of common meeting time. (McDonald et al., 2007)

The structured inquiry processes for the Learning Team Initiative will include identification of student strengths and needs, mini-unit planning, and mini-unit review. Team members will use a Learning Team Log to document their plans, analyses, and insights.

Instructional Improvement Focus

Learning Teams provide a structure in which teachers can work together on deepening their use of effective teaching strategies. Through coaching and professional development, DYS/SEIS will continue to support high-quality unit and lesson design, positive youth development/culturally responsive practice, the use of formative assessment practices, and differentiated instruction. Attention to these strategies will be integrated into a specific instructional improvement focus for all DYS/SEIS learning teams, a focus that will evolve over the years. The initial instructional improvement focus for the Learning Teams Initiative will be literacy across the content areas. DYS/SEIS coaching and professional development will support teachers in improving students' ability to read and write as means to learning content area subject matter.

Many American adolescents struggle to understand and learn from texts at their grade level and are unprepared for the literacy demands they will encounter in workplaces and post-secondary institutions (Kamil et al., 2008). This problem is particularly acute in juvenile justice settings (O’Cummings et al., 2010). Research demonstrates that secondary school teachers can support their students in accessing and learning content area knowledge—in reading to learn and writing to learn—through the use of specific generic and discipline-specific strategies. In addition, there is strong evidence that explicit vocabulary instruction and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies lead to improved reading proficiency—and thus enable student to “take full advantage content-area instruction.” (Kamil et al., 2008; Graham and Perrin, 2007)

The literacy across the content areas focus builds on existing teacher expertise and on previous DYS/SEIS professional development. It is also a focus that by definition spans the content areas and thus provides a natural point of discussion for interdisciplinary program teams. This focus will include reading and writing. Within reading, the emphasis will be on vocabulary development and reading comprehension.

Coaching, Facilitation, and Professional Development

As DYS/SEIS educational settings implement learning teams, coaches and professional development facilitators will need to support basic team functioning, the use of structured inquiry processes, and the literacy across the content areas instructional focus. Training for coaches,
professional development facilitators, and other leaders will take place in the summer and in follow-up meetings throughout the year. Teaching coordinators will also receive team leadership training during regular teaching coordinator meetings.

Each professional development facilitator will work with several program-based learning teams (about 25 educators) that will meet as a group at professional development release days during the school year. During these professional development release days, teachers will be introduced to structured inquiry processes before they use them, de-brief on their experiences using the tools after they have had opportunities to work with them at their sites, and deepen their knowledge of literacy across the content areas strategies.

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

Accountable implementation of the Learning Team Initiative will require that participants in DYS/SEIS educational programs assume the following important roles and responsibilities.

**Students:**

Provide feedback regarding the effectiveness of the teaching and adult support they experience.

**Teachers / Teaching Coordinators:**

Participate in collaborative team meetings with the goal of deepening their understanding of their students as learners, improve teaching and learning as a result of that understanding, share the roles of facilitator, recorder, and timekeeper, participate in professional development and coaching discussions, and implement strategies associated with the instructional improvement focus.

**Teaching Coordinators:**

Work to ensure that teams use the structured inquiry process smoothly and productively to support student learning, manage the rotation of roles, ensure that team learning logs are posted to the team online collaboration space in a timely fashion, and deepen team facilitation expertise through participation in teaching coordinator meetings and trainings.

**Coaches and Professional Development Facilitators:**

Support team functioning, use of structured inquiry processes, and implementation of instructional improvement strategies. Review and respond to learning team logs, collaboratively problem-solve, and provide technical assistance and coaching to learning teams.

**Education Administrators (e.g., Regional Education Coordinators):**

Review learning team logs and meet with teaching coordinators to support team progress, solve team challenges, and document and share successful solutions. Meet with learning teams with some frequency to support their development.

**Learning Team Work Group Members:**

Monitor the progress of the Learning Teams Initiative and the progress of program-based learning teams, solve implementation barriers as they arise, develop recommendations for improvement, and plan future phases of the initiative.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction:</strong> The Learning Team Toolkit, Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protocol 1:</strong> Current Cohort Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To assess the current status of each student’s progress by collaboratively reviewing new student data and other information in order to update strategies and plans.</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Protocol 6:</strong> Mini-Unit Tuning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim:</strong> To gather constructive feedback from colleagues on a mini-unit or lesson in order to make improvements and try out new strategies and approaches.</td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker</strong></td>
</tr>
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INTRODUCTION: LEARNING TEAM TOOLKIT, YEAR 3

The 2012-2013 Learning Team model has been designed as a next step in supporting learning teams as they work to improve student and program outcomes. Informed by analysis of a range of learning team data and feedback from teachers, coaches, and supervisors, this model encourages differentiation by program type, structured use of common planning time, and team choice in determining the types and sequence of meetings that will best meet team and student needs.

This approach to supporting learning teams is structured around new tools and a new process for using them. The toolkit includes six protocols to guide different types of meetings and a Student Goal and Progress Tracker. These tools support analysis of student progress and student work, differentiation of instructional strategies, collaborative mini-unit planning, and setting and monitoring student learning goals.

Each learning team is being asked to begin the 2012-13 academic year by following a sequence of learning team meetings—differentiated for detention/revocation, assessment, and treatment programs—in order to become familiar with some or all of the new tools. After completing this sequence of meetings, teams will review their progress and, through their teacher coordinator, plan the next 3-6 weeks of learning team meetings with their supervisors. This process of planning and review with supervisors will continue periodically throughout the year.

Instructional coaches will continue to provide strategic learning team support through site-based coaching, log feedback, and Regional and Statewide professional development. Teams will continue to use learning team logs to document the relevant discussion points and action steps that result from these learning team meetings.

Teachers throughout the DYS/SEIS system are taking advantage of learning team meetings to collaborate with each other in service of their students. The intent of these tools and our new approach to learning team meetings is to further all the quality hard work underway in program after program.
PROTOCOL 1: CURRENT COHORT REVIEW

**Aim:** To assess the current status of each student’s progress by collaboratively reviewing new student data and other information in order to update strategies and plans.

**Process:**

a. Prior to the meeting, assemble available data and assign roles (facilitator, time-keeper, and note-taker). Each teacher fills out the first three columns (i.e., student name, new data, and additional observations) on the **Current Cohort Review Form**. Consider the following types of data as you prepare to review each student’s progress:
   - TABE
   - MCAS
   - IEP
   - ILP
   - Math level indicator
   - Reading inventory
   - Multiple intelligence survey
   - Student interest survey
   - Writing samples from class

b. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.

c. To begin the protocol, allow each team member **silent reading and writing time** to review and/or complete the Current Cohort Review Form.

d. Conduct a short round for each student in the current cohort (or a sub-group of the current cohort). Each teacher draws on his/her notes from the Current Cohort Review Form. The goal is to discuss the most important information rather than to “cover” all the information on each teacher’s form.

e. The facilitator quickly gives each teacher the opportunity to share information and impressions about each student and then opens the round up for general discussion. The facilitator ensures that the conversation for each student is chunked into the following parts:
   - New data (factual information) to consider
   - Additional observations
     - Consider early evidence regarding which strategies are and are not having the desired effects
   - Strategies and plans

f. The note-taker captures the brainstormed strategies and plans for each student

g. Use the **Learning Team Process Rubric** to assess the quality of the team’s discussion.

h. Each teacher considers whether this discussion has implications for his/her **Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker** and makes updates accordingly. The note-taker completes the **Learning Team Log**, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>New Data (factual information)</th>
<th>Additional Observations</th>
<th>Strategies and Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PROTOCOL 1: CURRENT COHORT REVIEW

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Silent Reading and Writing Time (5 minutes)
- Complete and/or review the first three columns (i.e., student name, new data, and additional observations) on the Current Cohort Review Form

Student Discussion Rounds (30 minutes total—i.e., 5 minutes each for 6 students)
- Conduct a short round for each student in the current cohort (or a sub-group of the cohort). Each teacher draws on his/her notes from the Current Cohort Review Form. The goal is to discuss the most important information, not to “cover” all the information on each teacher’s form.
- The facilitator quickly gives each teacher the opportunity to share information, impressions, and judgments about each student and then opens the round up for general discussion. The facilitator ensures the conversation for each student is chunked into the following parts:
  - New data (factual information) to consider
  - Additional observations
    - Consider early evidence regarding which strategies are and are not having the desired effects
  - Strategies and plans
- The note-taker captures the brainstormed strategies and plans for each student

Debrief and Document (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions.
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log. All teachers update Student Priority Goal and Progress Trackers and note strategies to implement.
PROTOCOL 2: (NEW) STUDENT REVIEW AND PLANNING

Aim: To build on the New Student Information Sharing Protocol with an extended, more comprehensive analysis that leads to collaborative strategy development and focused planning. This protocol can be used with new students or on other occasions when devoting a full learning team meeting to discussion of one student would be valuable.

Process:

i. Prior to the meeting, assemble available data and assign roles (facilitator, time-keeper, and note-taker).

j. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.

k. To begin the protocol, allow each team member silent time to examine the full range of data available for the student.
   - TABE
   - MCAS
   - IEP
   - ILP
   - Math level indicator
   - Reading inventory
   - Multiple intelligence survey
   - Student interest survey
   - Writing samples from class

l. Make observations on these data and other relevant sources of objective evidence. Save all judgments and hunches for step d.

m. Share impressions based on interactions with the student and share inferences and judgments relevant to student learning.

n. Brainstorm potential strategies to encourage student strengths, engage students, and address challenges.

o. Develop a focused (realistic) plan based on the above analysis.

p. Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the quality of the team’s discussion.

q. Each teacher considers whether this discussion has implications for his/her Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker and makes updates accordingly. The note-taker completes the Learning Team Log, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
PROTOCOL 2: (NEW) STUDENT REVIEW AND PLANNING

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Silent Reading and Writing Time (5 minutes)

Round 1: Data observations (8 minutes)
- Share observations on the data.
- Save judgments for round 2.

Round 2: Interaction Observations (6 minutes)
- Share observations based on interactions with students; share inferences and judgments relevant to student learning.

Round 3: Strategies (8 minutes)
- Brainstorm potential strategies to encourage student strengths, engage students, and address challenges.

Round 4: Planning (8 minutes)
- Develop a focused (realistic) plan based on the above analysis.

Debrief and Document (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions.
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log. All teachers update Student Priority Goal and Progress Trackers and note strategies to implement.
PROTOCOL 3: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – WRITING ACROSS THE CONTENT AREAS (WAC)

**Aim:** To examine a single student’s writing in different content areas in order to identify patterns and contrasts across content areas and assignments. Based on this analysis, teachers can identify areas of need and appropriate strategies to support student learning through writing.

**Process:**

a. In advance of the meeting, determine which student’s work will be examined and who will be the facilitator.

b. Each teacher brings in two recent samples of the student’s writing (ungraded or with grades removed). Optionally, teachers can also bring in a somewhat older writing sample to assess growth or change. Each member is responsible for making copies for the members of the team.

c. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.

d. Begin the analysis of student work with 5 minutes of silent reading and writing time. It is important that everyone have the opportunity to concentrate on reading the work without yet being influenced by colleagues. There will be much opportunity for sharing and discussion.

e. Facilitator leads team through the discussion rounds described below for approximately 40 minutes. Literally go around the table and give each participant an opportunity to speak. Facilitator starts on left for the first round, then on the right, and then in the middle so that the same person does not always go last in the round. It is OK to “pass” one’s turn. After each member has had an opportunity to speak, facilitator can choose to open the round up for a short discussion.

f. The discussion rounds follow a three step process analogous to a patient going to a doctor: first observe and note symptoms, then look for underlying causes, and then evaluate possible solutions (i.e., prescriptions). The idea is to begin with observation and description and separate observation from attempts to understand underlying causes. Save all your good teaching suggestions (i.e., write them down) for the third round after you have fully assessed the student’s writing.

g. After Round 3, use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the quality of the team’s discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions.

h. Each teacher considers whether this discussion has implications for his/her Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker and makes updates accordingly. The note-taker completes the Learning Team Log, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
PROTOCOL 3: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – WRITING ACROSS THE CONTENT AREAS (WAC)

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Review Student Work: Silent Reading and Writing Time (5 minutes)
- Study the student work and prepare your questions and comments for rounds one and two.

Round One: Describe characteristics of the work, i.e., the “symptoms” (8 minutes)
- Examine the work and describe its strengths and areas in need of improvement.
- Do not yet attempt to explain why students are struggling or succeeding on specific tasks.
- Describe symptoms without yet attempting to diagnose the causes of these symptoms. 
  For example, describe the work in terms of ideas, voice, accuracy, clarity, sentence fluency, and/or conventions (not only conventions).

Round Two: Diagnose learning successes and challenges, i.e., diagnose underlying causes (8 minutes)
- What does the student understand and/or know how to do?
- Why is the student struggling on specific tasks?
- What obstacles to understanding/mastery account for errors or areas in need of improvement?
- What does the student seem on the verge of understanding? What’s the next step for this student?
  For example, “I wonder if the student knows how to...” “This student knows how to organize his/her ideas but...”

Silent Reading and Writing Time (2 minutes)
- Review the analysis thus far and prepare your questions and comments for round three.

Round Three: Brainstorm teaching strategies, i.e., what is your prescription? (12 minutes)
- What teaching strategies may help address the learning challenges identified?
- What are the next steps for this student?
  For example, “We could try out such and such strategies ....”

Debrief and Action Planning (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log. All teachers update Student Priority Goal and Progress Trackers and note/plan strategies to implement.
PROTOCOL 4: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – PATTERNS IN OPEN RESPONSE (OR)

**Aim**: To examine patterns and contrasts in a range of open responses from multiple students and written in different content areas. Based on this analysis, teachers can identify areas of need and appropriate strategies for different groups of students.

**Process**:

a. In advance of the meeting, determine who will be the facilitator and ensure that each teacher will have sample open responses to bring to the meeting (teams may want to arrange this meeting a few weeks in advance in order to leave time for teachers to find/create and give open response prompts).

b. Each teacher brings in 2-3 samples of MCAS-type open response writing that represent the range of student work in the current student cohort (e.g., a low, a medium, and a high sample). Also bring in the associated rubrics for evaluating the work (e.g., MCAS rubrics). Erase all student names for the work. Each member is responsible for making copies for the members of the team.

c. The facilitator organizes 2-3 stacks of student work (e.g., low, medium, and high). The group will read one stack and conduct the rounds below and then continue with another stack.

d. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.

e. Begin with 5 minutes of silent reading time. It is important that everyone have the opportunity to concentrate on reading the work without yet being influenced by colleagues. There will be much opportunity for sharing and discussion.

f. Facilitator leads team through the rounds described below. Literally go around the table and give each participant an opportunity to speak. It is OK to “pass” one’s turn. After each member has had an opportunity, facilitator can choose to open the round up for a short discussion. The discussion rounds follow a three step process analogous to a patient going to a doctor: first observe and note symptoms, then look for underlying causes, and then evaluate possible solutions (i.e., prescriptions). The idea is to begin with observation and description and separate observation from attempts to understand underlying causes. Save all your good teaching suggestions (i.e., write them down) for the third round after you have fully assessed the student’s writing.

g. After Round 3, use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the quality of the team’s discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions.

h. Each teacher considers whether this discussion has implications for his/her Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker and makes updates accordingly. The note-taker completes the Learning Team Log, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
PROTOCOL 4: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – PATTERNS IN OPEN RESPONSE (OR)

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Review Student Work: Silent Reading and Writing Time (5 minutes)
- Study the student work and prepare your questions and comments for rounds one and two.

Round One: Describe characteristics of the work, i.e., the “symptoms” (8 minutes)
- Examine the work and describe its strengths and areas in need of improvement.
- Do not yet attempt to explain why students are struggling or succeeding on specific tasks.
- Describe symptoms without yet attempting to diagnose the causes of these symptoms.
  *For example, describe the work in terms of ideas, voice, accuracy, clarity, sentence fluency, and/or conventions (not only conventions).*

Round Two: Diagnose learning successes and challenges, i.e., diagnose underlying causes (8 minutes)
- What does the student understand and/or know how to do?
- Why is the student struggling on specific tasks?
- What obstacles to understanding/mastery account for errors or areas in need of improvement?
- What does the student seem on the verge of understanding? What’s the next step for this student?
  *For example, “I wonder if the student knows how to...” “This student knows how to organize his/her ideas but...”*

Silent Reading and Writing Time (2 minutes)
- Review the analysis thus far and prepare your questions and comments for round three.

Round Three: Brainstorm teaching strategies, i.e., what is your prescription? (12 minutes)
- What teaching strategies may help address the learning challenges identified (taking advantage of student strengths when possible)?
- What are the next steps for this student?
  *For example, “We could try out such and such strategies ....”*

Debrief and Action Planning (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log. All teachers update Student Priority Goal and Progress Trackers and note/plan strategies to implement.
PROTOCOL 5: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – DIFFERENTIATION PLANNER

Aim: To plan differentiated tasks and strategies for students based on their performance on a specific assessment. This protocol supports teachers in assessing whether small groups of students would benefit from the same tasks and/or strategies. It encourages collaboration on matching instructional practices to specific student learning needs.

Process:

a. Teachers can complete the protocol through step 3 prior to the learning team meeting.

b. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.

c. Begin the protocol by completing and sharing each teacher’s responses on steps 2 and 3. Discuss the learning needs of specific students and groups of students. Assess whether there are patterns across content areas.

d. Each teacher fills out step 4 independently and silently to allow colleagues to focus on generating appropriate instructional responses to identified needs.

e. Conduct a round in which each teacher presents instructional tasks and strategies for specific students and/or groups of students. Discuss each teacher’s ideas briefly before moving on to the next teacher’s plans. Share ideas and be open to new possibilities. Consider whether implementing joint strategies across two or more classrooms in a coordinated fashion would be beneficial (e.g., emphasizing summarizing as a strategy during the same week).

f. Upon completion of the protocol, use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the quality of the team’s discussion.

g. Each teacher considers whether this discussion has implications for his/her Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker and makes updates accordingly. The note-taker completes the Learning Team Log, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
PROTOCOL 5: ANALYSIS OF STUDENT WORK – DIFFERENTIATION PLANNER

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Silent Writing Time: Learning Needs (5 minutes)
- Complete sections 1-3 on the Differentiation Planner.

Round 1: Identify Learning Needs (8 minutes)
- Discuss the learning needs of different (groups of) students and compare patterns across content areas.

Silent Writing Time: Instructional Strategies (4 minutes)
- Complete section 4 on the Differentiation Planner.

Round 2: Instructional Strategies (18 minutes)
- Discuss instructional tasks and strategies for specific students and/or groups of students.
- Consider whether implementing joint strategies across two or more classrooms in a coordinated fashion would be beneficial.

Debrief and Action Planning (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions.
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log. All teachers update Student Priority Goal and Progress Trackers and note/plan strategies to implement.
Differentiation Planner

Program ___________________________ Teacher______________________________

Subject Area ______________________  Date_______________________________

Assignment __________________________________________________________

Emphasized Standards _________________________________________________

1. Describe expectations for student performance:

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

2. “Sort” students’ work by degree of KUD objectives met (list student names in each category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUD Objectives fully met (or exceeded)</th>
<th>KUD Objectives partially met</th>
<th>KUD Objectives not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Describe the learning needs of the identified students (keeping student strengths in mind)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUD Objectives fully met (or exceeded)</th>
<th>KUD Objectives partially met</th>
<th>KUD Objectives not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. List instructional strategies for each student or group of students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUD Objectives fully met (or exceeded)</th>
<th>KUD Objectives partially met</th>
<th>KUD Objectives not met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROTOCOL 6: MINI-UNIT TUNING

Aim: To gather constructive feedback from colleagues on a mini-unit or lesson in order to make improvements and try out new strategies and approaches.

Process:
- In advance of the meeting, determine who will be the facilitator and who will present. Presenter may present a mini-unit or a lesson either before or after teaching it. The Presenter may want to share the mini-unit plan prior to the meeting, particularly if it is long. If so, note in log so that participants will know to expect it. Presenter may want to include student learning information gleaned from previous analyses of student work and/or the Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker. Further, the presenter can choose to limit the discussion to a lesson, one aspect of the mini-unit, and/or a focus question or open it up for more general comments.
  a. At the meeting, designate a time-keeper.
  b. Each learning team meeting begins with a review of recent action items and a brief discussion of what seems to be working and not working, based on whatever evidence teachers are able to observe.
  c. Review aim and norms. Good ideas for norms include: be constructive, be tactful, don’t be defensive, and share the air time. The experience should be comfortable for the presenter. Each discussion of the craft of mini-unit design and implementation is intended to be a learning opportunity for all participants. The goal is to generate ideas for improvements and new strategies or approaches that all teachers may want to try out.
  d. Facilitator leads team through the rounds described below. Literally go around the table and give each participant an opportunity to speak. It is OK to “pass” one’s turn. After each member has had an opportunity, facilitator can choose to open the round up for a short discussion.
  e. Take advantage of the silent reading and writing time. Thinking through comments and questions in advance will raise the quality of the discussion.
  f. Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the quality of the team’s discussion.
  g. The note-taker completes the Learning Team Log, adding a summary of key discussion points and action steps.
PROTOCOL 6: MINI-UNIT TUNING

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Opener (5 minutes)
- Briefly review action steps from last meeting (or the last couple of meetings).
- Who has tried out which strategies in their classes? Are you able to assess the efficacy of these strategies, and if so, based on what early evidence of change (e.g., increased student learning and/or engagement)?
- Review any team process practices the team agreed to work on in future meetings.

Step One: Presentation (5 minutes)
- Presenter describes teaching challenge and current practice used to address the challenge, making reference to relevant supporting artifacts, as necessary. The presenter may want to include student learning information gleaned from previous analyses of student work and/or the Student Priority Learning Goal and Progress Tracker. The presenter can choose to limit the discussion to a lesson, one aspect of the mini-unit, and/or a focus question or open it up for more general comments.

Step Three: Silent Reading Time (4 minutes)
- Participants study or review supporting artifacts, etc.

Step Four: Clarifying Questions (3 minutes)
- Participants ask non-judgmental, fact-collecting clarifying questions about the artifacts and practice.

Step Five: Silent Writing Time (3 minutes)
- Participants use their notes to compose constructive comments and questions for the presenter.

Step Six: Discussion (18 minutes)
- Warms and Cools Rounds (one round of each; presenter remains silent).
  - Warms: Has potential to improve student learning.
  - Cools: Questions, concerns, and issues to consider.
- Feel free to ask additional clarifying questions if they arise.
- Discussion (presenter responds and participates, but limits airtime to encourage discussion).

Step Seven: Summary and Reflection (2 minutes)
- Presenter summarizes issues raised and/or list of ideas and strategies to try out.

Debrief and Action Planning (5 minutes)
- Use the Learning Team Process Rubric to assess the discussion and plan ways to improve future discussions
- Note-taker completes the Learning Team Log.
**Student Priority Goal and Progress Tracker**

**Aim:** To set and monitor realistic student learning goals and focus attention on the concrete steps required to reach them.

**Process:** Use Protocols 1-5 to identify targeted skills for students to work on over the course of the next 30 days (or fewer). Discuss and agree on these goals with students. Discuss progress towards goals with students at regular checkpoints; assemble evidence for these conversations. Keep these goals in mind when planning and reviewing mini-units, including when using Protocol 6 (Mini-Unit Tuning Protocol). **Suggestion:** Fill in the skill, goal statement, next steps, and the dates for the interim checkpoint and goal review with each student. Then add assessment notes at the interim checkpoint and goal review conferences with the student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Priority Skill (one or two per student)</th>
<th>Goal Statement</th>
<th>Student Next Steps</th>
<th>Interim Checkpoint (date/assessment)</th>
<th>Goal Review (date/assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cools and Warms

Cools
- Too prescribed
- Rigid
- Colleagues air gripes
- Programs interfere with time slot
- Groups too large
- Too many words

Warms
- Good structure
- More specific
- More user-friendly, simplified
- Choice
- Flexibility
Which Protocols?

• Current cohort
• New student
• Mini-unit planning
• And …
  – DYOs (e.g., cohort review with student work)
  – Differentiation planner
  – Open response
  – WAC
Issues to Consider

• Availability of DYOs
• Size of group
  – 2 TCs
  – Content area groups
  – GED teachers
• Sequence and variety
  – Input from guests
  – Occasional variety, esp. in treatment
Coordinator Options

• Option 1
  – Coordinator meets with TC every six weeks to review logs and other artifacts and plan upcoming learning team sequence of meetings
    • See Progress Review and Planning Protocol for a suggested meeting structure

• Option 2
  – Coordinator and TC conduct Progress Review and Planning meetings twice a year
  – Coordinator participates in occasional learning team meetings
  – Coordinator provides written feedback on learning team logs
Sample Agenda: Coordinator Progress Review and Planning Meetings

- Review notes and artifacts prior to meeting
- Team leader summarizes work of past 4-5 weeks (<5 min)
- Team members and leader(s) make descriptive observations of team artifacts using post-its (5 minutes)
- Assessment: what worked, even better if … (10 minutes)
- Needs for upcoming meetings (5 minutes)
- Meeting plans (5 minutes)
Suggestions to Consider

- Attend to structure of meetings and size of groups and use judgment
  - Use spirit of the rubric as a guide
- Message to programs re protecting the learning team time
  - Invite clinical
- Incorporate fresh perspectives
- Encourage prep work and ways to find time (esp. for treatment)
Suggestions to Consider (cont.)

- More modeling and practice for TCs
- Stick with TC as facilitator as appropriate
- Encourage planning for the next week at the end
- Log is for their benefit too—begin by examining past actions
- Don’t police the minutes
- Don’t change the protocols
- CES: posters, videos, fish bowls, etc.
MEMORANDUM

TO: DYS General and SEIS Special Educators
FROM: Darnell Thigpen Williams, Associate Director of DYS Professional Development and Bill Benjamin, SEIS PD and Curriculum Coordinator
CC: Woody Clift, Director of DYS Education Initiative, Mary Lou Chapman, Administrator of Special Education and SEIS Project, Laura Finn-Heafey, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, Kathi Titus, CES Assistant Director for SEIS, RECs, ARECs, SEIS Coordinators, and Instructional Coaches in DYS Settings
DATE: August 29, 2013
SUBJECT: Expectations for Supporting the Success of Learning Teams

As you know, we will continue with our Learning Team approach for 2013-2014. The Learning Team approach has been designed as a next step in supporting learning teams as they work to improve student and program outcomes. Teachers will use existing protocols from the Learning Team Toolkit as well as approved protocols that teachers design themselves (DYOs) provided that they support a personalized approach to learning and result in improved student outcomes. Approved protocols and tools will support a shared understanding of youth strengths and needs, structured analysis of student data, establishment of learning goals, and the delivery of personalized instruction and assessments that support ongoing student learning needs.

Content-based learning teams, a new component of our PD program:

- will group same-content DYS general educators with SEIS special educators for the purpose of strengthening content area instruction, pedagogy, and access for all
- will convene three times during the year within the normal learning team weekly schedule (i.e., face-to-face and/or webinar) to collaboratively plan mini-units and/or lessons using existing tools and protocols and new content-specific protocols for supporting teaching and learning for a diverse student population.

Further guidance on the structure of content-based learning teams will be forthcoming.

All programs will be expected to conduct weekly learning teams beginning the week of September 23rd, 2013.

We will be providing a schedule with the learning team scope and sequence in the next couple of weeks. Teachers will receive explicit feedback and modeling of effective use of protocols during Statewide and Regional professional development days as well as through site-based coaching. The Learning Team Toolkit will expand to include protocols in support of content-based learning teams and student conferencing. Teachers will continue to use learning team logs to document the relevant discussion points and action steps that result from these learning team meetings. Weekly log feedback will be provided by the REC, AREC, SEIS Coordinator, and/or instructional coach on an as needed basis. Programs will maintain learning team log binders on site that contain the protocols and tools, copies of posted learning team logs, completed learning
team self-assessments, and artifacts such as, mini-unit plans, student work, and student progress and goal trackers.

Below are expectations of coordinators, instructional coaches, and teaching coordinators for ensuring the success of the Learning Teams:

1. Instructional coaches and coordinators (i.e., RECs, ARECs, and SEIS Coordinators) **review LT Logs once a week** and provide feedback as needed to support implementation of the protocols.

2. Instructional coaches and coordinators **check-in once a week on the LT Log Tracker** and determine appropriate follow-up action steps.

3. Instructional coaches **model effective use of learning team protocols** and provide onsite feedback to support implementation of learning team goals and objectives outlined on the Rubric for Effective Learning Teams.

4. RECs, ARECs, and SEIS Coordinators **meet regularly with TCs to monitor successful implementation of learning team goals and objectives** using the Rubric for Effective Learning Teams.
Why Learning Teams are Important  
*September 2013*

As we embark on year five of the DYS/SEIS Learning Team approach, it is important to remember why learning teams were formed in our settings. Most Learning Teams (LTs) or Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) assume a set of characteristics that reflect the nature of a true LT or PLC. An understanding of these characteristics provides educators with a shared lens through which to examine their own LTs. They also can provide an infrastructure for shaping practice and assessing progress. A brief description of some of the most commonly cited characteristics follow:

**Shared values and vision** (Bolam et al., 2005; DuFour, 2004; Feger & Arruda, 2008; Hord, 1997; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994). Teachers and administrators share a vision focused on student learning and a commitment to improvement (Reichstetter, 2006). The vision is used as a context for decision making about instructional practice and collaborative learning efforts. The vision statement should result in a collective responsibility for and an unwavering focus on student learning (Leo & Cowen, 2000; Louis & Kruse, 1995; Stoll et al., 2006).

**Collaborative culture** (Bolam et al., 2005; Feger & Arruda, 2008; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994). LTs or PLCs are based on the premise that through collaboration, professionals achieve more than they could alone (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). Teachers benefit from the resources that each brings to the LT (Newman, 1994). Collaboration provides a mechanism for sharing responsibility for student learning and a means to work together toward a common purpose (Reichstetter, 2006; Stoll et al., 2006). Collaboration (e.g., opportunities for teachers to engage in ongoing collegial opportunities where they talk about teaching, receive frequent feedback on teaching, design classes together, teach each other, etc.) has been found in successful schools and is missing in unsuccessful schools (Little, 1989, 2003).

**Focus on examining outcomes to improve student learning** (DuFour, 2004; Feger & Arruda, 2008; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994; Louis, 2006). LTs or PLCs promote results-oriented thinking that is focused on continuous improvement and student learning (Reichstetter, 2006). The focus goes beyond a team getting together to look at data. In LTs, teachers respond to data that require mutual accountability and changing classroom practices. Data help motivate teachers to see what is happening and what they need to do collectively (White & McIntosh, 2007).

**Supportive and shared leadership** (Feger & Arruda, 2008; Hord, 1997; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994; Louis & Kruse, 1995; Mitchell & Sackney, 2006). LTs or PLCs often are viewed as a foundation for developing teacher leaders (Caine & Caine, 2000). Administrators are committed to sharing decision making with teachers and providing opportunities for them to serve as leaders (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006; McREL, 2003). The purposes and goals of a LT grow from among the participants, based on their values, beliefs, and individual and shared experiences (Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004). Teacher leadership capacity sustains LTs. Sharing power and authority with teachers through decision making and shared leadership increases leadership capacity and builds a belief in the school’s collective ability to positively impact teaching and learning (Olivier & Hipp, 2006).

**Shared personal practice** (Hord, 1997; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1994; Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004). A major focus of LTs or PLCs is on professional learning in which teachers work and learn together as they continually evaluate the effectiveness of their practices and the needs, interests, and skills of their students (McREL, 2003). Teachers share experiences, observe each other, and discuss teaching. Shared practice and collective inquiry help sustain improvement by strengthening connections among teachers, stimulating discussion about professional practice, and helping teachers build on one another’s expertise (McREL, 2003). Through continuous inquiry and reflective dialogue teachers discover solutions and address student needs (Hord, 1997; Stoll et al., 2006).
In Search of Supports for Learning Teams
DMH LEARNING TEAM PROJECT REPORT

July 29, 2013

I. Project Development:

Initial Purpose: to provide professional development to DMH Learning Teams; operationally defining support for members to collaboratively discuss students in greater detail, gather authentic data to understand student needs and inform instructional planning, generate more specific action plans for individual students, and record more in-depth meeting notes on LT logs in relation to protocols in the DYS-SEIS Learning Team Toolkit

Additional purpose: to guide teams to think through collaborative problem solving as a gateway to connect with and enhance required Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports; giving DMH teams voice

Formative Nature of the Project: the form the project took evolved over the year; emerging from teams’ receipt of the DYS-SEIS Learning Team Toolkit, initial findings from focus groups/site observations, ongoing dialogues with SEIS - PD Curriculum Coordinator, conversation with DMH Regional Coordinator, and implementation of workshop with two sites
  o Make project palatable and inviting to DMH participants, recognizing importance of building relationships with consultants and feeling that the direction acknowledges their programs and the students they serve
  o Treat each of the activities of the project as sources of formative data, informing preliminary goals and subsequent revisions

• Meetings with SEIS - PD Curriculum Coordinator involved clarifying the project intent and brainstorming professional development options
  o Exploring DYS-SEIS Learning Team Toolkit; raising questions regarding the protocols and how the formal structure, assigned timeline, and content were responsive to the DMH teams’ individual focuses and requirements they need to fulfill (Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring Reports, Transition Plans, Preparation for Parent Meetings)
  o Figuring out ways to engage with the eight Learning Teams involved in the project (Centerpoint, Chauncy, Connections, Merrimack, Three Rivers, Transitions, UMass I, UMass II); emphasizing the importance of building trust and relationships with the professionals at the sites and determining professional development/support needs
  o Identifying options for engaging teams in different forms of professional development; including webinars, remote Skype supervision and feedback;
  o learning from coordinator’s perspectives and enthusiasm regarding the project, insights into the workings of the sites, and possibilities technology offers

• Multiple revisions of project proposal reflected the changing nature of the project as data were gathered and different options for defining and delivering support to the teams were explored; empowering teams to establish meeting focuses based on site needs (ex. Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring Notes; Getting to know new students or
transitioning others, etc.). The use of formative data contributed to the development of the project; reviewing the uses of the protocols, articulating specific skill targets for team members, and building and formulating ideas and strategies for delivery.

- **Questions** that emerged from formative data and threaded throughout the project and resulting themes:
  - How effectively and efficiently do the teams work collaboratively, productively, and stay on topic?
  - How systematic are teams in gathering data/assessing students, sharing information, and connecting to planning to meet student needs? How do teams talk about students, assess needs, and plan instruction?
  - To what extent do the protocols from the Toolkit structure and support the productivity of Learning Teams?
  - In what ways do the Toolkit protocols promote collaboration among team members to reflect the demands placed on DMH teachers and encourage effective and efficient use of meeting times?
  - How well do logs and forms capture the content of meetings and in-between conversations about the students? How well does the structure of the Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring forms invite open discussion versus confine what is discussed in Learning Team meetings?
  - How does the content of what teams write convey a clear understanding of student needs, ideas for program planning, or practical action plans?

**II. Data Collection - Individual Tools/ Key Activities/ Tasks of the Project** provided increased understanding of how sites operate, the ways in which teams collaborate, and their views of the form, function, and accomplishments of their Learning Teams

*The following reports out information gathered by consultants per tool/activity:*

- **Protocols** (document review of DYS-SEIS Learning Team Toolkit)
  - Stated as providing structured ways to collaborate among Learning Team members; offering guidance to members around different topic areas
  - Questions raised (consultants’ perspectives):
    - In what ways do the Toolkit protocols promote collaboration among team members, reflect the demands placed on DMH teachers, and support completing requirements in a timely fashion?
    - To what extent do the protocols from the Toolkit structure and support the productivity of Learning Teams?
      - How do protocols match up with the tools provided during workshops/webinars?
      - How do the protocols encourage the teams to develop comprehensive descriptions of learners and action plans connected with Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports?

- **Focus Groups** (inquiry task: facilitated discussion with each Learning Team - report attached)

*Questions posed to Learning Teams*
1. What are the benefits/ issues of conducting learning team meetings?
2. In what ways are discussions and results of meetings useful/ not useful?
3. How do the IEPs received inform work with students and guide work as a learning team?

Summary from Report

- Learning teams shared the values of having formal meetings at designated times that are dedicated to: collaborate about individual students (progress, newly arrived, in crisis), develop instructional ideas based on collective views of what works across classrooms, and fulfill responsibilities of Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports
- Learning teams discussed the restrictive nature of protocols and their disconnect from DMH requirements; adding paperwork that often duplicated requirements (raising questions about the redundancy of Moodle logs vs. Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring Reports), and feeling like the log format was difficult to follow and affected time efficiency
- Learning teams conveyed openness to engage in professional development designed to enhance the ways they operate and problem solve; use meeting time, address content, and collaborate

- **Workshop for two sites** (PowerPoint attached)
- **Webinars & Webinex:**
  - **Purposes:**
    - Both the workshop and webinars offered participants comparable content to support Learning Team meetings; targeting the use of objective language (asset/strength-based), examining a way to look at the relationship between demands placed on students and their responsiveness (interaction formula: what to teach, how to teach, how to approach, under what conditions, why teach), and profiling and planning for students practically (identifying who the student is as a reader, writer, mathematician, participant/member of the classroom).
    - Conveyed flexibility in the format (ways to use time), forms (open-ended log/ on how report information) focuses for discussions (challenging learners/ in crisis, Planning Notes, Progress reporting); while using Learning Team Toolkit as points of reference as well as other documents
    - **Goal:** to support Learning Teams to deepen how they collaboratively:
      - explore student IEPs
      - assess to further understand students
      - plan instruction around shared ideas
      - collect & collate progress monitoring data
      - contribute to & articulate planning notes
      - adapt DYS-SEIS Learning Team Toolkit

- Given the multiple focuses of team meetings, the session content provided teams and consultants with a common language and set of tools to use to evaluate how students are described with reference to demands of learning
experiences and ways to inform instructional planning and strategies for monitoring progress

- **Debriefing**
  - LTs’ analyses of a subpar IEP used for the activity indicated they interpreted as constructive information, even though it was worded generally and offered limited direction for working with the student; some reflections noted that information was missing
  - LTs’ responses to other webinar activities reinforced their further developing objectivity in the choice of language for describing students; continuing to use some *not* statements, abstract terms with limited references to demands of setting (interaction formula)
  - While it appears that teams did do assigned tasks (uploaded brief notes to Moodle), their responses and reflections were limited; and analysis of Learning Team observations-debriefings offered supplemental evidence of levels of application of webinar content
  - Webinex as an interactive medium was challenging for teams and facilitators as there were technical difficulties, issues coordinating discussions among sites, distractions from side conversations while forum took place, and concerns that teams were unable to see each other while speaking and listening; leading to teams muting the audio output and resorting to typing in chat questions and responses (at points, it was hard to keep up with and respond to one another, resulting in limited interactions among sites)
    - The documentation of the *chat* provided evidence of how the hour was spent. Comments entered by sites indicated that as a result of the webinars, the teams:
      - reported they will work to be more reflective about student-related information they present and share
      - appealed for constructive criticism and feedback regarding the documents they submit - Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports
      - requested exemplar documents of what Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports *should* contain
      - asked for feedback around the effectiveness of their LT meetings, the content they cover, and the ways they operate; focusing on individual teams versus group feedback

- **Logs /Planning Notes/ Progress Monitoring Reports** (document review of how teams report learning/behavior needs and plans, address student IEP progress or revisions, document crisis or transition planning)

  *Based on the small sample of documents provided, team:*

  - logs reported what transpired in learning team meetings, conveying a general summary
documents provided evidence of using broad descriptors, relying on grade-level references, offering general information about students

- present levels of performance, using grade-levels rather than task analyzing pertinent skill sets - these tended to be more descriptive around writing
- recommended goals and benchmarks were often general, giving broad instructional targets without honing in on a progression of skills or setting criteria to mark growth
- progress monitoring reports referenced general goals and objectives and conveyed whether or not a student had grown versus the evidence and markers for that growth
- general ideas for modifications around coping skills for behavior, graphic organizers to support writing, etc.; referencing checklists and keeping suggestions at a broad level

- **Observations/ Debriefing of Learning Team Meetings**

  - **Data Collection and Feedback provided** each team with highlights and areas for further focus; commenting on evidence gathered through the remote observations and debriefings

    - Consultants conducted and documented observations of learning team meetings, asking members to follow their usual procedures
    - Debriefings: Follow-up discussions with each team focused on information generated during the meeting about the targeted student. Consultants reviewed/confirmed the focus and asked related questions to promote use of tools (digging deeper, interaction formula, KWH) and team reflection on the ways they work together to use them

- **Themes generated from observations/ feedback** (includes highlights and areas for further focus, representing the varying ways teams operated)

  a) **Purpose for meeting** (set the stage/ direction for the meeting)

    - LT meetings focused on: Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring/ preparation for meeting with parents, Progress Monitoring/ preparation for transitions to new sites, new student meeting, student in crisis
    - Some teams needed to establish, clarify or revisit purpose during meeting
    - Remote debriefings provided opportunity to differentiate feedback per site, based on meeting focus

  b) **Collaboration** (with team, clinical staff, floor staff, families, students, receiving placements, home schools/ ETL)

    - Collaborative nature of team meetings: active listening to each other, building from what each person said, willingness to share information, interactive/ conversational manner, established working relationships (one team posted norms, one team used collaboration rubric to self-evaluate)
Ongoing team member relationships, representing shared experiences in the sites, led to making assumptions, without seeking further clarification, about the terms used and information presented

- Referenced and responded to clinical and floor staff input to guide plans and work with students
- Some teams provided evidence of giving student voice in discussions about goal setting and planning instruction

c) **Structure and Flow of Meeting** (how the team moves through the process; meeting problem solving process, clearly articulating challenges, and designing action plans)

To varying degrees, teams...

- organized meetings with purpose/procedure/reasons why; systematic, working within timeframe
- emphasized protocols and forms, which tended to interfere with the flow of conversation and content detail. Some teams used the forms (ex. new student protocol, planning notes form), relying on the sequence of questions to proceed, much like a checklist rather than relating to what student performance and context demands were
- got caught in excitement of student progress or concern (ex. speaking with parents, transition) and content jumped from idea to idea during meeting
- need to check that subtopics (ex. whether problem defined, question answered, or further assessment weighed, etc.) were addressed comprehensively before moving onto action planning

d) **Problem Definition - Description of students** (objective, practical language used to discuss student; making reference to the context/interaction formula, and connect to reader, writer, mathematician, participant/member)

To varying degrees, teams are...

- moving away from labels/diagnoses toward making descriptions and language more practical in relation to the classroom
- enhancing ways student behavior and academic challenges are described; needing to clarify what behaviors/academic performance look and sound like as readers, writers, mathematicians, and participants with reference to demands of learning experiences (what to teach, how to teach, how to approach, under what conditions, why teach) across content areas and settings within the site
- beginning to describe student skills and challenges, but are working to check terms used and depth of description and context

e) **Collecting/Analyzing Assessment Data To Learn More About Student/Use of KWH Framework**

To varying degrees, teams...
• analyzed and collated preliminary information about new/existing student; gathering and reporting additional data in order to develop a clearer picture of the student, and identify need for collecting more information to clarify and connect
• worked to clarify test scores, figuring out what they conveyed about the student as a reader, writer, mathematician, participant in ways that inform planning and instruction
• appeared to rely on commercial assessments available to settings, quick reviews of work samples; capturing more summative or quantitative data rather than details to inform further assessments and understanding of student
• worked to raise pertinent questions about existing descriptions to figure out what is missing, pursue more comprehensive understanding, and determine what will assist instructional planning
• worked toward detailed analysis of work samples as data sources to provide evidence of student performance in area(s) of concern and generate a comprehensive picture

f) Behavior in the Classroom and in Relation to Academic Performance

To varying degrees, teams...

• worked to draw connections between social challenges and academic performance; clarifying the social behaviors in the context of the different academic settings; explaining what the student is doing, when, what triggers those behaviors, what teacher prompts or responses support effective choices, and how self-regulation/coping are defined
• began to examine relationship among demands of learning environment and student behavior, evaluating academic success levels, types of group and independent tasks, and ways content is made relevant to student
• provided general references to behaviors (“good space,” using coping skills), requiring more explicit explanations

g) Action Planning

To varying degrees, teams...

• identified common instructional strategies, uses of student interests, and basic behavior ideas that worked with student
• designed solutions tended to come from the checklist teams had for planning notes, behavior charts derived from clinical and floor staff, and expectations for participation in curriculum; needing to add detail of how to differentiate modifications for individuals so others have the wherewithal to implement
• began to move from the recommendation to clarifying action steps to reflect individual learners
• outlined recommendations before presenting a full data picture of student
• established goals for students tended to be broad-based, focused on an area of instruction with limited definition of the desirable behaviors, performance seeking as a result of instruction; setting quantitative criteria that did not necessarily relate
• **Team Responses to Feedback/Project** (Based on focus groups, webinars, debriefing, and feedback: What future steps might be taken as a Learning Team to enhance work in the DMH setting?)

*Based on feedback, teams expressed that they felt...*

- positive about the purpose and functioning of learning teams, appreciative of time dedicated to meet, celebratory about their collaborative efforts; but struggled with the formal structure of the protocols as limiting and the additional paperwork required for Moodle as redundant
- encouraged to shift how IEPs are written to add more concrete information, explain further; moving away from broad descriptions and non-specific goals and objectives
- heard about the cooperative work they do and the ways in which they work together in and out formal learning team meetings
- receptive to adding detail to discussions and written documents
  - for some, this raised questions – how much to include, what types of info, how to write the goals and objectives in ways that make sense, and how to deal with limited time
  - for some, this felt like mixed messages as they reported being told to summarize vs. give more examples and have received different messages over the years
- welcoming of the constructive, practical feedback tailored to each learning team, acknowledging they had room to improve
- appreciative of consultants for the process of remote observations and the honesty and comfort in facilitating the debriefings - teams stated feedback was useful, questions pertinent and helped them think deeper, suggestions offered concrete and detailed examples; all of which was relevant to their work, although the end of the year was a factor

**IV. Discussion:**

**Evolving nature of the project:**

The formative nature of the project lent itself to building information and understanding how Learning Teams function, informed by the implementation and analysis of several activities. A variety of data were tracked, collected, and discussed; providing evidence of the form, content, and function of each Learning Team. The data verified that building relationships and the project across the year were valuable for fostering participant engagement, discerning the demands placed on Learning Teams in DMH settings, and seeing how to support their meeting requirements more comprehensively. The path the project took provided insight into how the different learning teams demonstrated varying degrees of specificity and clarity as they:

- referenced IEPs, presented students, planned to address needs, justified action steps, and translated this information to the Moodle logs, Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports they wrote
- used asset-based descriptions as they problem solved and monitored progress
• determined and made use of tools (KWH) to plan assessment to understand students and design instruction
• analyzed and interpreted authentic work samples to monitor student progress, make evidenced-based decisions, and inform individualized planning/ revisions
• engaged in cooperative brainstorming and action planning; referencing protocols to make data-based decisions for students within/across classrooms
• wrote student-specific Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports that guide work with students within/across classrooms
• recommended revisions to individualized educational plans and shared them with sending and receiving schools

A few factors influenced the flow of the project and how it unfolded: conflicting professional commitments of all involved, calendars, time to learn the medium and create webinars. Although it couldn’t be helped, the scheduling and timing of webinars, observations, and debriefings came toward the end of the school year. Teachers were flexible in spite of the stressful time of year and did engage in what was asked of them. They reported that this shift in thinking would serve them better when addressed in the beginning and during the school year. There were many barriers to implementing activities earlier than they happened for which the PD coordinator worked and reworked schedules.

**Professional development content** (Webinars/ Workshop, Observation-debriefings/ Document review)

• the tools presented in the webinars offered ways to describe student performance, participation, and progress in the context of educational settings and start to consider how to choose authentic assessments. The level at which teams presented information during subsequent meetings provided evidence that they are beginning to adopt the practices.
• webinar topics represented shifts in the ways teachers describe students/ instruction/ etc., but there was a differential between what the tools offered and ways in which sites thought about and discussed IEPs and evaluated and reported progress; as observed in the document reviews and learning team meetings/discussions
• workshops afforded immediate and in person feedback around activities
• webinars afforded flexibility in professional time
• technology supports for follow-ups on webinars could be more interactive but need to be structured differently

**Value of supervision-feedback through technical assistance**

The project culminated with remote observations/debriefings of learning team meetings, giving further insight into the varying degrees in which sites operate to address different focuses that are part of DMH work. The analysis and review of the observations/debriefings substantiated:

• teams’ openness to being observed, hearing constructive feedback and engaging in supervision dialogue
• the debriefings allowed for differentiated collaborative discussions per site
• the LT meetings are only one part of the teams’ collaborations as they supplement with conversations throughout the day; adding information, raising questions, sharing ideas. They report that this added information is brought into their team meeting work
• there are different interpretations across sites of what expectations are for format and structure of LT; recognizing the multi-purposes of the meetings and the need for teams to choose their own agenda based on pressing issues and due dates
• adherence to the protocols and forms (Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring Reports) tend to be confining; influencing the depth of discussions and quality of planning

As a result of focus group discussions and observations/ debriefings, it is evident that there are multiple purposes for the meetings and different interpretations of what is expected for the format of LT structure and directions/ content for the meeting. For many of the teams, both the structure of the protocols and forms (Planning Notes, Progress Monitoring Reports) can hinder the quality of planning as teams worked to respond directly to written questions / stems posed.

**Delivery of webinars, observations, conversations**

• Technology: Skype as a form of observations and debriefings presents a direct, relevant and time effective means for ongoing feedback within and among sites. Key to the success of this vehicle is the smoothness with which the technology is available (computers ready, arrangements, seating arrangements, visibility). Google chat would be a more effective tool and it is free
• Interaction: Project did not allow for direct feedback to teams on Moodle, regarding content of logs following webinars and Webinex. The levels of responses by teams ranged from minimal to semi-detailed. The content did not provide enough qualitative data to reach conclusions on status of site understanding. However, consultants pursued follow-ups during observation debriefings.
• Face to face contact with teachers, either on site or through remote conversation, is key to processing expectations, eliciting viewpoints, and assessing applications of concepts. Teachers reported the values of exchanges, particularly in relation to debriefing observations.
**RECOMMENDATIONS** (Learning Team Support - areas for further professional development) -
Next Steps:

The data suggest the following ways to provide ongoing SUPPORT to Learning Teams:

a) **Re-visit the purpose, structure, organization, and content of forms Learning Teams Use:**

- Allow teams to give input into the development and use of forms; based on the different focuses for meetings, ways that will render more student-specific information, and embedding segments of protocols that serve teams
- Planning Notes: sections of the form should prompt teams to engage in problem solving, based on the collection and analysis of authentic data; the collation of descriptive behavioral and academic information across content areas and classrooms; the targeting of skills and setting of criteria that is useable, practical and measurable; the identification of corresponding tools to document progress
- Progress Monitoring: determining how headings and questions promote members to collect, analyze, and prepare for sharing documentation of student performance and behavior relative to clearly articulated goals and objectives
- Protocols: offering the different structures, questions, guidelines as points of reference as deemed useable by Learning Teams
- Logs: taking on a different purpose, documenting Learning Team collaborations that are outside of the required forms (ex. dealing with a crisis, revamping work with individual or group of students, etc.); otherwise not required
  - However, it is important for any revisions to include teams’ voices in offering suggestions
- Provide exemplar IEP Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports; presenting teams with criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of information and guidelines for self-evaluation
  - Offer written feedback, based on criteria; posing questions, modeling re-writes of items in the submissions of IEP Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports

b) **Professional Development: Observations, debriefings, & feedback**

- Provide regularly scheduled supervision opportunities for Learning Teams to be observed and receive feedback
- Provide teams key guideline questions from which they may choose, depending on their meeting focus; connecting them purposefully with Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports and logs

**Delivery of observations, debriefings, & feedback: technology support**

- Technology person available to teams to ensure planned events occur, internet connections are clear and uninterrupted, and there is facility with media option
- Skype as a medium to deliver supervision proved effective, when seating arrangements allow for visibility of each team member throughout the meetings, computers/connections were cooperative
• Continued use of remote observations to allow the teams to get relaxed, ignore observers, and proceed in order to focus on the flow of learning team meeting and content covered (process and content)

c) **Topics for further work, building on DMH Project 2012-2013** *(In Search of Supports for Learning Teams)*

• Offer workshops to demonstrate the interconnections of assessment-planning-instruction-data collection-IEP development; applying this process to further develop how to think through and write comprehensive, useable IEPs, using the language of description that leads to goals and objectives that lead to progress monitoring
  o Include academic performance and social-emotional learning and assessments as part of the content, directly addressing specific strategies for description and intervention
  o Contextualize concepts (digging deeper, interaction formula and content-based descriptions) in Planning Notes and Progress Monitoring Reports; unpacking each form with reference to the tools presented during the webinars/workshop
  o Need to re-examine criteria for goals and objectives in ways that encourage them to define progress, collect ongoing data
    ▪ Give teachers the opportunity to try out materials with feedback (immediate feedback on Planning Notes or Progress Monitoring Report)
    ▪ Provide follow-up through observations of meetings

**System of delivery for workshops**

• Face-to-face workshops/webinars in real time as an option to provide ongoing feedback, offer immediate response to participants, and ensure completion of tasks
  o Bring multiple teams together to share ideas, perspectives, and cross-site experiences
  o Recommend limiting number of groups for webinar/feedback sessions to ensure opportunities for interactive dialogue

• Create pre-recorded “webinars” with input from participants

d) **Additional thoughts to consider:**

• Maintain Professional Development/Supervision-feedback for supporting Learning Teams for another year; giving continuity to this year’s work, offering opportunity to hone skills, and avoiding overloading teachers with a whole new project
  o If coaches are going to observe and supervise learning teams then need to develop system for giving feedback consistent with webinar tools; and ways to offer substantive input to the functioning of teams, consistent with what consultants provided
    ▪ Consider support workshops for TAs, Coaches, and Supervisors
    ▪ Consider technical assistance – observe the observer; providing feedback regarding constructive mix of positive and challenge statements and recommendations; extent to which give teams voice
  o Video tape the teams to use as a reference for non-evaluative feedback and support
Timing of the project needs to be rolled out at the “beginning of the year (once settled into classes, program),” supporting teachers as they begin required Learning Team tasks

Conduct formal, ongoing check-ins with learning teams (survey or written evaluation to determine the extent to which they find the professional development activities helpful in enhancing their skill sets for assessment, planning, instruction, progress monitoring)
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Purpose:

The SEIS-DYS Integrated Service Delivery Working Group was established in the fall of 2008 to develop a joint proposal for the implementation of an integrated service delivery model for special education students in DYS treatment programs. The original proposal is included in the attachments at the end of this section.

Participants on the working group included the following SEIS and DYS administrators:

- Jaime Bell, HEC SEIS-DYS Coordinator
- Mary Lou Chapman, HEC SEIS Project Coordinator
- Woody Clift, HEC DYS Project Director
- Mary Murray, DYS Consultant
- Cheryl Nicholson, SEIS Principal
- Sandra Shoro, HEC SEIS PD/Curriculum Coordinator
- Paul Stracca, HEC DYS Project Director

Additionally, the working group was tasked with identifying topics for professional development that would be essential knowledge and skills necessary for the implementation of an inclusive model. As part of the process, it was agreed the first step would be to establish a shared vision and shared understanding of what we intended to accomplish.

SEIS-DYS VISION of Integrated Service Delivery:

“All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.”

---

1 Joint letter from Christine Kenney, Director of Educational Services, Department of Youth Services; Jan Avallone, SEIS Director, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, to DYS General and SEIS educators working in ISD pilot sites, February 2010
The working group developed the following definitions to promote shared understanding by all stakeholders:

*Integrated service delivery* means the collaboration of DYS general educators and SEIS educators in providing instruction to all students.

*Learning teams* are the framework for the collaboration of DYS general educators and SEIS educators in providing instruction to all students.

The goal of the initial pilot was defined in the ISD Pilot Proposal as follows:

“To develop a model for collaborative teams at the program level to work together to support the students and the delivery of services to provide access to the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs.”

More specifically, the pilot was designed to:

- develop learning team protocols and structures;
- test and refine professional development supports;
- identify barriers to collaboration between SEIS and general educators; and
- identify opportunities to enhance SEIS and general educator collaboration.

What we learned from the work at the ISD pilot sites contributed to the development of learning teams supporting collaboration among DYS general educators and SEIS educators across all DYS programs.

**Activities:**

The DYS and SEIS Integrated Service Delivery Working Group was convened in 2008 and used the first year of the SEIS contract for collaborative visioning, background research, assessment, and planning. By the spring of 2009, the group had prepared a preliminary plan for an ISD pilot, which was implemented during the 2009-2010 school year and expanded the following year. Over the three year period (2008-2011), DYS and SEIS administrators and consultants conducted the following activities:

- Convened a working group from SEIS and DYS to develop a vision and pilot project, including a plan for implementation with action steps
- Defined and developed the continuum of service delivery models that would be appropriate for the settings
- Established criteria for selecting pilot sites, and selected two pilot sites for year one: Goss 2 and Westboro Secure
• Developed a process for evaluating and monitoring the service delivery models

• Identified essential skills and planned the training needed to implement the service delivery model, such as:
  o how to interpret the IEP and student records
  o strategies for co-teaching, collaboration, and consultation
  o how to co-plan for differentiating instruction

• Implemented the ISD pilot, which supported the following:
  o development of a transferable model
  o assessment of where the process needs refinement
  o design of strategies and tools to support replication (forms, processes, technical assistance, communication with all stakeholders)

• Continued and expanded the pilot to new programs during the school year 2010-2011

CES contracted with Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz, leaders in collaboration to support special education, and co-authors of the book, Collaborative Individualized Education Process: RSVP to IDEA (2007), to design and deliver professional development for educators in ISD pilot sites (2009-2011). The syllabus for the ISD training is included in the attachments.

The ISD Working Group met regularly to monitor the progress of the ISD pilot sites. The group invited DYS Regional Education Coordinators, the SEIS Host Agency Coordinator, and the professional development providers to meetings in order to obtain input on the successes and challenges to implementing ISD in DYS programs. The CES internal evaluator assisted with data collection on the pilot and shared findings with the working group at regular meetings. The group developed lessons-learned to inform the design and implementation of learning teams in DYS programs.

Outcomes:

The Integrated Service Delivery pilots produced significant outcomes in terms of teacher skills and collaboration at the pilot sites. In addition, findings from the pilots supported system-building to facilitate the implementation of program-based learning teams in all DYS sites. A summary of the findings is reported here. For further details, see the pilot report and evaluation findings in the attachments.

Educators participating in the learning team pilots indicated that the training, processes, and structures supported collaborative work and instructional delivery. Findings from teacher reports on the ISD training and implementation include the following:

• About nine-tenths (88%) of ISD participants agreed that learning teams meetings are a valuable use of time.
• 93% of ISD teachers reported that learning team meetings supported their ability to provide effective instruction. One educator explained:

“Focusing on ‘asset-based’ language encouraged us to focus on the specifics of student performance rather than making broad generalizations. For instance, prior to our exposure to ISD, I would often hear and/or say that a student is easily distracted. By using asset-based language, we are better able to ascertain when and how that student is able to pay attention. This helped us to pinpoint effective instructional strategies.”

• Over four-fifths (85%) of ISD teachers reported that their work on a learning team enhanced their knowledge of resources and strategies to teach standards-based content. One general educator articulated the value of collaborating with the SEIS educator on site:

“I find the advice, input, experience, and knowledge from another teacher is invaluable. Having the SEIS teacher helps me be a better teacher and provide accommodations so all the students are successful. An example is when I had re-phrased, restated, and racked my brain to get a concept across to one student. My co-teacher had a whole bunch of new ideas, one of which accomplished the goal. Two heads are better than one.”

• Teachers consistently reported that the ISD meetings promoted structured collaborative planning. For example, one educator described:

“I think that we plan together more consistently since beginning the ISD process. Before ISD we would have more sporadic and informal collaboration. The ISD meetings afford the opportunity for all teachers to plan together.”

In addition to building teacher skills and site-based collaborative mechanisms, the ISD pilots provided essential tools and learning that informed CES’s design and implementation of program-based learning teams statewide. The pilots facilitated the development of the learning team framework, communication tools, professional development, and support structures necessary for effective learning teams.

The ISD pilots supported system-building for effective learning teams in the following ways:

• Identification of barriers to learning team implementation and necessary professional development and administrative support structures (e.g., dedicated planning time, learning team logs, protocols)

• Development of communication tools to clearly articulate expectations for teachers, programs, and supervisors

• Establishment of the essential components of a learning teams framework, including structured inquiry processes (see ISD Learning Teams Program Orientation in attachments, as well as the Learning Team attachments in Section 1: Professional Development)
SEIS and DYS administrators used the ISD pilot findings to improve the implementation of ISD-informed learning teams in all DYS and DMH programs. Some of the critical ISD lessons that informed learning team implementation were as follows:

- Provide learning teams with a structured protocol or process to focus meeting conversations and document discussions
- Ensure that program administrators, education supervisors, and professional development staff have a consistent understanding of the expectations for learning teams
- Have supervisors assist learning teams in finding a consistent meeting time
- Provide tools for student work analysis and student progress assessment
- Provide ongoing training and site-based support for effective learning team meetings

**Next Steps:**

- Continue implementation of learning teams across all DYS programs (2010 to the present)
- Customize protocols and provide supervisory and coaching support for learning teams
- Develop additional inquiry protocols and provide ongoing training
- Continue to monitor the implementation of learning teams
- Clearly articulate expectations for co-planning between SEIS and DYS educators, providing a range of options for co-planning, and tools and training for advancing these options
- Evaluate learning teams to assess the impact of learning teams on co-planning and instructional delivery
Research that guided this work:
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ATTACHMENTS

Goal 1 | Section 2: Integrated Service Delivery in the Department of Youth Services

1. ISD Pilot Proposal (June 2009)

2. Letter from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to DYS General Educators and SEIS Educators participating in the Integrated Service Delivery Pilot (Feb 2010)


5. ISD Learning Teams Program Orientation (2010-2011)

6. ISD Professional Development Syllabus (2010-2011)

7. ISD Evaluation Findings (2010-2011)

8. Role of the SEIS Educator in DYS Programs (Aug 2011)
SEIS - DYS
INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY

Proposal for the Pilot
Presented
June 2009

Participants
Jaime Bell, HEC SEIS-DYS Coordinator
Mary Lou Chapman, HEC SEIS Project Coordinator
Woody Clift HEC DYS Project Director
Mary Murray, DYS Consultant
Cheryl Nicholson, SEIS Principal
Sandra Shoro, HEC SEIS PD/Curriculum Coordinator
Paul Stracco, HEC DYS Project Director
INTRODUCTION
The Working Group re-convened during May and June 2009 to develop a proposal for piloting the SEIS-DYS Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) model in the next school year. The working group first agreed on ISD Core Values that can be communicated jointly by SEIS and DYS; followed by recommendations of the pilot goal, activities, timelines, site selection, evaluation, training, budgetary implications, and communication / dissemination strategy.

INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY CORE VALUES
Professional Collaboration
Continuum of Services
Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
Student Centered and Strengths-Based
Access to the General Curriculum
Successful Transition to the Community
Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
Quality Teaching and Learning

PILOT GOAL
To develop a model for collaborative teams at the program level to work together to support the students and the delivery of services to provide access to the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs.

PILOT ACTIVITIES
Develop a model that is transferable.
Determine where the process needs refinement.
Monitor the impact on students.
Develop strategies: forms, process, technical assistance, communication with all stakeholders

TIME LINES
September-November 2009: preplanning and training
November-January 2010: first phase of implementation
Midterm Review
February-April 2010: second phase of implementation
May-June 2010: assessment and evaluation
SITE SELECTION

Decision Criteria

1. Long term program
2. Stable staffing
3. Established and receptive team
4. Receptive program – director and clinical

Sites Selected

1. Goss 2
2. Brewster Treatment
3. Westboro Secure

EVALUATION

Recommended Questions to Answer from the Pilot

1. Does the collaborative team process as outlined work? What should be refined?
2. Do the procedures adequately support the teachers and the process? What should be refined?
3. What additional resources are needed?
4. What barriers exist? How can they be overcome?

TRAINING

Training for the SEIS and DYS teaching staff and ETLs will include the 5 professional development days, as well as onsite, ongoing training and technical assistance. It is recommended that the training occur in phases, focusing on the programmatic team first, followed by the academic service delivery team.

- The optimal training option will include an expert facilitator for the 5 PD days; onsite assistance to include 3 days a week, 1 in each program site, for 20 weeks.
- A second option to be considered will include an expert facilitator for the 5 PD days; onsite assistance at 3 days a week, 1 in each program site, for 10 weeks; followed by 1.5 days a week, .5 in each program site for 10 weeks.
- A third option to be considered will include an expert facilitator for the 5 PD days; and a pilot in 2 sites instead of 3; onsite assistance at 2 days a week, 1 in each program site for 20 weeks..

Following is a summary of the budgetary implications for the 3 options:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OPTION 1: 3 Sites*</th>
<th>OPTION 2: 3 Sites Reduced Support</th>
<th>OPTION 3: 2 Sites**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 days attendance @ facilitator training</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
<td>$2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel and overnight accommodations</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days of PD at Norwood</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel and overnight accommodations</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site visits</td>
<td>$72,000.00</td>
<td>$54,000.00</td>
<td>$48,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel and overnight accommodations</td>
<td>$10,360.00</td>
<td>$8,660.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and supplies</td>
<td>$625.00</td>
<td>$625.00</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,135.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,435.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,525.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This assumes the program sites of Westboro Secure Treatment, Brewster Treatment, Goss 2

**This assumes the program sites of Westboro Secure Treatment and Brewster Treatment

Daily rate of $1200

Travel estimated at $.40/mile

Hotel cost of $120/night

Food at $50/day

Travel distances estimated:
- Westport, CT – North Grafton, MA – Westport, CT 252 miles
- Westport, CT – Norwood, MA – Westport, CT 330 miles
- Westport, CT – Westboro, MA 135 miles
- Westport, CT - Taunton, MA – Westport, CT 295 miles
- Westboro, MA – Brewster, MA 110 miles
- Westboro, MA - Taunton, MA 91 miles
- Brewster, MA – Westport, CT 220 miles

In APPENDIX A is a short bio, along with a proposal from the consultant who has been identified by the SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator to provide the training and technical assistance. Oversight of the process at the programs will be monitored during the week by the SEIS Principals, SEIS Coordinators and the DYS RECs; with additional support from the SEIS Quality Assurance Coordinator.
After the 20 weeks of the initial phase of the pilot, it is recommended that current staff resources will be utilized to sustain the model. Principals, Coordinators and Regional Education Coordinators will assist in the regular follow-up at the pilot sites. Ongoing monitoring of the pilot, as well as the mid-cycle review and post-pilot evaluation will be designed by a team including the SEIS Quality Assurance Coordinator, HEC Evaluation Coordinator, Mary Murray, Darnell Williams and the HEC DYS Associate Director (to be determined). An observation protocol will need to be developed to guide the data collection. Additional resources from both SEIS and DYS will be determined and appropriated as needed.

COMMUNICATION / DISSEMINATION STRATEGY

- Once SEIS and DYS have agreed on the funding for the integrated service delivery pilot, it is recommended that a joint memorandum be generated by Jan Avallone and Christine Kenney and sent to all staff.
- During the next school year, consistent information for all SEIS and DYS should be provided so that staff can begin to develop a common language about inclusive and integrated services.
- It is suggested that a paragraph incorporating the Integrated Service Delivery Core Values be developed and shared across SEIS and DYS staff.
- This consistent message should be delivered throughout the layers of the professional development system, including the full days at Norwood, the regional trainings, and the individual programs trainings.
- Presentation of the power point to groups will inform SEIS and DYS staff of the framework and research base for the integrated service delivery model.
- It is further recommended that the integrated service delivery model be communicated to DYS Program Directors, Clinical Staff, etc. by Christine Kenney.
- Communication of the integrated service delivery model needs to be delivered in multiple layers, individually delivered, and in groups.

RECOMMENDATION FOR NEXT STEPS

- Re-convene the ISD Working Group during July and August. Invite the DYS Regional Education Coordinators from the pilot sites to be part of the team.
- Develop Core Values Statements that can be included in communications with SEIS and DYS staff in the fall.
- Further define the monitoring and evaluation processes; including the mid-cycle review, observation protocol, and end of pilot evaluation. Include appropriate SEIS, DYS and HEC staff as needed.
 Work with the consultant to update her proposal, aligning it with the language in the original ISD Proposal.
Rather than “co-teaching,” she should focus on a continuum of service delivery options, and the
development of the collaborative team model.
 The HEC SEIS Contract Administrator, Mary Lou Chapman, and the HEC DYS Project Director should
work as a team to lead the pilot project.

6


TO: DYS General Educators and SEIS Educators participating in the Integrated Service Delivery pilot

FROM: Christine Kenney, Director of Educational Services, Department of Youth Services; Jan Avallone, SEIS Director, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

DATE: February 26, 2010

Thank you for the ongoing efforts you are making as a participant in the Integrated Service Delivery pilot project. This project is an important step in carrying out a DYS/SEIS collaborative vision and shared core values for education services for all students in DYS treatment programs. A working group, with members from both DYS and SEIS, developed a joint proposal for the implementation of an integrated service delivery model. The vision and core values were established as follows:

**VISION of DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery:**
All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

**DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery Core Values:**
- Professional Collaboration
- Continuum of Services
- Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
- Student-Centered and Strengths-Based
- Access to the General Curriculum
- Successful Transition to the Community
- Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
- Quality Teaching and Learning

The goal of this pilot is to develop a model for use across DYS where collaborative learning teams at the program level work together to support the students and the delivery of education services. In the model for DYS treatment programs, it is assumed that all students will be part of an inclusive model, and that the majority of special education students will be included with their general education peers. Since the purpose of special education is to provide specialized instruction to meet individual student needs, a continuum of service delivery models should be
available, and the collaborative learning teams of general and special educators should work together to determine the appropriate strategy for each student. In order to be able to implement a model of instructional delivery based on such collaborative and inclusive practices, it was agreed that all DYS and SEIS teachers will differentiate curriculum, instruction and assessment as a part of ongoing practice; implement collaborative planning for shared instructional delivery for all students; and provide access to the general curriculum.

As you know, DYS and SEIS Educators at both sites selected for the pilot are participating in intensive training during the professional development sessions throughout this school year, and are being provided with onsite technical assistance during the pilot.

The Department of Youth Services and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education heartily endorse the integrated service delivery model for all committed youth. We understand the need to change past practice and identify new ways of working together in order to address the needs of all students, and we appreciate the efforts you are making in this regard. We are looking forward to reviewing the results of this year’s pilot in order to establish how the model can be implemented across DYS program. It is anticipated that the success of this effort will only contribute to increased positive outcomes for the students. We look forward to this continued collaboration as we together support the needs of all students in DYS.
Project Report
DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery
2009-2010

Presented by the members of the DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery Working Group

To the
Massachusetts Department of
Elementary and Secondary Education and the
Department of Youth Services

June 2010
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97 Hawley Street, Northampton, MA 01060
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**SEIS-DYS VISION of Integrated Service Delivery:**
All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

**INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY CORE VALUES**
- Professional Collaboration
- Continuum of Services
- Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
- Student Centered and Strengths-Based
- Access to the General Curriculum
- Successful Transition to the Community
- Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
- Quality Teaching and Learning

The work of the Integrated Service Delivery Work Group in the previous year outlined the pilot as follows:

**PILOT GOAL**
To develop a model for collaborative teams at the program level to work together to support the students and the delivery of services to provide access to the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs.

**PILOT ACTIVITIES**
- Develop a model that is transferable.
- Determine where the process needs refinement.
- Monitor the impact on students.
- Develop strategies: forms, process, technical assistance, communication with all stakeholders.

**PROJECT UPDATES**

I. **Pilot I Status**
The two pilot program sites completed the 5-day training session, and had the consultants on site for five sessions, 3 hours each. The teachers continued to meet throughout the school year, and were doing some co-teaching.

II. **Pilot Evaluation**
The pilot evaluation plan consisted of gathering and reviewing data in 4 areas. Following each is a summary of the information that was collected

(1) Interviews with the pilot participants to gather responses on the following questions:

**How is the process working now? How has the process developed through the school year?**
In the Westboro program, the teachers responded that the process was focused only on students with IEPs and was in the infancy stage. They had not developed a formal process for collecting the meeting notes and discussion as of yet. Throughout the year, they developed their own strategies to help the work, and the outside observer was helpful. When using the tools presented at the March PD, they were presented with challenges for brainstorming about students.
In Goss I and II, the teachers continued to meet on Friday mornings, and rotated as facilitators during the meetings. While they only discussed Goss II students, their focus was on those who were in special education. During the meetings, notes were taken and distributed to both Goss I and II teams, and the elmo was used to project documents for all to view. The team created a plan including strategies for a particular student with follow up. They also felt that their work together was in the beginning stages, only on the surface and not in depth. More training was needed on the process of reviewing student information, planning and assessing progress, and outside support is necessary. Their concern was for sustaining their efforts next year, and knowing the next steps.

Please identify barriers to the process working effectively?
The following is a list of barriers that was generated by both pilot teams:
- Commitment for class coverage for the team to meet.
- Need for monitoring ongoing progress for the pilot teams, and who will be designated.
- Turnover in staff.
- Training new staff in both regions.
- Decision-making as a team.
- Accountability with clear roles and responsibilities for participants.
- Accountability for educators as well as administrators.
- Sustainability – How do we maintain momentum?

Please identify additional resources that you need for the process to work effectively?
The following is a list of additional resources that the participants identified as being necessary to the effectiveness of the process:
- Onsite monitoring
- Onsite training
- Dedicated staff to visit sites to provide support
- Moodle
- Peer observations
- Networking with other ISD teams
- Co-planning training
- Videos of teaching to critique teaching and learning process.

(2) A summary of the evaluations of the professional development sessions is presented in APPENDIX A.

(3) Evaluation of the project by the consultants based on both the trainings and onsite work.

The consultants reported to the working group at the meeting on April 30, 2010. They began by saying that the most important part of the process was for them to gain the trust of the staff, which took some time. The slow start reflected their concerns about administration support, which they brought back to this team, and was addressed. The teams needed to understand the project and where it is going. They felt that the teachers were phenomenal at both sites - they put a tremendous amount of effort in this project and were committed to a process of change; they were a gift. For the consultants, it also took time to try to understand the layers of the system they were dealing with.

They planned the project as they learned from the teachers in the sites. In creating this model, they were developing a team at each site, and felt that we need to acknowledge the teams. This was a process for the teams: building trust and collaboration, learning to describe students behaviorally, learning to use tools that would support co-teaching, and exploring their own beliefs. It was important for the teams to learn to work together, to observe students, and learn to make plans together. While the cycle of progress monitoring has
not been addressed yet, it is most important to have set up the framework in which the program teams can work together.

They worked with each site differently based on the needs of the team, and did not get onsite until they felt that the teachers were ready. The timeline between professional development days and the program visits was not optimal, and a clear understanding of the IEPs by the special educators was not evident. In order to move the two pilot teams forward, they recommended that the teams learn how to look at the students as individual learners, and how to co-teach with the individual learners in mind; the “why” and “how” of accommodations. They would continue working with the teams in analyzing student work samples, before moving to progress monitoring.

The consultant recommendations for next year include:
- Onsite support and training
- A base of training at the beginning, rather than scattered PD day
- PD to involve a couple of concepts each session and then go back to practice, with onsite support
- Build in a project during the winter hiatus of PD
- Pilot I participants to become teacher leaders
- More time to assess where the teachers were, as they were concerned about making it through the content.
- Continue with Moodle, even thought it took a while to get everyone on board

(4) Additional feedback from the ISD Design Team led to the identification of issues and development of an action plan with steps to be taken in preparation for the second phase of the implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear roles and responsibilities identified for participants.</td>
<td>Develop a FAQ for participants identifying points of contact, strategies for resolving issues, etc. How can we effectively model the integration / collaboration at the management level? How can we explore the roles in the ISD model, in order to support the implementation?</td>
<td>ISD Team Mary, Cheryl, ML</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher reflection and understanding of the change in practice as a result of the project.</td>
<td>Plan for monitoring the process, the needs of the teams, with a communication loop back to ISD team. Include in FAQs: Email from REC/Jaime to Ellen and Evie with cc to ML and Woody.</td>
<td>ISD Team Mary, Cheryl, ML</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing communication with the teams in order to respond to needs.</td>
<td>Bring together the LT and ISD work groups to address. Document that identifies the clear expectations of the ISD learning teams, i.e. taking notes at meetings, roles, responsibilities; to guide</td>
<td>LT and ISD</td>
<td>June-July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>WHAT</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>WHEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and ISD, and where it is different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them, concrete expectations. Align with LT, working with Ellen, Evie. Develop the common message.</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>August 2, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train facilitators to deliver common message</td>
<td>ML / Woody</td>
<td>July-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bring the LT and ISD consultants together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify coaches who can support the ISD work at the programs</td>
<td>Discussion with PD, and recommendations to ISD; include coach discussion</td>
<td>Cecelia, Shirley, Sandy</td>
<td>June-July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for pilot programs. Development of an orientation for program directors, program staff, clinical staff.</td>
<td>Develop, design for this audience; clear expectations and monitoring process with key criteria for program working.</td>
<td>Woody / Mary - include Sandy and Shirley</td>
<td>July-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to new ISD teams</td>
<td>What – how the ISD will be happening next year. Format for the communication – in person-shared delivery Notify groups before the end of the school year if possible.</td>
<td>Tom-Karen-Jaime-Tara</td>
<td>Before end of school year if possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking points</td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter about PD plans</td>
<td>Sandy / Shirley</td>
<td>summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation to ISD - Clear explanation with people they know and opportunity for questions</td>
<td>SEIS-DYS Managers</td>
<td>First day of PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with provider program</td>
<td>Connect with Christine</td>
<td>Mary M.</td>
<td>June if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact with SEIS teacher</td>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up blocks of time for onsite support</td>
<td>Need responsible party at each site to set this up; coverage by floating subs; clarify options for setting this up – giving permission for participants to change practice</td>
<td>REC, Jaime, TC</td>
<td>Start of school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing communication, consistent message</td>
<td>Ongoing communication and dissemination strategy to bring to meeting with Jan and Christine.</td>
<td>ISD Team</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with consultants</td>
<td>Contract with explicit expectations for outcomes. Critical observers.</td>
<td>Cecelia, ML, Sandy</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Phase 2 Implementation

In order to determine the next steps in the implementation of integrated service delivery, information was collected about additional long term treatment programs, both HEC and other providers. The decision criteria that were used last year in the selection of the pilot sites included the following:

- long term program
- stable staffing
- established and receptive team
- receptive program – director and clinical.

Additional factors considered were the average numbers of students with IEPs in the sites, the licensure of special educators, the location of the program, and the participation in other initiatives. After consideration of all the criteria and information gathered, the ISD Working Group recommends the following for Phase 2:

- Goss I
- Spectrum REACH
- Teamworks
- Community Adolescent Treatment Program – CHD
- Two alternate sites - Gandara and Worcester Secure.

IV. Priorities for Professional Development Planning

The Design Team has developed a set of priorities for future professional development planning. Each one of these priorities will need further discussion and action plans to accomplish.

- Determining the consultant role for training and technical assistance for new sites.
- Introducing new sites and providing technical assistance more frequently.
- Maintaining technical assistance for current pilot sites.
- Building internal capacity for sustainability of integrated services.
- Building internal capacity for monitoring and accountability.

Based on these priorities, the following are recommendations for Professional Development for school year 2010-2011:

- 4 full Professional Development days, including teams from both Pilot 1 and Pilot 2 sites.
- Professional Development with the Learning Teams. Specific ISD training to occur onsite along with consultants. Workshop days for SEIS teachers to cover special education topics. ISD groups will have intensive training and coaching support onsite for delivery of services. Identify a designated coach to facilitate the LT trainings for the ISD groups.
- Intensive training in ISD for a designated coach who can become the facilitator for the full day trainings; followed by onsite support from consultants.
- Additional training for others (coaches, supervisors) to support the development of internal capacity for monitoring and sustaining the project.
V. Proposed Timeline

**Integrated Service Delivery Implementation in Long Term Treatment Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>2+ sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>6 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>9 sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>13 sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep-09</th>
<th>Jun-10</th>
<th>Sep-10</th>
<th>Jun-11</th>
<th>Sep-11</th>
<th>Jun-10</th>
<th>Sep-10</th>
<th>Jun-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISD Participant Feedback
ISD Group PD Sessions: Summary of Participant Feedback Forms September-April

- This ISD PD-day has been the most beneficial of my 14 plus years teaching in a DYS setting. The progress that HEC and the Commonwealth Corp have done [sic] has been impeccable.

- Communication is the key

**Question #1: Usefulness to role (Scale of 1-4)**

All rated generally useful or extremely useful. By the end 95% rated a 4

Requested feedback for the first three sessions asked each participant to indicate What I learned, I wish that, What I liked most, What I liked least.

In their responses to **What I Learned**, all participants focused on specific content:
  - **September**: RSVP model, using concrete language to describe student behavior, integration is possible in DYS
  - **October**: How to work with IEPs, Interaction formula & layers of RSVP, What to teach how to teach how to approach
  - **November**: Using KWH, how to best to use common planning time

There was a shift in the type of comments made in the **What I Liked Most** section: Consistently, the facilitators received praise for their knowledge, presentation style, and activities. Additionally, more participants commented they liked the collaboration and cooperation.

As the group gelled, there was a decrease in the number of comments made in **What I Liked Least**. In the I Wish That having more time was a constant

All participants were able to state **How what they learned today** (PD session) will be reflected in practice for the first three sessions. Most comments reflected the **What I Learned Today** response.

**April 13th Question/Responses**

1) For each of the prompts below, please briefly describe one or two changes in your practice as a result of working with your facilitator and colleagues in the ISD pilot group this year.

**Assessing student needs and strengths:**
As a team, we have formally committed to a strength based approach to instruction, & alter our teaching approaches to meet individual student needs.
As a team, depth of assessment much greater, using (KWH), using student work from all classes

**Planning for instructional delivery for students with IEPs:**
Plan how each teacher can help student using our strengths – Analyze IEP thoroughly, all teachers plan how they can help students using teachers strengths, using a variety of materials.
We spend more formal planning time together.
Differentiated Instruction DI’s importance is much more evident since it is keenly evident that these students learning needs are as varied as the methodology
Planning for instructional delivery for general education students:
Hasn’t changed greatly for us yet
More consideration is given to determining why a student has specific challenge—not immediately assume a disability is present.
Goals & obj. posted daily, Using Curriculum guides (guidelines) For coplanning & coteaching, grouping students – Gen ed paired w/struggling in certain areas works well
Taking a team approach, all students benefit from best practices

Providing instruction for all students:

With 2 teachers in ISD classroom, all students are being evaluated & enveloped into an all inclusive classroom.
We have tried to down play the “roles” of each teacher. One is not the “SPED” teacher & other a “general” teacher. We are simply teachers.
Utilizing the goals and needs of the IEPs along with Curriculum Guides and DI to enhance instruction for all students

2) What specific gains and practice changes has your team made as a result of working on this pilot?
   • Look at students (differently/thoroughly): 8
   • Developed a Team:5
   • Structured meeting/planning time: 4
   • Shared strategies:3
   • Clarified roles: 1

March 16th Question: Please describe any barriers your team is facing in moving toward greater collaboration and integration?
Time to meet/plan -9
Concern that we will not continue this pilot for a second & third year

What supports does your team need to overcome the barriers you listed in question #4?

How find more time: 7
More time with facilitators 3 (both more site visits and more PD sessions next year)
Administrative support

April 13th Several participants have mentioned that finding common planning time has been a challenge. Aside from this challenge, what other barriers has your team encountered in working together to assess student needs/strengths and to plan instruction. How have you addressed these barriers?
What helped?
   • Our coordinating time and efforts have all but eliminated the barriers
   • Clear expectations/shared vision, continued support
   • Honesty
Students -3
   • Students splitting staff especially when it came to discipline. We rewrote “our” classroom rules to include both of our names
• Resistance from students: Non-IEP students resent the presence of SPED teachers. The students relaxed about it eventually
• Some group members don’t always want to meet, rules for class were not set up, students were not introduced to this model

Challenges/Needs:
• Learning how to share a classroom is a challenge. It too, is a work in progress for me.
• Not receiving assessment packets from Assessment units prior to commitment
• We need practice using tools to co-teach

March 16th Please rate the aspects of professional development provided during this pilot project as to their usefulness to your teaching team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>A fair amount</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD Sessions in Norwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site supports from facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and materials provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 no response to any & 1 only responded to PD item (represents 7% & 15%)

3) If you were to talk to colleagues in another DYS program about the collaborative team process you have begun to develop, how would you describe the pilot process and your current practice as a team?

It's a process:
  o It's a work in progress, don’t get frustrated
  o It started off slowly, but we finally have a better idea of what needs to be done. People need to feel comfortable enough to be honest with each other
  o As a work in process, we are still trying to feel out the best way to co-plan and share responsibility
  o Pilot process started slow. We still have trouble finding time to co-plan which hinders the co-teaching process.
  o It is a process that needs flexibility

Suggestions:
  o First, get a working definition of ISD and when to begin implementation. There are many hurdles but with excellent instruction from E & E and support from management, we are making a big impact
  o Use the strength based model of instruction, Analyze IEPS for usefulness and validity
  o Meeting weekly to discuss students is a great help

Benefits/Successes:
  o It has drawn us together as team. It shows true collaboration.
  o Enriching, team work, positive experience
  o We took something that works and improved it.
  o Interesting, innovative, collaborating
- A new lens to look at students, assets-based model - team approach, problem solving

**Summary/Overview comments:**
- Each team provided a shared vision and defined their own process and approach to ISD. Students benefit and teachers work more collaboratively and are able to discuss students on a more formal basis.
- The pilot (PD) presented various tools to open discussion of student behaviors & classwork. Teaching teams identified common time to meet, discuss student(s) & begin planning. It is an excellent to be part of the discussion & hear the positive feedback

**April 13th** If your colleagues in another program were going to begin this process, what three key pieces of advice would you give them?
- Teamwork/relationships (staff & students)/trust: 8
- Be open: 9
- Ask for help/accept help: 4
- Set aside the time necessary: 5
- Set roles & responsibilities for team members: 2
- Focus on students: 4
- Develop the language to describe student behavior and performance clearly: 1
- Work with 5-step instructional process: 1
- Accept it's a process: 1
PD Eval Summary 3/16/10

Facilitator/Session: Ellen Koretz & Evie Gleckel/ISD Pilot

1.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total # forms</th>
<th># DYS gen ed</th>
<th>Avg. rating</th>
<th># SEIS</th>
<th>Avg. rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Did not identify and rated usefulness as 4

2. Please provide facilitator with feedback regarding this session

Useful activity: 7

Activity provided the model to determine best teaching approaches
Great opportunity to have staff work together in the discussion of a student w/support
I think we went deeper today than we have at other on-site meetings
Breaking down and prioritizing

Great session again 5

Feeling that my understanding is increasing, goals are clearer, amazing, informative
Loved discussion on asset-based teaching
So much info-so little time
Depth of knowledge needed to look at our students
Agenda was full & not able to get to co-planning
Would like to extend the program to another year

3) How has the collaborative team process as outlined worked for your team thus far?

Process works well-7

Our team has always been collaborative- this PD has helped us to formalize this process
The collaborative team has worked well-everyone works well together
Excellent
The team definitely worked collaboratively & shared ideas/strategies. Effort to have a plan in place at end of each meeting -great way to guide future discussion and assess effectiveness
We have been meeting & learning more about our students
Good
Very helpful working with SEIS teacher

Working but needs more -3

It’s hard work but not impossible, with practice it will be easier
Yes, though it is very much a work-in-progress
Yes, the team is working very hard

We have used it on a daily basis
Helpful to both teams it sounds like

4) Please describe any barriers your team is facing in moving toward greater collaboration and integration?

Time to meet/plan -9

Time is an issue
More opportunity for common planning time
Adjusting & coordinating planning time together

What co-teaching looks like
Revolving teachers @ Westboro

Concern that we will not continue this pilot for a second & third year
None -1
5) What supports does your team need to overcome the barriers you listed in question #4?

How find more time: 7
- Coverage for planning time
- More co-planning time/formalized planning time - 3
- Help in scheduling common planning time since am is full of other responsibilities

More time with facilitators 3
- A few more site visits to comment on our progress, lead us in the proper direction, advise us on issues
- More PDs with Ellen & Evie next year

Just communicate and get out of routine
Tough to say

Administrative support
Think administration needs to be supportive throughout this pilot, but moving in the right direction

6) Please rate the aspects of professional development provided during this pilot project as to their usefulness to your teaching team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>A fair amount</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD Sessions in Norwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site supports from facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moodle discussions</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and materials provided</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 no response to any & 1 only responded to PD item (represents 7% & 15%)

Please use the space below for additional comments.

Continuation of pilot - 3
We could really use a 2nd year in the process of implementing the ISD pilot. There is a phenomenal amount of information for this process
Think there is still a lot to cover and would appreciate a continuation of this process/PD/Pilot next year
I found today was extremely interesting & stimulating, time went by quickly
I love this PD day
ISD Meeting 06/18/10 Goss I and Goss II

Joining phase 2 programs – for PD training

Continuation of ISD for Goss II and Westboro secure

Currently on Goss I for math and ELA - consistent John and Pedro only

Concerns: part time for Goss I (SEIS Teacher)
Goss I am

Goss II- inclusion – students who still need pull out / not inclusion

Scheduling for Goss I
  Begin with 1 or 2 content areas – rolling it out slowly.

Time to prep with teachers-

No rotation option

KWH- Friday meetings on Goss II / creating some tool kits

Ask Karen Kinney – regarding Title I teachers
Melanie has participated in Friday morning meetings

What would Title I role be?

Observing other groups who are already doing it.
ISD Meeting 06/21/10 Spectrum Reach

Attendees: Tom Finneran, Jaime Bell, Bruce Bisbee, John Vancelette, and Asst. Director Tricia

Concerns: part time employee

Explanation to students – script to students

IEP service Delivery – pullout

Teacher Meetings- Limited time
   Currently – lunchtime

Extending time – during lunch hour?
   Scheduling?

Students reading skills - not do well in inclusion setting
   Will not benefit in inclusion setting

Title I – Karen Kinney?

Coverage
   Scheduling
ISD Meeting --- Tara Jacome, Karen George, and Jaime Bell

How is the process working now?

Westboro—
Using some of tools at March PD presented with some challenges—
Brainstorming about students who posed challenges
Outside observer has been helpful
Developed strategies to help work
With students during these meeting not formalized yet (notes, data on paper)
Infancy stage
Focus on sped students

Goss II and I-
Continued to meet on Friday AM's
Facilitators rotate in during meeting
Speaking of only Goss II students
Switching roles
Focus more on sped students
Did create a plan for student and follow up / came up with strategies for this particular student
Infancy stage
On surface of where they need to be --- not so much in dept
How they should look at kids
Meeting - notes are taken and distributed to Goss I and II teams
Using elmo to project documents
Need outside support to stay focused
Concerns for next year - will it continue?
What are next steps?

Please identify barriers to the process working effectively?

Westboro, Goss I, Goss II---
Commitment for class coverage for team to meet
Checking in to monitor ongoing progress for pilot - who will be designated staff to move this pilot forward
Turn over in staff
Training new staff in both regions—how do we provide this?
Who will provide training?
Accountability - clarify roles and responsibilities for participants
Decision making as a team
Accountability for educators as well as administrators
Sustainability / how do we maintain momentum?

Please identify additional resources that you need for the process to work effectively?
Onsite monitoring
Onsite training --- from whom?
Dedicated staff --- supervisors? Who will visit sites to provide support?
Moodle
Peer observations
Networking with other ISD teams
Co-planning training
Videos of teaching to critique teaching and learning process
Notes from ISD Meeting at Goss I and II

All educational staff from both programs were present, including Jamie, Cheryl, Woody and Tara.

After introductions, we provided them with the joint letter, provided a context for our visit, and then created an open forum for them to discuss questions, highlight successes, and explore challenges. The meeting began at roughly 11:00 and ended at 12:15.

Cheryl, Jamie, and I presented on the history of ISD and the development of the pilot. The staff did not have any questions about this background.

We then held an open discussion about the pilot. Below are some of the educators observations and comments:

- Initial apprehension by students, both special ed and general ed, to this change in service delivery which manifest in different ways. This should be addressed in future roll out.
- Need to determine how to explain to current residents about this change of service delivery.
- Recommend hearing from students about how this has worked for them in ELA and Math.
- Noted that pull out has been primarily only in ELA and Math so this change in service is only experienced by students in these subject areas, though the teachers have begun to explore how service delivery can be expanded to other subject areas.
- Some dual authority challenges associated with two teachers in the room. Needs time to discuss prior to implementation and throughout.
- Some discussion about how much time is enough time to focus on one student when there are many others in the program not benefitting from the *kwhl* process outlined by E & E book. “should we be covering more students?” “should special ed students come first?” Stated they have permission to answer some of these questions themselves and when they have time with E & E, but that when first learning a process it takes more time and it might be best to limit the focus to one student before expanding to many others.
- When referencing their Friday morning meetings as “learning teams (as described in the memo)” they were perplexed, but when I clarified the meeting as a Friday meeting, they understood. Might make sense to reinforce learning team language.
- Notion of this process being beneficial to all students was proposed and lots of head nodding in support.
- Challenge of finding common prep time was put forward as a concern with no clear answer as Gen Ed teachers teach 6 classes during the day and have prep before and after school, while the Special Ed teachers have prep in the middle of the day.
- I publicly supported Tara as having full authority to work with the program to try and resolve issues in collaboration with the program.
• Some concern about the lack of clarity about what “ISD” was (what would the finished product look like) and recommended clarity about what the “core components” of an ISD model would include prior to implementation.
• Some anxiety about “are we doing it right?” since they have no idea about what “right” looks like.
Overall discussion with Administration, Lead Teacher & SEIS Teacher

- Spectrum of educational services/levels provided at the program
  - College, GED and K – 12

- Clarification of role of the consultants
  - Change current model at the program – or–
  - Looking at this site as a program model

  What are the expectations of the consultants during site visits

- Common meeting times
  - Teaching Coordinator is full time coordinator (change from full time teaching)
  - Three teachers, including SEIS teacher – teach full schedule
  - 1 hour prior to school – daily discussion
  - Lunch & Shift Change (all staff together)
  - Continual communication with all education staff

  SEIS ETL meets with TC & SEIS Teacher on new students

- ISD Pilot
  - Expectations of this group for the program
  - Expectations of end product for PD
  - Status of pilot at program next year
DYS-SEIS
Integrated Service Delivery
2009-2010
Pilot Evaluation Findings

Presented by the Collaborative for Educational Services

To the
Massachusetts Department
of Elementary and Secondary Education

Fall 2010

collaborative.org
Collaborative for Educational Services

97 Hawley Street
Northampton, MA 01060
413.586.4900 Phone
413.586.2798 Fax

Everyone is a learner
DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery

2009-2010 Pilot Evaluation Findings

PROJECT OVERVIEW:

The DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery Working Group initiated the design of an integrated service delivery (ISD) pilot in the fall of 2008.¹ The plan was finalized and approved in June 2009 and implementation began over the summer for the 2009-2010 school year. The goal of the pilot was to develop a model for training, implementation, and support for site-based integrated service delivery to provide access to the general curriculum for all DYS students. The lessons learned from this pilot are to be used to support transferability to new sites in future years.

Throughout the pilot year, DYS and SEIS provided professional development sessions and on-site supports to general and special education teachers at two treatment facilities—Goss 2 and Westboro Secure.² Training was developed and provided by Ellen Koretz and Evie Gleckel, independent educational consultants, in alignment with the approved pilot plan. Administrators from SEIS and DYS (“the ISD workgroup”) oversaw the pilot, developed communication tools, and, in consultation with Kate Lytton, HEC Internal Evaluator, implemented pilot evaluation activities, including:

- surveys of educators regarding the value of the training provided and implementation barriers;
- site visits conducted by DYS and SEIS administrators and managers;
- consultant assessments of educator training and support needs, implementation successes, and obstacles; and
- interviews with educators involved in the pilot sites.

This report presents a summary of the evaluation findings. For a more detailed description of the pilot activities, successes, barriers, and plan for future years, see the report, DYS-SEIS Integrated Service Delivery Project Report and Updates 2009-2010 (June 2010).

EVALUATION FINDINGS:

Overall achievement of the pilot goals:

The overall pilot goal as stated in the initial proposal was “To develop a model for collaborative teams at the program level to work together to support the students and the delivery of services to provide access to the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs.”³ During the course of the year, the pilot achieved the following critical components of this goal:

- development of training content and resources to support educator effectiveness;
- establishment of expectations for team meetings;
- identification of necessary communication protocols to support ISD teams;
- educator skill development in working as part of a team, strength-based student assessment, instructional planning, and collaborative instructional delivery; and
- documentation of lessons learned to support effective rollout of ISD in sites statewide.

¹ The initial Working Group which developed the ISD proposal consisted of Mary Lou Chapman, HEC SEIS Project Coordinator; Cheryl Nicholson, SEIS Principal; Sandra Shore, HEC SEIS PD/Curriculum Coordinator; Jaime Bell, HEC SEIS-DYS Coordinator; Paul Stracco, HEC DYS Project Director; Woody Cift, HEC DYS Project Director; and Mary Murray, DYS Consultant.
² Due to staff overlap and co-location with one of the target programs, shared educators from a third program (Goss 1) were included in the professional development activities.
Summary of Implementation Activities:

Two sites (Westboro Secure and Goss 2) were selected for the pilot in the spring of 2009. The primary selection criteria the pilot designers used were:

- type of program (only long term treatment programs were considered),
- stable staffing patterns,
- established and receptive team, and
- supportive DYS program management.

Using these criteria, the designers selected sites that had the greatest capacity for effective ISD implementation. The pilot findings therefore should be interpreted cautiously; additional preparation at new sites may be necessary to build the infrastructure and readiness to support ISD success.

Twelve educators at the two pilot sites, as well as two Regional Education Coordinators, the SEIS Host Agency Coordinator, and an SEIS Principal, participated in the initial SD sessions that were provided during the DYS/SEIS professional development days in Norwood, MA. The consultants utilized MOODLE to provide online supports and generate discussion between professional development sessions. The consultants noted that because they were new to the DYS system and that educators were not familiar with them, it took a few sessions for them to develop the trust of the educators.

At both sites, teachers initiated structured on-site ISD team meetings on a weekly basis in January with a focus on students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Consultants provided on-site supports for five sessions for each site between January and April. Each program team developed and implemented its own approach to team meetings, planning, and instructional delivery. These variations were connected to team skill sets, attitudes, context (e.g., availability of coverage), and student needs. By the spring, there was some co-teaching at both sites. Consistent processes for utilizing student progress monitoring to inform instructional planning were not in place.

Implementation Strengths:

Educators found the training and on-site supports provided by the consultants to be very valuable. By April, 93% (13 out of 14) reported that the professional development sessions were "extremely useful" to them in their teaching roles (up from 69% after the first session in September). All were able to name specific things they learned and ways the training had affected their practice.

Over the course of the year, participating educators developed skills and familiarity with tools to support structured, strengths-based student assessment. They also developed skills in working as a team and talking about students as learners. Teachers were able to name specific tools that they used during team meetings, including the KWH chart ("what is Known about the student, what teachers Want to find out, and how to get the information"), IEPs, smart boards to outline student strengths and needs, and Instructional Guides. Several participants described that this process helped them to "take a closer look at individual students;" "to look at students through many eyes;" "to recognize student assets; and to better understand student motivations, behaviors, and skills. It should be noted that the consultant/trainers recommended further training and support on: the content and use of IEPs, how to meaningfully talk about students; and how to use this information to plan instruction.

Most educators also noted the benefits of working as a team. While many indicated that teachers had already been accustomed to working together, they noted that the ISD pilot helped them formalize structures, develop skills to focus conversations and planning, and to strengthen the team. One participant described the effort as having "drawn us together as a team. It shows true collaboration." Participants suggested that the ISD process facilitated structured team meetings and informal collaboration among colleagues.

---

4 Of the 12 teachers who attended the Sept. PD session, ten attended all five sessions and participated in the on-site team meetings. An additional five general education teachers participated in portions of the ISD implementation, either in PD sessions and/or on-site meetings.
SEIS and DYS education administrators and coordinators also gained new understandings as a result of the ISD pilot. Coordinators have a greater sense of how to support ISD teams with skill development, planning meeting time, and working with program staff. In their planning documents for the 2010-2011 year, the ISD workgroup demonstrated the insights they had gained regarding consistent communication with all stakeholders, clearly defining roles and responsibilities, and the supports participating educators need. Much of the design for the Learning Teams and ISD professional development was informed by the lessons learned from the 2009-2010 ISD pilot regarding the need to support essential skills, disseminate learning team protocols, monitor progress, and integrate on- and off-site supports.

**Implementation Challenges:**

During the course of the year, participating educators, consultants, and program managers noted that there was a lack of clarity among stakeholder groups in terms of expectations for teams, roles and responsibilities, and communication channels. The pilot design included communication recommendations to promote consistent messaging and a common understanding of ISD structures and supports. The recommendations, however, were not fully implemented, and educator confusion regarding their roles, autonomy, and expectations demonstrated that they needed more guidance from agency supervisors and administrators. For example, during the first several months, participating educators expressed uncertainty regarding how much autonomy they had in organizing themselves and what oversight or support they had access to in order to make weekly meetings a reality. The consultant-trainers also expressed concern about this issue and felt that educators were looking to them for answers that needed to be addressed by supervisors and administrators. Further, the consultants needed clarification on what communication process they should use to work with the ISD workgroup to address problems as they were identified. As implementation questions and barriers arose in the fall, the ISD workgroup refined a communications strategy to provide consistent information to stakeholders, and to respond efficiently as challenges were communicated to anyone on the ISD implementation team.

Educators faced a significant challenge in establishing common planning time during which SEIS and DYS General Educators could meet on a weekly basis. Educators identified a number of obstacles, including lack of coverage for teachers, other program meetings, and program staff not understanding the intent of ISD meetings. During the November professional development session, the consultants asked each team to determine a common weekly planning time and the supports they needed to make this work. This provided educators with clear direction around this critical expectation—i.e., that they would hold weekly meetings. While this was a necessary process, several educators identified this as the most frustrating part of the session.

At Westboro Secure, there was some teacher turnover during the year which affected the team-building and the skill development. As new teachers joined the team, some began to participate in the PD sessions at Norwood and others simply participated in the on-site team meetings. There was no formal system for getting them up-to-speed on the trainings that they had missed or for initiating them into the team process.

One other critical challenge that educators and the consultants identified was the lag time between the initial set of professional development sessions and the on-site support, as well as the limited number of sites visits. The scheduling was in part necessitated by the limited availability of the consultants. Educators noted that the skills they developed during the fall professional development sessions were useful for their individual practice and in their site-based team meetings. Consultants and educators, however, noted that the professional development sessions and on-site supports needed to be better integrated for more immediate follow-up to support use of new skills as a team. The implementation timeline and resources also did not allow adequate time for formal training and on-site support in collaborative teaching models and student progress monitoring.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from the pilot suggest two key areas of development for moving forward. First, the needs of the year one pilot sites should be addressed. Secondly, lessons from these teams can support effective roll-out to new sites.

Support for Initial Pilot Sites:

The educators who participated in the ISD pilot, the Coordinators, and the consultants all agreed that these teams need further support to continue implementing and strengthening the ISD model at their site. The teams need reinforcement and further skill development in:

- structured student assessment,
- reading and interpreting IEPs and utilizing this information in instructional planning,
- planning for instructional delivery,
- collaborative models for delivering instruction, and
- using student progress monitoring to improve instructional delivery.

To address these needs, DYS and SEIS should dedicate resources to continued off-site training and practice, as well as on-site supports focused on instructional planning, delivery, and monitoring.

Rollout to New Sites:

The purpose of a pilot is to explore the effectiveness of an intervention and to develop an understanding of strengths, weaknesses, and barriers that need to be overcome in further implementation of the intervention. The ISD pilot in 2009-2010 provided valuable lessons for further implementation as DYS and SEIS plan for new sites during the 2010-2011 year and support Learning Teams in all institutional programs.

Site selection and differentiated professional development: Administrators and consultants should assess site readiness for ISD implementation and identify additional supports that individual teams may need. To implement ISD in all long term treatment programs, site selection should be phased in over the next few years to initially include those sites that are “most ready,” while building initial capacity at other sites. Readiness criteria might include demonstrated teamwork and collaboration; consistent staffing; SEIS teacher time on site; number of IEPs; program receptivity; and participation in other initiatives.

As noted earlier, the pilot sites were selected because of specific strengths that were likely to support effective implementation. Further sites may not have these advantages and will need more work in building trust and collegiality. In addition, individual team members may not have the extensive experience in working with the DYS student population and may have greater skill development needs. The model developed over the past year will have to be refined over time to accommodate these diverse learning needs of teachers and teams. The professional development plans for 2010-2011 focusing on site-based Learning Teams should help to build many of the basic skills and structures that will support ISD teams in the future.

Communication: It is essential that the ISD workgroup outline a clear communication plan starting in the summer of 2010 for all stakeholders in the 2009-2010 pilot and those who will be involved in the new ISD sites for 2010-2011. Stakeholders include: educators, Regional Education Coordinators (RECs), the SEIS Host Agency Coordinator, consultant-trainers, coaches, DYS program directors and staff, the SEIS and DYS Professional Development Coordinators, SEIS ETLs and DYS Education Liaisons, and DYS and SEIS officials who oversee the contracts. This communication plan should include the timeline, methods, and accountability for communicating the following:

- clear outlines of ISD goals, expectations, roles, and responsibilities;
- expected roll-out, training, and implementation timelines;
- description of supports available for educators and how to access these supports; and
- outline of the monitoring and support plan, including the supports available for supervisors, coordinators, and administrators.
The ISD workgroup should assign monitoring of the implementation of this workplan to one individual, who will be responsible for bringing any obstacles as well as successes to the workgroup’s attention.

**Training and Support:** The ISD workgroup should identify and define the skill sets needed by each of the stakeholder groups in order to support effective ISD implementation. This includes not only the educators involved on ISD teams, but also their supervisors, coaches, and program directors and staff. This assessment can then be used to design and implement the necessary training and supports for these groups.

For educator training and support, as noted above, coaches and consultant-trainers should be prepared to differentiate their instruction to address individual educator strengths and needs, and to work with ISD teams at whatever point they are in their emergence as a working group. In addition, training plans need to accommodate possible teacher turnover on teams. Further, building on the lessons learned from the year one pilot, the training schedule should be adjusted to better align and integrate the professional development sessions and the on-site supports. The educator training should include clear delineation of the supports available to individuals and teams, so that all participants clearly understand the roles of the consultants, supervisors, and coaches.

**On-site Implementation of ISD Teams:** One of the early and significant obstacles the ISD pilot teams faced was scheduling a regular, common planning time. Participating educators were at first unsure of what autonomy they had to schedule this time, what coverage (if any) they could utilize, and whether program directors and staff would understand and support this time away from students. In the coming years, the expectations for weekly planning time should be clearly explained to all stakeholder groups. DYS program directors and staff should be informed regarding the change in practice and provided with guidance on how they can support this initiative. Educators may need assistance from RECs and the SEIS Host Agency Coordinator to create an appropriate block of time. The ISD workgroup will also want to build in monitoring mechanisms to provide regular feedback on the frequency and use of team meetings.

In addition, ISD teams need clear protocols and expectations for team meetings. The year one training included several activities, tools, and processes that educators could use in their discussions of students. Both pilot ISD teams found these tools very useful. Meeting agendas and structures (facilitation, follow-up, note-taking, etc.) at the two sites, however, varied significantly. While it is inappropriate for the ISD workgroup to dictate a specific model for how ISD teams work together, they can outline a few key methods to support effective use of team meetings and appropriate instructional planning. These might include a consistent agenda, note taking, advanced decisions regarding which student(s) will be discussed so that educators can bring appropriate work samples and assessments, and expected follow-up from meetings. Many of these processes are included in the Learning Team training planned for 2010-2011.

**Capacity Building:** The year one pilot clearly suggests system components necessary to support effective implementation of ISD teams. In order to increasingly rely on internal resources for this support, the ISD workgroup should implement capacity building measures over the next several years. These could include:

- ensuring all coaches are trained to support ISD teams, and providing additional training to identified coaches or coordinators who will take a lead in future ISD training and implementation planning;
- ensuring all RECs, the SEIS DYS Host Agency Coordinator, and Teaching Coordinators are familiar with the teacher skill needs to effectively contribute to an ISD team and that the Coordinators have the skills to support teachers in this role; and
- building a consistent model and mechanisms for oversight and monitoring of ISD teams across multiple sites, including identification of teams in need of support, communication channels, and response and support mechanisms.

As the rollout expands to new sites, there will be increasing demands on the SEIS and DYS systems, including on RECs, SEIS Coordinators, and DYS and SEIS administrators. In order to effectively support ISD implementation in multiple sites, roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined. In addition, the ISD workgroup will want to look at the systemic capacity and adjustments that can be made to ensure staff can meet the defined expectations.
Integrated Service Delivery
Learning Teams
Program Orientation
2010-2011
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The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Departments of Youth Services and Elementary and Secondary Education

Jane E. Tewksbury
Commissioner of Youth Services

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D. Commissioner
of Elementary and Secondary Education

TO: DYS General Educators, involved in Integrated Service Delivery implementation
SEIS Educators, involved in Integrated Service Delivery implementation
DYS Programs, involved in Integrated Service Delivery implementation

FROM: Christine Kenney, Director of Educational Services, Department of Youth Services
Jan Avallone, SEIS Director, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

DATE: August 20, 2010

In the fall of 2008, a working group with members from both DYS and Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) developed a joint proposal for phasing in a system of shared instructional delivery for special and general education students in the DYS treatment programs. The foundation established for development of this system included confirmation of a shared vision, core values and expectations as follows:

**Vision:**

All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

**Core Values:**

- Professional Collaboration
- Continuum of Services
- Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
- Student-Centered and Strengths-Based
- Access to the General Curriculum
- Successful Transition to the Community
- Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
- Quality Teaching and Learning
**Expectations:**

- All students will have access to the general curriculum and be supported in their learning needs as a result of full implementation of this system of shared instructional delivery.
- All students in DYS programs will be part of an inclusive model, and the majority of special education students will be included in classes with their general education peers.
- All DYS and SEIS teachers will differentiate curriculum, instruction and assessment as a part of ongoing practice; implement collaborative planning for shared instructional delivery for all students; and use a framework for universal access to the curriculum.
- Development of collaborative learning team processes that support teachers in determining and planning for appropriate strategies for each student will be key to this shared work.

During the 2009-2010 school year, a pilot of integrated service delivery for special education students in DYS programs was implemented at two DYS educational program sites, Goss II and Westboro Secure. The goal of the pilot was to develop collaborative learning teams, whereby general education and special education teachers work together at the program level to support the students and the delivery of services that provide access to the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs. The pilot provided an opportunity to provide intensive training and technical assistance to special and general educators at the pilot sites to support them in their work as teams and begin initial efforts in shared instructional delivery. It also made it possible to assess development of the process, while identifying needed resources and preventable barriers to address in further implementation. Furthermore, it provided insight into factors that contribute to effective implementation of general program based learning teams, which will be deployed throughout the DYS education system this year.

Pilot results have been very promising and prompted planning for the implementation of integrated service delivery at four additional sites for the 2010-2011 school year. Spectrum Reach, Community Adolescent Treatment Program, Teamworks, and Goss I were selected as sites, based on a combination of data related to size and regional location of programs and numbers of general and special education teachers and students. The Department of Youth Services and the SEIS Program of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education continues to heartily endorse the development of a system of shared instructional delivery for all committed youth. It is anticipated that the success of this effort will only contribute to increased positive outcomes for all students.

We look forward to this continued collaboration as we together support the needs of all students in DYS. We thank you for your participation in this phase of the project and as we continue implementation in DYS educational programs.
Vision and Core Values

DYS-SEIS INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY

The SEIS-DYS Working Group was established during school year 2008-2009 to develop a joint proposal for the implementation of an integrated service delivery model for special education students in DYS treatment programs. As part of the process, the group developed a shared vision, core values and a model for a pilot to begin in the fall of 2009.

DYS-SEIS VISION of Integrated Service Delivery

All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

Integrated Service Delivery Core Values

- Professional Collaboration
- Continuum of Services
- Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
- Student Centered and Strengths-Based
- Access to the General Curriculum
- Successful Transition to the Community
- Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
- Quality Teaching and Learning
Learning Teams and Integrated Services Delivery

Beginning in the fall of 2010, and as part of a multi-year effort, the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services and the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Special Education in Institutional Settings Program (SEIS) will institute learning teams across our educational programs for youth. Learning teams, as we have defined them, are “groups of professionals who collaborate regularly in a structured inquiry process to enhance student learning and self-efficacy.” The learning team effort represents a next step in the Departments’ ongoing efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning in our educational settings.

Learning teams build on the expertise of DYS/SEIS educators as well as the extensive professional development and curriculum improvement efforts undertaken during the past several years. The strategy is based on the simple idea that teachers throughout DYS/SEIS settings can improve their effectiveness through ongoing, purposeful, focused collaboration with colleagues at their programs who share the same students. Specifically, learning teams are site-based program teams that use structured inquiry processes to monitor student progress. Based on the data collected, team members will work together to plan curriculum, instruction and assessment based on students’ strengths and needs. Additionally, team members may develop intervention plans for struggling students.

In 2009-2010 DYS/SEIS launched a specialized Learning Team effort, referred to as Integrated Service Delivery. During this pilot, two treatment programs formed Integrated Service Delivery teams, a specialized learning team, in which special educators and educators collaborated to support all students in accessing the general curriculum based on student strengths and needs. The initial pilot year introduced some of the components that are critical for integrated service delivery between general and special education and revealed the importance of working in unison towards achieving the potential that this strategy promises for our students.

Some clear similarities that exist between learning teams and the ISD Learning Team include:

- Four professional development release days devoted to learning teams
- Both scheduled and as requested support from consultants, instructional coaches, supervisors, and PD facilitators will be available
- The expectation that teams will meet together for a minimum of 45 mins. per week and use the tools and structures provided during release days.
- Improved teaching and learning outcomes, with a focus on literacy, will result.

We thank you for your support in this effort and invite you to join us in this process. Your insights are valued and as a partner in promoting the social, academic, and emotional growth and development of our students, our success is bound together with your commitment and support.
Integrated Service Delivery: Program Expectations 2010-2011

Anticipated Outcomes:

♦ Teachers develop knowledge and skills about each other’s area(s) of expertise (i.e. accommodations, instructional strategies, curriculum content)
♦ Educational services are provided to all students to allow access to the general curriculum based on learner strengths and needs
♦ Increase in collaboration in planning and share instructional delivery between and special educators

Approach and Support:

The Integrated Service Delivery program will use the DYS “Learning Teams” framework and associated professional development (PD) as a platform from which to establish how ISD teams at each site will function. ISD Learning Teams will incorporate the concepts of:

♦ teacher teaming
♦ coordination of planning
♦ and use of instruction-driven and assessment driven planning and instructional strategies into review of IEP information and requirements.

While all Learning Teams are expected to meet together for a minimum amount of time once a week at their sites, ISD Learning Teams may be meeting for longer periods of time or more frequently. ISD Learning Teams will be supported in this process by consultants/coaches who will visit 10 times during the school year. Their visits will provide opportunities for observation and coaching of team processes, planning strategies and teaching activities related to meeting the needs of special education students within general education settings. This may require additional meeting time that will be arranged for at each site with the support of the DYS and SEIS administration, Regional Education Coordinators (RECs)/Education Coordinators and Program Directors.

Each ISD Learning Team will collaboratively focus on students with IEPs and their needs for specialized instruction, while providing access to the general curriculum in general education settings. ISD Learning Team members who are general educators will gain a better understanding of IEP’s and specialized instruction. ISD Learning Team members who are special educators will gain a better understanding of specific curriculum content and standards. All ISD Learning Team members, through their shared expertise, will ultimately support all students’ learning needs through their collaborative work.
Roles and Responsibilities

All program staff will work to ensure:

- The conditions for effective learning exist for students to grow and thrive
- ISD Learning Teams meet a minimum of 45 minutes per week and are conducted without interruption
- A process exists whereby challenges that arise in meeting the expectations for and goals of ISD learning teams can be addressed in a timely manner
- Create opportunities for support personnel, e.g. instructional coaches, facilitators, and supervisory staff to visit programs to meet with educators

General Education and Special Education Teachers:

- Actively participate in team meetings by sharing expertise with the goal of improving teaching and learning
- Share facilitation, note-keeping, and time-keeping roles
- Actively participate in professional development and coaching discussions, and deepen implementation of strategies associated with the instructional improvement focus.

Teaching Coordinators:

- Work to ensure that teams use the meeting structures smoothly and productively to support student learning
- Manage the rotation of facilitator, note-keeping, and time-keeping roles
- Schedule visits from coaches and facilitators and notify program directors/staff of these visits
- Ensure that team learning logs are completed and posted to the team collaboration space (Moodle) in a timely fashion, and deepen team facilitation expertise through participation in teaching coordinator meetings and trainings.

Instructional Coaches and Facilitators:

- support team functioning, use of meeting structures, and implementation of instructional improvement strategies
- review and respond to team learning logs, solve problems, and participate in learning team meetings when possible.
• Be respectful and considerate of the school day and make every effort to be minimally intrusive for youth and classroom teachers
• Abide by the confidentiality laws, regulations, and procedures
• Conduct classroom observations as a part of our support efforts
• Visit programs as is scheduled and arrive on time
• Make follow-up phone calls to education and program staff to obtain additional information if necessary
• Coordinate our visits with adequate notice with the Teaching Coordinators and honor their time commitments

**Education Administrators:**

• Review team learning logs and meet with teaching coordinators and facilitators to monitor team progress
• Provide support in resolving team challenges
• Document and share successful solutions with DYS/SEIS Leadership
• Both check-in and meet with learning teams with some frequency to support their development.

**Program Directors:**

• Provide leadership to program staff in creating the conditions for learning in balance with a safe and secure environment
• Maintain open lines of communication with educators, including checking in with Teaching Coordinator re: progress of learning teams
• Support the logistical expectations for learning teams
Problem Solving Resources

Ongoing communication between the ISD Learning Teams and the REC/Education Coordinator and SEIS Coordinator will serve to anticipate and resolve conflicts or problems. If issues arise, general educators will contact the REC/Education Coordinator, and special educators, the SEIS Coordinator, who will in turn communicate with the ISD consultants.

Ongoing communication between Teaching Coordinators and Program Directors serves to ensure that logistical and operational issues that might arise are proactively addressed. In the event that any such issues cannot be resolved at the program level, Program Directors are invited to speak with the REC/Education Coordinator and/or SEIS Coordinator who will seek resolution from their appropriate supervisor.

If teams are unable to determine common meeting time, then the Teaching Coordinator will notify the REC/Education Coordinator who will work collaboratively with the SEIS Coordinator and program staff to find a solution.

If problems arise in setting up the blocks of time for the consultant visits, then the Teaching Coordinator will notify the REC/Education Coordinator who will work collaboratively with the SEIS Coordinator, program staff and consultants to find a solution.
Frequently Asked Questions

Shifting to a system of shared instructional delivery involves many changes in practice. With this in mind, it is anticipated that challenges will arise, and you are encouraged to work collaboratively with all involved in resolving them. Following are questions and answers that may provide you with useful information.

What are the roles of Learning Team members?

The Learning Team consists of the general education teachers, special education teacher and the teaching coordinator at the program. All Learning Team members share their observations of students’ performance strengths and needs within the classroom. The general education teachers provide expertise on specific curriculum content, sequence of topics, and classroom lessons and activities. The special education teacher provides expertise in IEP information, accommodations, and strategies to assist specific students with identified disabilities. The general education and special education teacher share planning of classroom lessons and activities. The teaching coordinator, in addition to general education teacher responsibilities, coordinates Learning Team meetings, follows up on meeting outcomes and communicates with the REC/Education Coordinator and/or SEIS Program Coordinator for support as needed. ISD Consultants may also participate in the Learning Team meetings and are a resource to support the needs of the team.

How do we schedule common meeting time?

As a group, all teachers will review the school schedule and identify common time to meet to discuss students as part of the Learning Team framework. It is expected that additional common planning time will be identified for the general education teacher and the special education teacher to discuss curriculum content, lesson planning, strategies, and accommodations to instruct and support students in the classroom. Several time blocks may be specified for this purpose.

How do we structure our meetings?

The Learning Team framework will be presented through professional development sessions during four professional development release days. Each Learning Team will use a structured inquiry process to guide each meeting. The work of the Learning Teams will be documented in their Learning Team Logs.

Who is available to support the Learning Team?

Incorporation of the Learning Team framework in our educational program is supported by the leadership of both DYS & SEIS. Direct, on-site support is provided by the REC/Education Coordinator, SEIS Program Coordinator, coaches, and consultants. All individual and programmatic concerns or questions are directed to the Teaching Coordinator, who will collaborate to resolve issues and contact the REC/Education Coordinator and/or SEIS Program Coordinator to communicate solutions or share issues for joint problem resolution.
**What does this look like in the classroom?**

In the general education classroom integrated service delivery can involve a number of flexible formats that are dependent on the needs of students and teacher expertise.

♦ General educators and special educators can have set or interchangeable roles depending on lesson content and activities involved.
  o For example, the general educator may serve as the consultant for curriculum content, while the special educator may act as the consultant for accommodations or adaptations.
  o However, those roles may change for instructional purposes (see attached diagram)
    ▪ based on the curriculum or instructional expertise of teachers
    ▪ the needs of individual students or groups of students

♦ Teacher roles may be agreed upon at the outset of a lesson, but change towards the close of the lesson, based on informal assessment of students’ needs.

Decisions about roles and formats should always be made in the best interest of providing access to the general curriculum for all students.

**How do I respond to students questioning shared teaching responsibilities?**

All teachers and students are working together. All teachers have a shared responsibility for all students’ success and all students are responsible for meeting similar curriculum requirements.

**How do we resolve program-based conflicts/problems?**

Ongoing communication between the ISD Learning Teams and the REC/Education Coordinator and SEIS Coordinator will serve to anticipate and resolve conflicts or problems. If issues arise, general educators will contact the REC/Education Coordinator; and special educators, the SEIS Coordinator, who will in turn communicate with the ISD consultants.

Ongoing communication between Teaching Coordinators and Program Directors serves to ensure that logistical and operational issues that might arise are proactively addressed. In the event that any such issues cannot be resolved at the program level, Program Directors are invited to speak with the REC/Education Coordinator and/or SEIS Coordinator who will seek resolution from their appropriate supervisor.

If teams are unable to determine common meeting time, then the Teaching Coordinator will notify the REC/Education Coordinator who will work collaboratively with the SEIS Coordinator and program staff to find a solution.

If problems arise in setting up the blocks of time for the consultant visits, then the Teaching Coordinator will notify the REC/Education Coordinator who will work collaboratively with the SEIS Coordinator, program staff and consultants to find a solution.
After review of an IEP, how is a decision reached if the IEP indicates pull out and the Learning Team determines inclusion is appropriate?

The SEIS Teacher contacts the SEIS ETL with the outcome of the Learning Team’s review of the IEP. The SEIS ETL will follow up with the student’s school district as appropriate.

What does a Learning Team do if highly specialized instruction cannot be provided in the general education classroom? (e.g., 2nd grade reading level & Wilson Reading Program identified for instruction)

When necessary, educational services/support can be provided outside of the general education classroom. Consultants and instructional coaches are available resources to support any identified concerns. Services that cannot be provided in the classroom are identified to the SEIS ETL for notification and discussion with the student’s school district.

What is the role of the SEIS ETL?

The SEIS ETL collaborates with the SEIS Teacher, Educational Program staff, DYS Education Liaison and the students’ school districts to ensure compliance with special education procedures and services. The SEIS ETL coordinates with the DYS Education Liaison and the school districts to obtain special education records, schedule Team meetings, and facilitate communication regarding students’ participation and progress in the educational setting. The SEIS ETL also communicates with the SEIS Teacher regarding students’ IEP discussions at the program site, the provision of services identified on the IEP, any identified service not provided, students’ class schedules, draft IEP planning notes and progress reports, and any service implementation issues.
Flexible Instructional Format
Overview and Goals:

The four-day professional development experience along with on-site support, targets the advancement of the thinking and practices that support Integrated Service Delivery. Professional Learning Teams in each site are the vehicles for teachers to come together to develop and reframe working relationships. The focus of workshops is to adopt structured inquiry to engage SEIS/DYS teachers in collaborative problem solving around building cohesive, comprehensive pictures of individual students; planning assessment; monitoring student progress; differentiating instruction; and designing curriculum and instruction (paying close attention to literacy across the curriculum). The intent is to enhance identified students’ experiences in and out of general education through a series of tools that will be introduced and used as resources to support learning team conversations, problem solving, and collaborative process.

DYS and SEIS teachers will participate in building site-based integrated service delivery through collaborative learning teams dedicated to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEC Standards</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 9, 10</td>
<td>• Re-evaluate how services are delivered to students with and without IEPs who are experiencing academic and social/ behavioral challenges; examining levels of in-class interventions, co-teaching options, and the values of supplemental pull-out programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>• Identify ways classroom and special education teachers work together collaboratively to problem solve, assess and pool information, plan cooperatively, and monitor student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>• Refine the ways professionals collectively think about students, using strength-/asset-based lens to describe student performance and behavior as a reader, writer, mathematician, participant/ member in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>• Bridge assessment of student strengths, needs, and challenges to instructional planning using the Interaction Formula as a lens for tailoring learning experiences to individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 7, 8</td>
<td>• Enhance the design and analysis of authentic assessments as formative tools during instruction and as vehicles for determining student needs and monitoring their progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>• Use assessment data to inform the focus of instruction, embedding strategies and interventions into programs, and developing modifications and alternative types of learning experiences to include students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10</td>
<td>• Use the book, Collaborative Individualized Education Process: RSVP to IDEA (Gleckel &amp; Koretz, 2008) to serve as the resource for reframing and enhancing professional perspectives and building capacity to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
support ISDM.
- Use the principles of differentiated instruction, positive youth development, and culturally-responsive practice to identify instructional focuses, teaching strategies, and leveled interventions to support individual and group needs

Readings:


Articles will be posted to Moodle.

**Four Workshop Sessions for INTEGRATED SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL (ISDM) PROJECT**

**SESSION ONE (9/1/10): LIFT OFF... The Basics - Revisiting for Cohort I, Beginnings for Cohort II**

The first session is devoted to shifting how services are delivered to all students, reconfiguring how colleagues work together, sharing responsibilities, team building, and adopting tools to design access for all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction to Integrated Service Delivery Project:</strong> Year-long Work with Cohort I and Cohort II</td>
<td>RSVP – Chapter I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed outcomes and themes for our work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On-site applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Learning Teams / Structured Inquiry Process:</strong> Form &amp; Functions</td>
<td>RSVP – Chapter I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Working Together</strong> (Roles, tasks, responsibilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Tiered Problem Solving:</strong> define concerns, prioritize focus, brainstorm strategies, construct plans and next steps (form)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Focus on:</strong> understanding student, gathering assessment data, and/or planning instruction (function)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Logistics (learning team time, logs, Moodle, ongoing feedback)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools for Understanding Students/ Student Talk:</strong></td>
<td>RSVP – Chapters 1, 2, 3, 5 (pay attention to Toolboxes in each chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Strength/asset-based</strong> student descriptions: profiling students as readers, writers, and participants in the classroom across the curriculum and learning settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Interaction Formula:</strong> a framework for examining student needs and instructional demands concurrently (what to teach, how to teach, how to approach, under what conditions, why teach)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second session is designed to keep conversations progressing in order to develop an understanding about students across instructional areas and experiences; what they bring to the learning situation and the impact of setting and teaching on their growth.

**Assignments:**
- Complete readings.
- As a site-based team, agree on 1-2 students you have discussed and reported on in your learning team meetings and logs. Bring a copy of the team’s set of learning logs (remove identifying information – setting, teacher, and student names).
- Each teacher is to bring materials s/he asked the student to read or respond to and a sample of work/writing that student did in class.

### Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning teams and logs check-in/Student Talk</td>
<td>Learning Log Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Learning Teams/ Structured Inquiry Process Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Examining the values of IEP documents; evaluating the extent to which they are informative and relevant to work with students</td>
<td>RSVP Chapter 5 (pay attention to Toolbox – Criteria for Effective IEPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engaging in an Assessment Planning Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Solving Team Meeting – Focus on Assessment Planning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing student descriptions by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thinking to expand detail about students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the variables over which teachers have control (interaction formula)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Asking questions of colleagues to grow the pictures and pursue further assessment; building on what know about student and what want to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Choosing the assessment tools to learn more about student needs; figuring out how to get the information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools for Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Know-Want-How/ Assessment Planning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using existing description of the student to make deliberate choices about tools to guide collecting assessment data</td>
<td>RSVP Chapter 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formative assessments, sources for authentic data: work samples, observations (functional behavior assessment), interviews to determine what impacts student performance,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
progress, & participation to inform decision making and instructional planning
• Strategies for systematically charting and analyzing data (error analysis)


The third session examines tools for cooperative instructional planning, collaborative individualized planning, and options of ways to deliver services in and out of the general education/ DYS setting.

Assignment:
• Complete readings.
• Bring a unit of study or set of lessons that you use to reconstruct as a cooperative planning and co-teaching venture. Think about using your areas of expertise, DYS standards, workshop session tools, and some favorite resources and activities to address topic areas (ex. Black History Month, Rap and Rock Music, The Body & Health, Building US Infrastructure/ American Recovery Act). Also, come prepared with students in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning teams and logs check-ins: Using assessment data to inform instruction</td>
<td>RSVP chapters 6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning Teams/ Structured Inquiry Process Applications</td>
<td>RSVP chapters 6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using data to summarize findings, prioritize concerns, and develop plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Problem solving to brainstorm and select effective instructional focuses, approaches, strategies, and incentives to promote student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaging in a Co-planning Meeting to determine how instruction is delivered and behavior addressed in the context of general or specialized classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for Integrated Service Delivery</td>
<td>RSVP chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Places and spaces in and out of general education/ DYS classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarification of roles, responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Instructional Planning</td>
<td>Chapters 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steps for bridging the description of the student to planning instruction, interventions, and progress monitoring approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria for what differentiated instruction (application of interaction formula) and behavior intervention plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-Teaching Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION FOUR (3/17): FLIGHT PLAN ADJUSTMENTS… Reflections & Moving Forward – Building & Maintaining Cooperative Structures

In session four, each site will evaluate their own status and strategies for integrating service delivery, setting goals for additional site visits and future work. Some additional work will be done on instructional approaches to support student learning and monitor progress. Each team will commit to developing and implementing a system of mutually agreed upon collaborations, procedures, tasks, roles, responsibilities, and strategies.

Assignment:
- Complete readings.
- Bring samples of progress monitoring tools and modifications of assignments that are a result of collaborations and co-teaching efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log check-in</td>
<td>RSVP chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning Teams – Where are we? Evaluate the status of your Integrated Service Delivery Approach (collaborative learning teams, structured inquiry process, working together):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the shifts in your service delivery and learning team meetings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the stumbling blocks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What supports or additional perspectives will add to your comfort?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Supporting Students as Readers, Writers, Participants</td>
<td>RSVP chapters 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Apply the IF to promote literacy across the curriculum, use modifications/adaptations to meet individual needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thinking about differentiated instruction in the context of the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Action planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSIGNMENTS for the 2010-2011 Professional Development Year

1. **Complete readings**, which are assigned to give you background information in preparation for work during each session. You will be asked to demonstrate application of information through the language of discussions and application of checklists, etc. on PD days and through learning team logs.

2. **Learning Log Assignments:**
- Learning team meeting each week: Plan ahead to discuss one shared student who is struggling. Agree to discuss a specific focus area: reader/writer/member of the classroom. Watch/look/listen/gather: Bring in evidence/information about the student.
  - As a group, using the KWHL Tool, (K): describe who this student is as a reader, writer, participant; writing down what you know to depict who he is as a learner in your setting.
  - (H) Identify questions you have about factors impacting learning.
  - and/or
o (L): Generate ideas to facilitate working with the student.
  o Download the logs on Moodle. Keep logs in a notebook with supportive evidence to review with Molly on-site.
- Bring your site’s notebook of learning logs, etc. to each session.

REFLECTION:

For the last session: Each ISD site is to create a product that represents shifts in how you have grown as a learning team; the ways in which you now work together. The product may incorporate some or all of the following artifacts: development of learning team logs from initial write ups to the end of the year; completed KWHL Charts, assessment tools/co-analyzed; student plans of actions; co-teaching lesson plans/units, videos, and/or testimonials from students; student products such as writing, posters, computer-generated items, 3 dimensional creations, etc.), progress monitoring tools, etc. Each site will display its product to:

- make sure that your team demonstrates:
  o shared voices of contributing to understanding student needs and to inform instructional planning
  o ways teaching reflects common understanding of students, offering examples of modifications
  o evidence of student growth and progress

Each team will also submit a collective narrative/ annotated web/ annotated illustration that discusses advances and barriers to integrated service delivery; identifying how:

- collaborative problem solving learning team meetings functioned
- collaborative problem solving learning team meetings informed understanding and work with students and examined assessment and progress monitoring evidence in depth
- co-planning & co-teaching experiences provided supports/challenges
- instruction/interactions/services for students evolved and changed
- lenses used to assess students and design instruction added or detracted from work?

MOODLE:

Moodle is the destination for learning logs, but it is also an opportunity to participate in discussions across sites: sharing achievements, dilemmas, questions, stumbling blocks, and heartwarming stories. It is important for conversations to continue in between sessions to keep ideas flowing. If we stay with four threads, hopefully conversation will grow. Post your input under one of four headings:

- Integrated service delivery (ISD) - intentions, beliefs, questions
- Student Talk:
- Collaborative Problem Solving:
- Co-planning and co-teaching:
- Other:
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Introduction

In 2008, DYS and SEIS administrators developed a proposal for phasing in a system of shared instructional delivery for special and general education students in DYS treatment programs. The Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) planning team developed a training and implementation plan aligned with the following vision:

All students in DYS educational programs will be provided the support to maximize their potential to successfully contribute to society. Through collaboration of all personnel, a continuum of services will be implemented responding to individual needs, and allowing for access to the general education curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

The planning team initiated a pilot of the Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) plan in three treatment programs during the 2009-2010 year. The goal of the pilot was to develop a model for training, implementation, and support for site-based integrated service delivery to provide access to the general curriculum for all DYS students. Administrators utilized the lessons learned from this pilot to refine the training and support and to expand ISD to three additional programs, while continuing to providing professional development and on-site support to the initial three sites.

In addition to the ISD expansion, the integrated DYS-SEIS Professional Development Planning Group focused on supporting teacher learning teams in all DYS programs statewide during the 2010-2011 year. The teacher training and protocols were designed to build critical skills and processes for bringing educators together to assess student needs and strengths and collaboratively plan for instructional delivery. The educators in the ISD programs utilized the Learning Team framework and were further trained to use structured, collaborative tools and processes to support an integrated approach among special and general educators to assessment, planning, and teaching.

Throughout this past year, DYS and SEIS administrators thoughtfully identified the similarities between the Learning Team and ISD approaches and began to develop a vision for ISD-informed learning teams that could be implemented in all DYS educational programs. This report provides a summary of the findings from the second year of ISD implementation and identifies lessons learned that can support the further development of ISD-informed learning teams.
Executive Summary

During the 2010-2011 school year, the Department of Youth Services (DYS) and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) collaborated on further implementation of the Integrated Service Delivery (ISD) initiative. An ISD pilot had been conducted the previous year, the findings from which informed an expanded ISD implementation (that included six DYS treatment programs), as well as learning team professional development provided to educators in all DYS programs. During the course of this year 27 general and special educators were provided with extensive professional development through four full-day workshops conducted at statewide release days, on-site coaching, and on-site supports provided by two ISD consultant-facilitators (Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz). At the same time all other educators working in DYS facilities were provided with professional development offerings to develop structured learning teams to support educators in working together to effectively provide all students with access to the general education curriculum. Based on teacher surveys, consultant and coach reports, and a review of Learning Team Planning Group documents, this report presents evaluation findings from the ISD implementation during the 2010-2011 year.

Overall, the findings indicate that most teachers in the ISD learning teams were invested in the process of enhanced collaboration between special and general educators to provide effective instruction to all students. Teachers highly valued the professional development offerings provided by the consultants and ISD-dedicated coach (Molly Edelen), and most educators saw significant gains during the course of the year in achieving the ISD objectives. ISD participants developed skills conducting structured learning team meetings, using asset-based language to discuss student needs and strengths, using various tools to assess students and consider appropriate educational strategies, and differentiating instruction to increase learner access to the general curriculum. Most ISD learning teams valued and utilized several of the assessment and planning tools introduced, including the KWHL charts and the problem solving agenda recommended by Gleckel and Koretz.

At most programs, there was a decreased use of pull-out services for students with IEPs, as teachers worked to adapt instruction to include these students in the general classroom whenever appropriate. In addition, many of the general education teachers felt they had learned effective modifications and differentiation strategies from their colleagues that enabled them to better serve students with IEPs and those without IEPs. ISD teams also worked on inter-disciplinary collaboration developing plans to emphasize skill development, common content, or study skills across content areas.

While some programs or individual teacher partnerships had success with other types of ISD service delivery, such as shared instruction or co-teaching, few teachers clearly described significant changes in the roles of special and general educators in an inclusive classroom. All teams need ongoing support with instructional delivery models, including assessing potential options and effective implementation. ISD teachers and teams found it difficult to bridge the gap between understanding student needs, planning for content objectives, and co-planning effective instructional strategies that support individual learners and help them achieve the curricular objectives.

Teachers, coaches, and the consultants identified a number of challenges or barriers that ISD teams faced in achieving the ISD objectives. First, much of the success of ISD
teams revolved around strong partnerships between individual teachers. When staffing shifts occurred this frequently interrupted progress the teams had made and left participants frustrated. Further, in programs where there was interpersonal conflict, teachers and leaders needed further skill development in managing conflict in order to move forward as a team.

In addition, there was some differences between the general Learning Team model and the specific ISD tools and approaches. Some ISD programs found it difficult to fit some of the ISD tools into the learning team structured inquiry process, standard agenda, and reporting requirements. Further, ISD participants noted that supervisors who had not participated in the ISD training expected to see activities and documentation that matched the general learning team processes rather than some of the ISD-specific tools.

It also appears that given teacher experience and skill level at the beginning of the year, the skills required to work effectively as a team to conduct thorough student assessments, co-plan instructional delivery, and effectively implement a range of models will take more than one year to develop—even with extensive on-site supports. This effort must be seen as a long-term endeavor, requiring consistent, on-going supports and clear expectations, with differentiated professional development for teams and teachers at different levels of skill development.

The experience of the consultants, coaches, and ISD participants over the past year provides some clear direction for enhancing implementation of integrated service delivery learning team models in the future. Four key recommendations come out of these findings:

- **Educator skill development**: Teachers and teams require ongoing, intensive, differentiated instruction to help them develop individually and as a team the skills necessary to effectively implement ISD. Training should support skill development in managing difficult conversations, asset-based approaches, co-planning that integrates content objectives and individual learner needs, and implementing a range of instructional models.

- **Standard tools and protocols that support site-based team efforts**: All learning teams would benefit from the sharing of effective tools and protocols that promote asset-based assessment, co-planning, and collaborative teaching approaches. DYS and SEIS administrators will want to identify which tools and activities most effectively support ISD and disseminate a standardized toolkit to all teams. At the same time, teams will need some flexibility in determining which tools and processes are most appropriate for their settings and students.

- **Program Management**: Decision-making regarding staffing and schedule changes need to take into account learning team activities, including teacher relationships and meeting and planning schedules. Systems need to be adopted to support teams that experience staff changes and that support teachers that are newly assigned to a functional ISD learning team.
• **Alignment of supervision and supports**: Supervisors and coaches need to develop a common understanding of the skills required, the tools and processes, and the expectations for ISD learning teams. They need to be able to assess progress and collaborate to further develop individual teacher skills and help teams make progress in co-planning and collaborative instructional delivery. Teachers would benefit from seeing coaches, supervisors, and facilitators model collaboration and conflict resolution, asset-based approaches, and differentiated instruction as they support ISD teams.
Methods

This summary of findings is derived from the following sources:

- Web-based teacher surveys conducted at each of the ISD professional development sessions and a post-survey conducted in June
- ISD status update web survey conducted with all ISD teachers, supervisors, and coaches in February
- Detailed coach updates and final progress reports
- Consultant final report
- Meeting with coach and consultants
- Review of professional development planning documents, meeting minutes, and summaries of Learning Team logs
- Participation in ISD and professional development workgroup meetings.

The web based surveys were designed to assess teacher perceptions of progress in achieving the ISD objectives for this year. The tracking surveys also included a common set of progress monitoring items that were used for all learning teams to track achievement of the goals of the broader Learning Team initiative.

The tracking surveys were administered during each of the professional development sessions at Norwood. Of the 27 teachers assigned to the ISD professional development sessions, 89% completed the pre-survey at the September professional development session, and between 78% and 88% completed the tracking surveys conducted in October, November, and March. A final post-survey was administered via an email invitation with a web survey link. The response rate was 67% for ISD teachers.

Respondents on the pre-, post-, and tracking surveys were asked to create their own unique identifier that would be used to track skill development at the individual level in addition to the group level. Teachers were asked to provide three pieces of information (middle initial, number of older siblings, and the 2 digit day of their birth), which were concatenated to create the respondent identifier. Several teachers chose not to provide this data on one or more of the surveys. Therefore, the analysis of change at the individual level between the pre- and the post-surveys reflects a subgroup of the teachers. The findings presented in this report regarding change between the pre- and post-surveys are based on a substantiation process that considered individual and group-level change.

The designated ISD coach compiled progress reports and a final report that described the status of ISD implementation in each of the six sites. The report assessed teacher attitudes, team processes, changes in instructional delivery, and factors that supported or hindered ISD implementation. In addition, the ISD consultants provided a final report with their assessment of progress made, challenges, and recommendations for future ISD development. Finally, progress monitoring was conducted by the ISD planning group at regular team meetings throughout the year. The documentation from these sources informs the findings in this report.
Detailed Findings

For the 2010-2011 year, administrators established three critical expected outcomes for the ISD initiative:

- Teachers develop knowledge and skills about each other’s area(s) of expertise (i.e. accommodations, instructional strategies, curriculum content)
- Educational services are provided to all students to allow access to the general curriculum based on learner strengths and needs
- Increase in collaboration in planning and shared instructional delivery between general and special educators.

To attain these goals, the ISD planning team contracted with consultants Evie Gleckel and Ellen Koretz who had worked with the first year ISD pilot sites. The consultants developed a syllabus for developing ISD skills in four professional development sessions at Norwood. In addition, the consultants conducted five or six site visits to each ISD program. The designated ISD coach (Molly Edelen) participated in all professional development sessions and provided on-site coaching to all ISD teams.

Value of Professional Development Offerings

Overall, ISD participants were highly satisfied with the professional development supports provided. These teachers tended to rate the value of the statewide professional development sessions very positively. For example, in March, about four-fifths (82%) of the ISD participants reported that professional development sessions helped them be an effective participant on their learning team. In addition, about 90% of ISD teachers reported that site visits by the facilitators and coaches were highly valuable for their learning team work. Figure A shows the perceived value of each of the professional development sessions for educators in the ISD group.

Figure A
Value of ISD PD Days in Preparing Educators for Upcoming LT Work
Educator Perceptions of ISD Learning Teams

Most teachers involved in the ISD initiative also valued the work they did on site with their learning teams. While several felt that even before ISD they had strong working relationships with their colleagues, many noted that the learning team structures and ISD tools and skill development helped them work together in a more focused and effective manner. About nine-tenths (88%) of ISD participants agreed that learning teams meetings are a valuable use of time. In addition, 93% of ISD teachers reported that learning team meetings supported their ability to provide effective instruction. Over four-fifths (85%) of ISD teachers reported that their work on a learning team enhanced their knowledge of resources and strategies to teach standards-based content. Specific changes to instruction are discussed later in the findings.

Teacher comments in their professional development product and in surveys clearly indicate the value they saw in the ISD learning team process. For example, one educator wrote:

My impressions of the Learning Team meetings changed considerably from the beginning of the year to March. Initially, I thought it might be just another meeting to take up space when I could be doing more productive preparation for classes. However, almost instantly, I enjoyed the Problem Solving Agenda tool. As a team we would normally talk about each of the students in our school and ways to move them forward; but these usually were “catch as catch can” or “water cooler” conversations. Now after practicing the Problem Solving Agenda over the past seven months, we’ve learned to talk about the students in more meaningful ways as well as push ourselves to develop products that address our students’ issues more effectively.

Figure B below presents ISD teacher perceptions of the learning team experience. This indicates generally positive attitudes, and identifies some common concerns. Most ISD teachers reported that learning teams were collaborative (84%) and productive (74%), and over one-half felt that they were organized (58%) and empowering (53%). A smaller group (37%) felt that learning teams were a “comfortable” experience. Several teachers noted that the ISD effort pushed them beyond their “comfort zone,” and that while this was challenging for them, they felt it was beneficial in the long run. Others referred to tensions or disagreements among colleagues making it difficult to maintain a productive conversation. Coaches and consultants confirmed that some of the programs had trouble establishing effective learning team meetings in large part because of interpersonal challenges.

About one-third (32%) of ISD teachers felt that their learning team experience was frustrating, and one-sixth (16%) felt the process was overwhelming. Some of these teachers mentioned the challenges in finding time for learning team meetings, as well as separate co-planning time. Others complained that when teachers were moved to other programs, it had a significant negative impact on their team’s effectiveness and progress. Challenges faced by ISD learning teams are discussed in more detail later in the findings.

While ISD learning teams faced significant challenges, most achieved the overall objectives for general learning teams, as well as some of the ISD–specific skills. Data
from the pre- and post surveys indicates positive changes in knowledge and perceived skills between September and June. Specifically, ISD teacher reports of:

- **understanding of learning team roles and processes** increased from 46% in September to 68% in March;
- programs holding **consistent weekly meetings** increased from 79% in September to 100% of ISD learning teams in March;
- use of a **structured inquiry process** increased from 65% in September to 94% in March;
- ISD learning team use of **asset based language** remained high throughout the year (83% in September and 92% in June); and
- **use of student work and data to assess student needs** also remained fairly high from September (75%) to June (83%).

Some of the high ratings at the beginning of the year relate to the fact that three of the ISD programs had also been involved in the first year pilot and therefore had already developed some of these skills and structures. It should also be noted that these findings reflect teacher self-reporting, which is likely to show some bias toward positive ratings. However, tracking responses over time (through the pre-, post-, and tracking surveys) controls for some of this response bias, and most of these positive findings were confirmed by learning team logs and coaching reports. The end of the year summary report by Gleckel and Koretz confirms that most teams were using the standard learning team tools and processes, although some were adapting them or utilizing ISD-specific tools to meet the needs of the group and the current questions or topic.

In addition to teachers developing skills in working collaboratively with colleagues to discuss students, working with the facilitators and as part of an ISD team had a positive effective on educator attitudes regarding students’ capacity to learn and grow. **ISD participants indicated a positive change over the course of the year in their belief that “all students are able to make progress in academic content areas.”** While teachers generally reported high levels of agreement with this statement in September (71% agreed), this increased to 100% of ISD teachers in June.
OUTCOMES

The primary objective of the ISD learning team initiative was to promote effective site-based teams that engage in:

- collaborative assessment of student needs, strengths, and progress;
- educator co-planning to determine the most effective approaches to meeting student needs; and
- effective implementation of appropriate models of instructional delivery.

Findings from the teacher surveys and the coach’s and consultants’ reports all help to paint a picture of progress made in each of these areas.

Student Assessment and Progress Monitoring:

The learning team protocols, as well as the ISD-specific tools and processes, all supported learning teams in focusing on individual learners and conducting assessments of learner needs and strengths. As with all learning teams, the ISD groups were supported in using asset-based language to understand student strengths and to focus on specific behaviors rather than general concepts or gaps. As one educator described, “After a few weeks I quickly noticed how beneficial the meetings were because they
allowed me to get a better grasp on the learning behaviors in different settings with
certain students.”

Supervisors and coaches noted that over the course of the year, ISD teams were
increasingly using asset-based language in their discussions about students. All
educators were aware of the significance of the shift to and asset-based approach,
although at least two programs continued to struggle with this. As one teacher
explained, “Focusing on ‘asset based’ language encouraged us to focus on the specifics
of student performance rather than making broad generalizations. For instance, prior to
our exposure to ISD, I would often hear and/or say that a student is easily distracted. By
using asset based language, we are better able to ascertain when and how that student
is able to pay attention. This helped us to pinpoint effective instructional strategies.”
Another teacher noted the value of the asset approach on teacher efficacy and student
engagement: “Using asset based language as well as a strength-based teaching
approach has made a world of difference in reaching some of these students.”

The coaches and consultants noted that one or two of the ISD teams struggled with
keeping the focus on individual students and using an asset-based approach. Team
discussions often veered into site-based challenges or issues affecting the student
population in general. On the other end of the spectrum, one ISD program excelled in
utilizing several different approaches, tools, and sources of information to create a
common, in-depth understanding of individual students. Some teams effectively used a
structured problem-solving process to agree on challenges, narrow their focus,
brainstorm solutions, and generate plans. Others jumped directly to solutions without a
shared understanding of the learner challenges they were working to address.

Teachers highlighted the value of the KWHL (what we know about a student, what we
want to know, how we will find out, and what we learn about the student) chart, the
expectations for weekly learning team meetings, and occasionally the problem solving
agenda and the toolboxes as critical tools to keep the team focused on student needs.
Many also reported that input from the consultants and/or coach provided essential
supports assisting learning teams to work effectively together to improve their
understanding of students.

Educators frequently identified the KWHL tool as a critical piece of their work, assisting
them in discussing the various types of information they have access to and identifying
what further information they need. One teacher emphasized, “Working with the KWHL
charts gave me the deepest understanding of the students ever in my career.” Other
educators mentioned the problem solving agenda and the co-teaching agreement as
useful tools for assessment and planning. Some educators appreciated the value of
having structured team meetings and clear expectation, although no one specifically
mentioned the value of the structured inquiry process in helping teams work effectively
together.

The most common sources of information they used to inform their understanding of
students included: IEPs, teacher observations of classroom behavior, and student work.
According to teacher reports, learning teams in the ISD group consistently used student
work and data to assess student strengths and needs (75% “frequently” or “always” in
September), although there was increase over the course of the year (83% in June). By
June, however, several teachers in the ISD group reported increasing their use of
various assessment techniques to understand student needs and strengths and
to plan instruction. In addition, ISD teachers reported a modest increase in the extent to which they worked as a learning team to identify assessment needs, create and administer assessments, and interpret results (75% reported that this occurred “frequently” or “always” in September compared to 92% in June). Finally, ISD teacher reports also showed an increase in the extent to which teams used student work and assessments to monitor student progress in instructional areas (67% in September compared to 100% in June).

SEIS educators took primary responsibility for understanding and communicating to the team the information in an IEP, and for suggesting appropriate accommodations and modifications. The pre-post survey indicates no significant gains among teachers in the extent to which educators on ISD teams increased their understanding of how to read and use IEPs (in September, 61% of general education teachers rated themselves proficient or advanced, compared to 70% of the general educators responding to the post survey). Some general educators clearly developed a stronger understanding of students and the value of IEPs from the professional development and ensuing focus on IEPs in their team meetings. One teacher explains, “One of the PD-days involved strategically viewing student IEP’s. This was very enlightening as they are often just glanced at and the accommodations noted. During this class we had sample IEP’s and had to describe what we were viewing in the minutest of details. This helped to better understand the student and also see if the IEP was even drafted accurately by what we already knew about the student. In our team meetings, the IEP became more of an intricate tool. We began having copies in front of us at every mtg. and used them to better analyze the student being discussed.”

Some administrators expressed concern about the limited scope of ISD teams because of their intensive focus on individual students, thinking they could not adequately address the needs of all learners in the program. Each team created their own plan for the frequency with which they would discuss individual students, and how often they would revisit students to monitor progress. One educator described his/her teams approach as follows: “Our team adopted a “leap frog” approach for addressing individual students. We concentrated on one student in one meeting, switched to a different student for the next meeting, then returned to the original student in the third meeting. We repeated this until we full covered a student’s needs and moved onto new students. Using this approach, we had two weeks to conduct data gathering and interventions between meetings. It was hard at times to keep track of who we were working with and when but the quality of the data gathered and shared was well worth the effort.” As of March (at which point learning teams could have had as many as 25 weekly meetings), about one-quarter (29%) of ISD team participants reported that their team had had in-depth discussions about less than five students, and another one-quarter (24%) said they had discussed between five and eight students in-depth in their learning team meetings. The other one-half (48%) said they had covered nine or more students. While students with IEPs were generally the focus of ISD meetings, educators reported that their collaborative work included discussions of other students and supported their ability to effectively differentiate instruction for those with and without IEPs.

**Instructional Planning**

While ISD learning teams made great strides in collaborative, student-centered assessment, coaches and consultants noted that only a couple of teams were able to effectively move from understanding to effective planning and instructional delivery. This
is clearly an area that all learning teams will need further support on in the future. One of the challenges teams faced was aligning their work on addressing individual learner needs with planning around content-based KUDs. While learning team discussions primarily focused on strategies to support individual learners, educators and teams needed further skill development to then use this information to shape lesson planning around specific standards-based content.

In addition, many teams had trouble finding the time for co-planning. In some cases, this happened during weekly team meetings, but in many programs educators had to find time outside of meetings for specific content-based planning between special and general educators.

Although the co-planning that occurred did not fully achieve the ISD expectations around determining the most effective approach for individual learners and how instruction would be implemented, educators in the ISD groups did develop new approaches to collaboration and shared responsibility for learner achievement. The pre- and post-survey data indicates an increase in the extent to which educators used a shared understanding about learner strengths and needs to plan instructional delivery (67% “frequently” or “always” in September, compared to 92% in April). The consultants noted that some teams were beginning to use structured co-planning tools, such as the co-teaching agreement or co-teaching plan.

Much of the “co-planning” at team meetings or between SEIS and general educators involved integration of accommodations or modifications suggested by team members. In several programs, general educators were highly appreciative of these types of suggestions that came from their SEIS or general education colleagues. In some groups, each of the content-based general educators would work with the same types of differentiation to attempt to engage an individual learner. At future meetings they would share their thoughts about how well the new approaches worked. One teacher described his/her experience with sharing approaches, “The problem solving agenda also forced me to justify and think through why I offered a particular assignment or activity. Many times we as a learning team developed action plans for students and it was important to show that the plan was being carried through. As I develop[ed] lessons, I created many of them with the action steps that we as a learning team fleshed out around a particular student or students.”

In some sites, teachers used learning team meetings or other collaborative time to share and get feedback on lesson plans. The pre- and post-survey data indicates that this is an area that changed significantly over the course of the year, with several ISD participants indicating an increase in the extent to which they shared written unit plans with team members and provided input on plans. This increased from about one-third (35%) of teachers in September to two-thirds (67%) of teachers in the June survey reporting that this happens “always” or “frequently.”

Several teams worked on inter-disciplinary collaboration. Teachers in different content areas would agree on a common skill set to develop with an individual student across content areas. Some educators appreciated the input of Title I teachers who supported the team with suggestions for integrating reading and writing strategies into the content areas. Cross-content collaboration also included teachers focusing on common themes that cut across different content areas to integrate the material with which students were working in different classes.
It was less common for individual general and special educators to plan for how they would jointly provide content-based instruction. Several teams clearly struggled with determining whether to work with an inclusion or pull-out model for individual students, and figuring out how to collaborate to offer “differentiated instruction” in inclusion classrooms. It appears there was little re-defining of educator roles in the classroom, with the common assumption being that general educators would assume responsibility for the content instruction, while special educators would support individual learners with modified approaches.

**Instructional Delivery**

The consultant and coach assessments confirm teacher reports about the variety of models of integrated delivery implemented by SEIS and general educators. Gleckel and Koretz emphasized that “co-teaching looks and sounds different across the sites” as educators try new roles and determine the most effective strategies for supporting individual learners and working with groups. Some SEIS and general educator partners were trying new models for sharing roles and responsibilities, although few described any specific structures, such as “parallel teaching” or “station teaching.” The most common changes in instructional delivery involved greater differentiation and use of modifications based on learning team planning, and reduced use of pull-out as SEIS teachers were more likely to support students who remained in the general education classroom.

**Differentiation:** The most common types of adjustments to instructional delivery involved more appropriate differentiation or use of modifications for individual students. In planning sessions, teachers would look at work and their knowledge of student strengths and needs and discuss possible strategies to more effectively engage the student. One or more teachers would try out some of these strategies, and at future meetings, teachers would review their successes and look at new work samples.

Teachers in ISD groups reported a moderate increase over the course of the year in their perception of how collaborative assessment and planning helped them to provide appropriate modifications and accommodations to meet the needs of individual learners (increase from 87% “agree” or “strongly agree” in September to 100% in June). For example, one general educator reported, “I find the advice, input, experience, and knowledge from another teacher is invaluable. Having the SEIS teacher helps me be a better teacher and provide accommodations so all the students are successful. An example is when I had re-phrased, restated, and racked my brain to get a concept across to one student. My co-teacher had a whole bunch of new ideas, one of which accomplished the goal. Two heads are better than one.”

Improved collaboration between SEIS and general education teachers has improved teacher understanding of how to support individual students with a variety of accommodations, tools, and strategies. These advancements in discussions about individual learner needs and effective differentiation strategies affected both students with IEPs and those without. In some cases, students who do not have IEPs were the subject of ISD team meetings and teachers shared new strategies for working with these students. Several teachers indicated that the ISD training and process have led them to taking a more individualized approach to all learners.
Pull-out: In most sites, teachers reported a decrease in the use of pull-out, with special educators more often providing one-on-one assistance or modifications in the general education classroom. Coach reports confirm decreased use of pull-out in at least four of the ISD sites, with one other program making significant effort to increase inclusion of students with IEPs in the general education classroom whenever possible. In these sites, SEIS and general educators felt this decrease in inclusion benefited students by supporting their engagement in the general education content, and helping SEIS teachers develop greater awareness of the general education material and expectations. As one SEIS teacher reported: “I don’t pull out the students with “pull-outs” every time anymore. … When I am able to help students on a 1:1 basis WITHIN the class, everyone seems better satisfied. … Three out of four … students with IEPs have performed better, on the whole, when they’ve stayed put in the large class.”

Knowledge and Use of Other Models: Teacher, coach, and consultant reports confirm that teachers developed a greater understanding of the range of instructional delivery models available to them to support students with IEPs. The pre-post survey findings indicate that teachers in ISD sites reported an increase in understanding over the course of the year in the various co-teaching options or frameworks that a learning team may utilize to provide instruction (increase from 70% “agree” or “strongly agree” in September to 100% in June).

That said, when teachers described “instructional delivery models,” they frequently mentioned strategies or tools, such as differentiation, assessment, and specific modifications. A few teachers mentioned specific ISD “models,” such as inclusion, monitoring, or co-teaching, but few provided descriptions of how these are implemented (aside from one-on-one supports being provided in the regular classroom). One teacher reported that their team had tried several different models, including “shared teaching, alternative teaching, and one teacher at front/one teacher floating at student desks.” Another educator commented on the value of having two teachers available in class to help students work through assignments.

While most teachers at ISD sites have clearly begun thinking and talking about alternative models for instructional delivery, they will need more support in the future on how to determine and implement effective strategies. Educators noted how challenging it was to push themselves beyond their “comfort zone,” taking on a new role in the classroom and sharing what they had seen as their responsibilities. The coaches, consultants, and coordinators agreed that ISD teams need more support to enhance their understanding of the different roles teachers might play, to co-plan with these new roles in mind, and to effectively implement these models to ensure that all students are receiving the most appropriate services.

Factors that Support Effective ISD Implementation

ISD participants saw great value in the supports provided to them by the ISD facilitators and coach, both during the professional development sessions and on-site. For example, after the March professional development day, over four-fifths (82%) of ISD teachers reported that professional development sessions helped them to effectively participate on their learning team. In addition, several educators praised the on-site supports provided by the ISD coach and consultants. One teacher commented, “It was refreshing to work alongside people who knew the field and were able to offer practical and real solutions to the problems we face on a daily basis. I appreciated the extra work
Evie [Gleckel], Ellen [Koretz], and Molly [Edelen] offered us. On one occasion Molly [Edelen] went through our IEP's with us and gave suggestions as to the most effective ways to meet each of the students’ needs. Evie [Gleckel] went the extra mile by sending us materials to help certain students. In addition, they gave our learning team excellent feedback during and after our team meetings. Evie [Gleckel], Ellen [Koretz], and Molly [Edelen] were very straight forward and clear about what we could improve upon and, again, were more than willing to not only critique us but offer assistance when we asked for it.”

Teachers noted that Edelen, Koretz, and Gleckel worked to understand the challenges faced at each site, assist teams in better understanding the ISD process, and using structured tools, information, and protocols to understand student needs and plan instruction. Educators appreciated how these consultants modeled differentiation and supported individual team development.

It is also clear that program success with ISD was frequently connected to strong working relationships between individual teachers, often between the SEIS teacher and one or more general educators. Effective partnerships among content teachers and with Title I teachers also enhanced the likelihood of successful teacher teaming to address student needs.

In addition, as discussed above, several teams found specific tools, structures, or processes particularly useful in helping teachers work effectively together. Having the dedicated time (weekly meetings) and clear expectations (focused agendas) helped teams make consistent progress in enhancing collaboration and staying focused on students. One educator described, “I think that we plan together more consistently since beginning the ISD process. Before ISD we would have more sporadic and informal collaboration. The ISD meetings afford the opportunity for all teachers to plan together.” As noted above, several teachers found tools such as the KWHL chart invaluable in helping educators work together to develop a deep understanding of student behaviors, needs, and strengths.

**Challenges to Effective ISD Implementation**

A variety of issues hindered program-based teams in achieving the ISD objectives. These ranged from individual teacher skill development needs to management and learning team structures that impeded teacher or team progress.

Teachers, coaches, and consultants agreed that staff changes at ISD sites posed significant challenges to teams that were adapting new structures, roles, and relationships. Particularly because individual working relationships were an essential factor affecting the success of ISD learning teams, when staff were moved away from a site, this could cripple a team’s progress. Several educators mentioned the loss of key personnel significantly affecting team momentum. As one teacher described, “There hasn’t been a consistent educational team in place on my unit which has caused the ISD model to all but be abandoned at times. This has been caused by illnesses and staff changes which are still occurring even now. The teachers on my unit had about six weeks of stability when we could all experience the co-teaching, co-planning method.”

Staff changes left some teams or educators frustrated and resentful of administrative decision-making. More than one educator mentioned changes that took place with
minimal or no notice and no attention paid to the impact on the team. There were no supports in place to get new teachers up-to-speed on the process, nor had teams developed structures for bringing in new participants. Teachers felt that administrators were not sensitive to the fact that decisions in one arena (staffing) would affect progress in ISD and concluded that ISD was not on the radar as management decisions were made.

**Scheduling,** particularly of the SEIS teachers, posed a related challenge to effective ISD implementation. When SEIS teachers were shared among programs, several participants noted the challenges of both scheduling learning team meetings and having the SEIS teacher available for consults, teaching, and follow-up. SEIS teachers expressed frustration with the time constraints and expectations, and with not being able to adequately support the ISD teams and the students they serve. Some educators noted that reporting requirements for SEIS teachers appeared to detract significantly from their availability for team meetings, co-planning, and providing quality instruction.

In addition, at several programs, teachers noted that learning team meetings were primarily focused on assessment and idea generating, but that detailed instructional co-planning to meet KUDs had to happen at other times. Several programs noted that it was difficult to find adequate time to conduct effective co-planning.

As a corollary to the importance of interpersonal relationships to successful teams, conflict and poor working relationships significantly hampered ISD implementation in some programs. Coaches and consultants noted that some teams could not progress with conducting effective meetings or co-planning until they had developed a stronger skill set in conflict resolution and managing difficult conversations.

The ISD teams were seen as a specialized learning team, and were expected to use many of the learning team processes, as they also worked with ISD-specific tools and agendas. Several teams found some incompatibility in these expectations or felt that the learning team structures did not adequately accommodate the ISD discussions. For example, some teams found it difficult to use the structured inquiry process and the focus questions, while also attempting to use the KWHL to analyze student needs. In addition, several teachers as well as the ISD consultants felt the requirements of the learning team logs impeded productive ISD team meetings and that the logs could not accurately reflect the conversations that were happening in the ISD learning team meetings.

Some educators or teams felt they got conflicting input from administrators and from coach or consultants. This in part resulted from the fact that general learning teams and ISD-specific teams at times focused on different strategies or tools. Administrators and some coaches stressed following the learning team protocols, some of which teachers felt impeded effective implementation of the skills or tools they were working on in the ISD initiative. Teachers also reported receiving mixed messages from administrators about the range of instructional delivery options that could be provided. Some teachers reported pressure to comply with IEP recommendations that indicated pull-out, in spite of team determination regarding the possibility of providing modified general education for the student.

**Supports provided by instructional coaches and supervisors** did not have the same value to teachers as did supports provided by Gleckel and Koretz. Teachers tended to
perceive of supervisors or coordinators as functioning in an evaluative role rather than a supportive one. Many also felt that that supervisors lacked an adequate knowledge of the ISD protocols and expectations to effectively provide constructive feedback to or support ISD teams. Part way through the year, other groups suggested that they did not have adequate on-site time with the ISD consultants to help them navigate challenges and develop skills.

As noted above, educator skill development emerged as critical to full implementation of ISD. Some teachers and teams need significant work in managing disagreement, using an asset-based approach, and adhering to a focused meeting agenda to make ISD team meetings function effectively. Even among highly skilled teachers, many teams were challenged in moving from constructive conversations about students and planning for instructional delivery to effective instruction. Teachers need to build essential skills to plan with student needs and KUDs in mind, integrating the need for differentiation and standards-based content planning. Further, all teachers need to develop a better understanding of how to plan for and implement the range of potential instructional delivery models with confidence that they are complying with IEP requirements and providing effective access to the general curriculum. This will require supports to help teachers move out of their “comfort zone,” as they step into new roles and abdicate control over aspects of planning or instructional delivery.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The progress made by ISD teams this year and the challenges they faced indicate key areas that need to be addressed to enhance the implementation of integrated service delivery in DYS programs. The critical elements to address fall in the areas of: teacher skill development, standardized learning team structures, and program management.

Educator Skill Development:

As noted above, the work of integrated service delivery requires teachers to develop a wide range of skills including assessment, collaboration, planning, and instructional delivery. Applying integrated service delivery across all of DYS will require further building on the skills focused on in the learning team professional development effort to support all educators in achieving advanced skills, including:

- using asset-based language,
- managing conflict and having difficult conversations,
- using structured protocols and student work to meaningfully assess students strengths and needs,
- clearly defining roles in planning and instructional delivery,
- aligning student-centered and content-based planning efforts,
- effective differentiation aligned with student needs, and
- working collaboratively within a range of instructional delivery models.

Working effectively on an ISD team requires proficiency in effective instruction and strong collaborative skills. It requires educators to develop beyond the skill set that may have been serving them well for many years. As one teacher explained, “In previous years, I have relied heavily on myself as my greatest asset. The nature of learning
teams made this strategy impossible, and thus pushed me out of my ‘comfort zone’. While this is (by definition) uncomfortable, it came with some unexpected benefits.”

Learning Team Structures and Supports:

As DYS and SEIS move forward with using the integrated service delivery approach and skill development to learning teams throughout DYS, it will be important to identify the assets to incorporate from the ISD framework and address any incompatibility with learning team expectations. All learning teams should have access to a common set of recommended planning tools (such as the KWHL, problem solving agenda, and a structured inquiry process that promotes student-centered planning). Administrators need to work with teachers and teams to ensure that recording and reporting functions are useful for the site-based efforts and not simply seen as accountability measures. Site-based teams also need assistance and support in creating the time for co-planning outside of the learning team meeting time dedicated to student assessment and high-level planning. Finally, coaches and other on-site supports need to have a common understanding of the ISD model, the planning activities, and the potential service delivery models so that they can adequately support teachers and teams.

Program Management:

Effective collaboration requires a high level of trust, a common understanding of roles and expectations, and significant effort to develop constructive working relationships. Therefore, if DYS and SEIS are prioritizing collaboration, it is important for administrators to consider the impact on site-based teams when staffing or schedule changes are required. It will benefit teams and promote trust if program staff have advance notice of necessary changes. Administrators may want to consider team composition and co-planning and co-teaching schedules, as they assign staff to programs or adjust staff schedules. In addition, as part of the learning team initiative, it is essential to develop structures and materials to support new staff in understanding the ISD expectations, developing the needed skills, and transitioning to a new team. Further, teams will need training and support to effectively manage personnel changes and integrate new staff onto working teams.

One final area for development that teachers, coaches, and the consultants all noted was support for supervisors (Coordinators) to increase their knowledge and understanding of the skills required for effective implementation of ISD. Supervising staff need to develop:

- a clear understanding of what is expected of ISD learning teams, and the common learning team tools and processes;
- a clear role for supporting teams, identifying and addressing obstacles, and monitoring and documenting progress; and
- skills to support individual educators and learning teams in addressing the challenges they face.

The skill development needs and expectations for educators involved in learning teams need to be incorporated into teacher evaluation and support activities.

In addition, DYS and SEIS need to ensure that supervisors develop the critical skills for effective collaboration that teachers are developing. Coordinators should model the use of asset-based language, using data to assess progress, conducting difficult
conversations, differentiating support, and co-planning. Supervisors and all coaches also need to be able to support teachers in further skill development in these areas, as they facilitate team efforts and help teachers move beyond their “comfort zone.”

One of the challenges identified above relates to conflicting expectations that arose among supervisors, instructional coaches, and the ISD facilitators and coach. DYS and SEIS will want to further develop communication and training mechanisms to foster integrated service delivery at this level of educator instruction and program management. There needs to be a structured system of collaboration among administrators, supervisors, and coaches so that they share a common lens for assessing the strengths and needs of ISD teams and a coordinated (“co-planned”) approach to providing supports.

One educator identified the multiple levels of intervention necessary to further develop ISD in DYS settings: “The Integrated Delivery Service project has been extremely important to me. I feel strongly that it can make a difference for clients in DYS facilities, but it needs support from many places. Hard work and commitment on the part of teachers, coaches, direct care staff, clinicians, CES administration and DYS is needed to bring this model to total fruition.” The learning team and ISD initiatives have made great strides in developing teacher skills and establishing protocols to support effective collaboration. These findings clearly identify critical assets that must be enhanced to further improve the quality of instruction for all students in DYS settings.
Role of the SEIS Educator in DYS Programs

Agency Coordination Process

Each SEIS educator assigned to a DYS educational program is an integral member of the teaching team. As outlined in the current Agency-Coordination Process, the SEIS educator and the DYS Teaching Coordinator review the IEPs of any student who has been identified as eligible to receive special education services. Based on the information contained in the IEP and a review of any additional available educational records, a preliminary plan to provide educational services is developed jointly by the SEIS educator and the DYS TC. The schedule for providing educational services is based on individual student needs and may include a variety of options. All teachers are responsible for the provision of the specialized instruction, including all listed accommodations and modifications for any student with an IEP or 504 plan. The SEIS educator is responsible for tracking a student’s progress in meeting the goals, objectives, and benchmarks listed in the IEP.

Learning Teams

While the SEIS educator has specific responsibilities related to those students with IEPs, he/she is an integral member of the teaching team for all students in the DYS program. The Learning Team process was introduced to provide each DYS teaching team with a platform to collaboratively identify students’ strengths and needs. Learning Teams use focus questions in order to gather all available data to determine who the students are as learners across the content areas and/or members of the learning community. When additional data is needed, an action plan is developed to acquire the data in order to implement instructional strategies to meet the diverse learning needs of the students.

SEIS educators share information available on IEPs as well as data they collect while working directly with students. Additionally, as part of the teaching team, SEIS educators provide suggestions for meeting the needs of all learners based on their knowledge of alternate methods of presenting/representing content, alternate methods for students to demonstrate mastery and communicate their learning, and alternate methods to engage students in the learning process.

Instruction

Along with the DYS general educators, the SEIS educator provides access to the general curriculum. The DYS Instructional Guides in ELA, Mathematics, Science, US History I, US History II, and the Empower Your Future Curriculum outline the general curriculum for students enrolled in DYS programs. SEIS educators, working collaboratively with the general education content teachers, support the development of standards-based instructional plans aligned to the scope and sequence of the guides incorporating the accommodations, modifications, and specialized instruction listed in the IEP.

As part of the teaching team, the SEIS educator supports the learning of all students. What this support looks like in the classroom is dependent on the specific needs of the students, the instructional content being presented, and the composition of the teaching team.
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In some sites, physical space considerations limit the options available. For those students with an IEP, their school schedule is initially determined by the SEIS educator and the DYS Teaching Coordinator as outlined in the Agency Coordination Process. SEIS and DYS educators strive to provide a continuum of services designed to meet the needs of the students, and may work with small groups of students or individual students in a scheduled pull-out class. The SEIS educator may work within the general education classroom providing instruction using any number of co-teaching models. The SEIS educator may consult with general educators on how to provide the necessary accommodations or modifications outlined in an IEP, and also provide suggestions on strategies and materials that would benefit all students.

Reasons to Use Specialized Content Area Instruction (pull-out) Services
- SEIS educators meet with a new student to review the content of the IEP and engage the student in an initial interview.
- SEIS educators meet with a student prior to annual review of team meeting for student input on goals and/or to prepare student to participate.
- Informal assessments (i.e. QRI-4, MCAS open response w/ discussion). This may be appropriate if student appears hesitant to participate in the larger group.
- Targeted content-area instruction
  Using the content being addressed in the general education classroom, SEIS teachers may use pull-out to:
  o Pre-teach vocabulary for new unit of study
  o Provide alternate text selection to prepare student for new unit of study
  o Reteach content, process
  o Review material previously covered
- Introduce new tech tool or accommodation in a 1:1 or small group setting (i.e. OpenBook, use of a calculator, math manipulatives, use of NEO/AlphaSmart, use of CoWriter, screen readers)

(Please note it is possible to accomplish many of the above activities in the general education classroom using the Co-teaching model: Alternate teaching)

Co-Planning with General Educators
As general educators and SEIS educators work together in the planning process, the special educator can offer a variety of specific suggestions to mini-unit and lesson plans. As an active member of the teaching team, the SEIS educator
- provides suggestions for accommodations and modifications to unit plans in process
- provides modified content resources (alternate material or teacher-made modifications)
  o (i.e. scaffolded notes, word banks, cloze activities, audio or digital versions of texts)
- provides support materials for differentiation
  o (i.e. podcast math lesson, video clip illustrating concepts presented)
- provides formative assessment strategies designed to measure student progress
- provides summative assessments, including scoring procedure (rubric)
- collaborates to develop learning objectives
- reviews student work to determine next steps in instructional planning
- collaborates with general educators to plan for specialized content area instruction (pull-out) lessons

**Planning for and Co-Teaching with General Educators**

![Diagram of co-teaching models](image)

**Variations of Co-Teaching**

Successful co-teaching requires planning and specific role assignments. Initially, the SEIS educator can take the lead in a variety of instructional activities such as:

- Do-Now activity
- Formative assessment activity and/or data collection
- Specific strategy instruction (use of GO, note taking, pre-reading strategies)
- Alternate presentation of material
- Collecting data specific to LT action plan
- Monitoring small group work
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EDUCATOR MENTORING PROGRAM

Purpose:
SEIS teachers are assigned to small programs located throughout the state, and must follow policies and procedures set by different host agencies (CHCs, DMH, DPH, DMH), different residential program vendors and, sometimes, different employee master agreements. The geographical spread and the differences among programs often make it difficult or impossible for any individual supervisor, instructional coach, or mentor to provide all necessary core mentoring activities.

During the 2012-2013 school year, a Mentoring Workgroup was convened with the primary goal of developing and overseeing the implementation of a statewide educator mentoring program to ensure that new teachers received essential supports aligned with DESE requirements for new teacher induction programs. The workgroup was comprised of the following:

- Kathi Titus, CES Assistant Director of the SEIS Contract
- Cheryl Nicholson, DESE SEIS Assistant Director
- Bill Benjamin, CES Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator
- Debbie Corcoran, DMH Host Agency Coordinator
- Heidi Cahoon-McEwen, DYS Host Agency Coordinator
- Jaime Bell, DYS Host Agency Coordinator (added in 2013)

Mentoring programs provide guidance and support to teachers who are new to the profession as well as those who are new to SEIS in the role of the SEIS educator. The primary objectives of the workgroup follow:

- Review and research best practice and Massachusetts requirements for mentoring programs
- Review mentor selection criteria samples from districts in Massachusetts and other states
- Review research on best practice for comprehensive induction support
- Align all of the above with the full range of induction and professional development support outlined in SEIS Mentoring Program Framework (attached)
- Develop mentor selection criteria that align with DESE Guidelines and the SEIS Mentoring Framework
- Prioritize areas of focus for SEIS mentors
- Suggest measures and evidence for each of the mentor selection criteria
• Develop an SEIS Mentoring Program implementation plan that can apply across different settings

The foundations of this work were the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Guidelines for Induction Programs and the SEIS Mentoring Framework. Additional research on best practice in mentoring programs was conducted.

Activities:

1. Reviewed and researched best practice and Massachusetts mentoring requirements

The workgroup reviewed research, with particular focus on the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Guidelines for Induction Programs (pp. 3-9). This established the foundation for SEIS orientation and induction support documents, core mentoring activities, mentor selection criteria, and mentor assignment.

The core mentoring activities described by DESE were then aligned with the range of induction supports described within the SEIS Mentoring Program Framework (pp. 9-15). The Framework clearly sees mentoring as only one of many components of a comprehensive continuous improvement process that supports all SEIS teachers. This larger, job-embedded professional development network includes instructional coaching, Moodle resources (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, Common Core resources, and learning team tools), webinars, direct support from onsite supervisors and teaching coordinators, and other supports.

This approach aligns with recommendations noted earlier, from the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (Fulton, Yoon, and Lee, 2005). Blending resources to provide comprehensive induction support beyond individual mentoring is critical to the success of new teachers.

A final step in the research process was to review samples of mentor selection criteria from Massachusetts districts.

2. Developed mentor selection criteria

The workgroup drafted customized SEIS Mentor Selection Criteria organized under these three main areas:

• Knowledge of Special Education and Services in Institutional Settings
• Collaborative and Reflective Practice
• Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Measures and evidence for each of the mentor selection criteria were suggested. First and foremost, input from the teacher evaluation system ratings and from the teaching coordinators and supervisors
are critical. The workgroup also generated examples of other evidence which could be useful to illustrate a mentor candidate’s skills, and listed those examples beside each criterion. It is important to note that the list of sample evidence is not all-inclusive, and that a mentor candidate is not required to submit evidence in order to be considered. Examples were provided to show that additional input can and will be reviewed at the mentor candidate’s request.

3. Developed an SEIS Mentoring Program implementation plan

After developing selection criteria, the group designed implementation processes and documents that would be effective within the unique contexts of SEIS. The workgroup identified a combination of resources that, together with individual SEIS mentors, would provide the complete range of induction supports for all new SEIS teachers. Those additional resources include SEIS instructional coaches, virtual networking, and online or other references and tools. Research confirms that a blended approach to induction support is preferable in order to develop effective 21st Century teachers. The workgroup also collaborated with the professional development team1 to finalize the plan for mentor training modules and quarterly seminars to support the work of the mentors.

The workgroup developed an implementation plan as well as documents describing the mentoring program, mentor selection criteria, the recruiting and selection process, and mentor training and responsibilities. An Individual Mentoring Plan template (attached) was developed for each new teacher to outline personalized goals with the support of the SEIS mentor or instructional coach. An Individual Mentoring Plan Log of Activities (attached) was developed to record required weekly contacts between mentor and mentees and progress made toward Individual Mentoring Plan goals.

SEIS supervisors sent a packet of mentoring information and documents to all SEIS teachers. This packet included an introductory letter, a “Frequently Asked Questions” document, a copy of the Mentor Selection Criteria, and a Mentoring Commitment form detailing responsibilities. Applicants were asked to sign and return a Mentor Commitment form for the Mentoring Workgroup’s consideration. They were also invited to submit additional evidence for review if they wished.

The informational documents made it clear that although SEIS mentors will be the primary support to new teachers, mentors will be at different levels of expertise in applying the selection criteria to their own practice (e.g.: Integrated Service Delivery, mini-unit planning, transition-informed planning notes, differentiated and/or modified instruction as needed, etc.). Mentor teachers will be expected to provide direct support, and work with SEIS instructional coaches to provide mentees with key links to other people and resources. This strategy will ensure that the goals of individual mentoring plans are fully addressed.

---

1 This team, consisting of Bill Benjamin (SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator), Rick Last (a professional development consultant), and SEIS instructional coaches, had already done training for the coaches and gathered their feedback. The collaboration was an attempt to coordinate the recommendations of both this group and the Mentoring Workgroup.
The Professional Development and Curriculum Planning Committee reviewed all of the documents before finalizing mentor training modules and the training format.

Outcomes:

As described above, the workgroup developed mentor selection criteria, mentoring responsibilities and benefits, and a selection and assignment process. An informational packet explaining all of these was distributed to SEIS teachers through their supervisors in the spring of 2013. The workgroup reviewed all applications in late June, and sent written notification of application status in August.

Detailed information about training materials and time frames were sent to all prospective mentors. The workgroup reviewed the recommendations of onsite supervisors and finalized mentor assignments. (Accomplished summer 2013)

Initial training through online modules was completed in October 2013 with 17 mentors (see the Mentor Training Powerpoint in the attachments). The training structures provided opportunities for mentors to collaborate with other trainees through online chats and shared documents, as well as through weekly group sessions with an SEIS instructional coach/facilitator.

Next Steps:

The workgroup will meet quarterly during 2013-14. The purpose will be to review the activities and resources used by mentors and mentees to make progress toward Individual Mentoring Plan goals, and to identify any issues or additional resources needed. This type of information will be used both for evaluation of the mentoring program and to share with SEIS coaches for their quarterly seminars that support mentors.

Quarterly data will be collected from mentors, SEIS instructional coaches, and onsite supervisors about their satisfaction with the effectiveness of the mentoring program and resources. Potential survey items for both mentees and for other groups are available through the New Teacher Center or through evaluation resources from other states.

The workgroup will compile data on: 1) Program activities; (2) Number and complete list of beginning teachers served, (3) Number and complete list of trained mentors; (4) Number of classroom observations of mentees; (5) Number of mentor/mentee contacts; (6) Hiring and retention rates for beginning teachers; (7) Participant satisfaction; (8) Other resources used to support mentees, and (9) Number of mentees who are working toward professional level licenses.
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SECTION ONE:
SEIS MENTORING FRAMEWORK
A shared understanding of relevant research and state regulations regarding mentoring new teachers, and the implications of research and regulation for practice and professional development for SEIS educators

INTRODUCTION
The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS), a program which serves the Massachusetts Departments of Mental Heath, Public Health, and Youth Services, and the County Houses of Correction, will implement a teacher Mentoring Program in educational programs serving at risk youth.

Mentoring will provide guidance and support to teachers new to the profession as well as those new to SEIS in implementing the role of the SEIS educator. The proposed Mentoring Program will build on and align with assets already in place in the programs: educator expertise, clear and specific expectations regarding service delivery, ready access to student IEPs, planning and progress documentation, instructional coaching, and site-based Learning Teams that collaborate routinely, using structured inquiry processes to enhance student learning and self-efficacy. Mentoring will build on current teacher induction (orientation and new teacher training sessions), and align with a professional development system that includes release day courses, 1:1 job embedded instructional coaching, and online resources for teachers and supervisors.

Mentoring new teachers as a systemic strategy within a comprehensive induction process is representative of a national effort to build collaborative structures in education in order to increase positive student outcomes, teacher effectiveness, teacher retention, and professional collaboration. Mentoring is of particular value for organizations and districts servicing students in institutional schools, where uniform service delivery across programs is a critical challenge. Mentoring supports acculturation of new teachers, efficient and effective dissemination of effective practices, as well as consistent implementation of collegial structures, e.g., Learning Teams, for co-planning and co-teaching. Mentoring guides new teachers in working successfully, understanding program-specific issues and practices within the context of organizational values: high quality teaching and learning, efficient and effective service delivery, and equity.

The 2012-13 school year will be the first year of a multi-year process that will introduce new teacher mentoring in all SEIS programs across multiple agencies. The SEIS Mentoring Framework presents the research base, regulatory language, and theory of action informing the Mentoring Program. It describes how teacher mentoring will support new teachers in improving teaching and learning, and delineates the roles and responsibilities of SEIS educators, instructional coaches, supervisors and administrators in assuring successful implementation.
IMPROVING TEACHING AND LEARNING THROUGH MENTORING

Since 2008, SEIS teachers, instructional coaches, supervisors and administrators have worked collaboratively with partner agencies - the Departments of Mental Health, Public Health, and Youth Services, and the County Houses of Correction - to introduce important changes in education programming: clear standards of practice, co-planning for integrated service delivery, the use of standards-based curriculum guides and/or maps, the Teacher Evaluation System, use of universal design, DESE-designed assessment tools developed for English Language Learners, and system-wide professional development addressing teaching and learning priorities shared across agencies. These changes have improved the quality of teaching and learning in the educational settings and deepened shared commitment to effective student progress monitoring and providing access for all while supporting literacy and numeracy across content areas positive youth development, and culturally responsive teaching.

Shared efforts to strengthen recruitment and retention of quality teachers, instructional coaches, supervisors and administrators have informed the implementation of teacher orientation and system-wide new teacher training. Formal and informal collaboration within and across agencies, and in professional development sessions and learning teams have created a culture of mutual support and collaboration, provided role clarity, and supported efficient and effective service delivery, and data driven practices. The SEIS Mentoring Program builds on these efforts to address SEIS’ overarching goal: Provide high quality special education services to SEIS students to ensure that all students have access to the general curriculum aligned with statewide learning objectives and are effectively prepared for transitions, including to school and community settings, higher education, and employment.

A robust body of literature confirms that (1) teacher mentoring increases the productivity of new teachers, (2) teacher mentoring organized around clear standards of practice is associated with teacher effectiveness, focusing mentors’ and mentees’ efforts on key elements of teaching success, and (3) the selection of skilled mentors who are themselves effective teachers is associated with high levels of impact on mentor and mentee practice. ¹

Mentoring assures the quality of new teachers’ experience, providing teachers with training that accelerates their development as professionals and increases the likelihood that they will both be successful in their work and will continue in their roles, providing a significant benefit to students in terms of improved educational outcomes. Teachers with more years of successful experience are more effective at raising student achievement than new teachers (Rockoff, 2004; Harris and Sass, 2006). Trained mentors help mentees plan lessons, assist them in gathering information about best practices, observe new teachers' instruction, and provide feedback. The mentee reflects and, in turn applies reflection to her/his practice. In an analysis of the initial impact of mentoring programs, Storms, Wing, et al. (2000) found that mentoring played a significant role in the professional growth of the new teachers. “Specifically, mentoring programs helped new teachers hone their practice—planning lessons, for example—and develop professional habits of mind, reflecting on the effectiveness of their instruction, and adjusting instruction. Mentors found that working with beginning teachers engaged them in reflection about their own instructional practices.”

Giebelhaus and Bowman (2000) studied a large-scale mentoring program developed by the Educational Testing Service for prospective teachers and their mentors. The study was designed to find out whether a specific model for framing discussions on teaching and learning would nurture and develop prospective teachers’ pedagogical skills. They found that prospective teachers working with trained mentors demonstrated more complete and effective planning, more effective classroom instruction, and a higher level of reflection on practice than did new teachers whose mentors had received only an orientation program. They concluded that formal induction program models including mentoring that provides a framework for discussion, reflection, and goal setting lead to more effective teaching by novices.

---


Research

Effect of Mentoring on Teaching Practice of New Teachers (Chicago Public Schools)

Agreeing that mentoring has improved their practice:

81% ........................................................................................................................................ Year 1
99% ........................................................................................................................................ Year 2

When educators engage in meaningful induction programs, their practice becomes more thoughtful, strategic and effective.

Responses from 917 new teachers show that 81% of teachers believe that their own instructional abilities improve when receiving induction services. That number increases to almost all (99%) when teachers have two years of induction support.\(^5\)


Those who serve in the role of mentor improve their own teaching skills In New Teacher Center's 2010 Induction Survey, a significant number of the mentors who responded to the survey agreed that, once they return to the classroom, after their tenure as a mentor has ended, they will be more able to positively influence student learning as a result of being in the program.\(^6\)

Research

Beginning teachers' performance related to student gains on par with that of veteran teachers

The following data, also based on Santa Cruz/Silicon Valley New Teacher Project, suggests that when new teachers have access to high quality mentoring, their students can make gains equal to or greater than their veteran peers, contradicting a large body of research that suggests new teachers typically foster the least student gains. In this research, beginning teachers are shown to be making similar student gains as their veteran counterparts on SAT9 tests, even given the fact that the new teachers in this program are assigned with a greater proportion of English Language Learner (ELL) students.\(^7\)

Teacher mentoring programs provide new teachers with a "local guide."\(^8\) A mentor teacher leads, guides and advises another teacher more junior in experience in a work situation characterized by mutual trust and belief. Typically, mentoring programs pair novice teachers with more experienced teachers who can ably explain school or program policies, regulations and procedures; share methods, materials and other resources; help solve problems in teaching and learning; provide personal and professional support; and guide the growth of the new teacher through reflection, collaboration, and shared inquiry.\(^9\)

---


Beginning teachers are full of questions, concerns and issues about what needs to be done in their new position. They are ready to learn, and what they learn will help shape their perceptions of what good teaching is and what it means to be a professional teacher. “What new teachers want in their induction is experienced colleagues who will take their daily dilemmas seriously, watch them teach and provide feedback, help them develop instructional strategies to address the challenges, model teaching skills, and share insights about students' work and lives.” 10

Mentoring is not only a good idea; it is a requirement in Massachusetts as well as many other states. Each Massachusetts school districts is required to develop an induction program that includes mentoring for teachers in their first year of practice. “The new teacher is paired with a trained mentor within the first two weeks of teaching. Mentor qualifications and the application processes for mentor selection and assignment as well as the parameters for mentor training are determined by each individual school district.”

Mentoring is one component of a comprehensive induction program, which includes team support systems at the site level, basic orientation to the “institutional” characteristics of the program and ongoing professional development, including instructional coaching and Learning Teams in the DYS/DMH settings. Well-crafted induction programs can improve teaching quality, stem high rates of teacher attrition and, in doing so, decrease the overall costs of teacher recruitment and retention.11 A growing body of research demonstrates that comprehensive induction can cut attrition rates by as much as 50 percent.

Guidelines for Induction programs introduced by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education identify five components for a comprehensive induction for teachers: an orientation program, beginning teacher support structures, beginning teacher development and training, beginning teacher evaluation, and induction program evaluation.

District induction programs should include, at a minimum: an orientation program for beginning teachers and all other incoming teachers; assignment of all beginning teachers to a trained mentor within the first two weeks of teaching; assignment of a support team that shall consist of, but not be limited to, the mentor and an administrator qualified to evaluate teachers; and release time for the mentor and beginning teacher to engage in regular classroom observations and other mentoring activities. [603, CMR 7.12 (2)]

In the past four years, SEIS has supported practices associated with effective induction practices identified in the literature (long-term planning for improving teaching and learning, induction aligned with the instructional philosophy of the school/district, instructional practices aligned with professional standards as well as state and district-based student learning standards, and a strong sense of institutional commitment with strong administrator support and involvement.)12

---


The SEIS Mentoring Program is designed to build on these practices and to introduce additional practices/conditions specific to successful mentoring: participation by all new teachers, whether entering the profession from traditional or alternative pathways, input from instructional coaches and beginning and veteran teachers on program design and structure, mentoring that begins prior to, extends throughout, and continues beyond the new teacher’s first year of teaching, providing opportunities for inductees to visit demonstration classrooms as well as engage in online content-based forums through which new teachers can network and build support, commitment, and leadership in a learning community, careful mentee selection, and provision of adequate time and resources for implementation. (Griffin, Winn, et al.; Wong, 2012) Mentoring effectiveness is enhanced by supportive communication from the principal, and other administrators, common planning or collaboration time with other teachers in the field and participation in an external network of teachers.

In the past four years, SEIS teachers, instructional coaches, supervisors, and administrators have accomplished important work with regard to teaching and learning outcomes, increasing uniform practice in the planning and delivery of instruction, and student engagement. Professional development in positive youth development, IEP planning and progress notes, integrated service delivery, universal design for learning, teaching English Language Learners, and co-planning and co-teaching in various settings has supported strong professional growth. Collaborative use of instructional guides and new curriculum materials, expectations and support for consistent unit planning, integration of instruction technology, such as SmartBoards and Prometheans, and curriculum mapping efforts provide the foundation for alignment to new state standards, course completion and credit recovery, and MCAS success. Systemic instructional and curricular improvement creates the context for mentoring new teachers.

Learning Teams, initiated as a model for integrated service delivery, and instructional coaching have established a collegial environment in which student-centered reflection and dialogue, and the use of evidence to inform problem-solving, and careful documentation are norms. The values and practices fostered in Learning Teams and through coaching relationships mirror those found in successful mentoring programs.

The 2012-2013 school year will be the initial year of a multi-year initiative to institutionalize a mentoring program This document provides a framework that places this initiative in the larger context of SEIS professional development and describes how systematic implementation of mentoring will strengthen integrated service delivery, uniform practice, and sustained improvement in program culture and educator quality.

---


The SEIS Mentoring Program will provide new teachers with support in acclimating to a complex new environment, and effective implementation of the role of an SEIS educator. Mentoring provides new teachers with the opportunity to contribute to a group, experience success, and make a difference. In a mentoring relationship founded on trust and respect, collegial interchange and mutual support, not isolation, become the norm for teachers.  

The SEIS Mentor Program Framework supports four goals:

1. To enhance student learning and self-efficacy through quality instructional delivery
2. To pilot and implement a comprehensive mentoring program, aligned with SEIS goals, effective teaching practice, and state regulations associated with mentoring
3. To optimize the capacity of SEIS instructional coaches to support expert teachers as mentors
4. To optimize the capacity of expert teachers to mentor new teachers

The graphic in Figure 1 on Page 13 illustrates the SEIS Mentoring Framework. Beginning from the left side of the page, Box 1 describes the Preconditions for Successful Mentoring: long term planning for teaching and learning, explicit standards of practice aligned with SEIS instructional philosophy and state standards known to all, a mentoring program design that reflects SEIS beliefs as well as state regulations, strong institutional commitment to mentoring, established staff orientation and teacher training, collaborative structures for instructional planning and delivery, and systemic professional development - coaching, learning teams, common release days, distance learning and leadership training. These preconditions create the context for the SEIS Mentoring Program.

To the right of the box labeled Preconditions of Mentoring, is the Core Content of the SEIS Mentoring Program: a shared model for framing discussion of instructional planning and delivery, reflection, and goal-setting for effective instruction, and mentoring practices aligned with current research and with state regulations, a process for refining and revising mentor training with input from current and veteran staff, and research-based criteria for mentor selection.

The Implementation Circles surrounding the Mentoring Core represent the training of current instructional coaches in the 2012-2013 school year, both to provide mentoring support and to guide future mentors; followed by the selection and training of teacher leaders as mentors, beginning in the 2012-2013 school year, and continuing in 2013-2014. Both implementation circles move through a process of (1) training in the core content, when all mentors in training share goals of learning and implementing a common model and set of practices, (2) modeling of mentoring practices and supportive coaching, (3) implementation, (4) reflection, and (5) goal-setting, at which point goals are specific to individual mentors.

---

To the right of Core Content, the box labeled Instructional Delivery identifies four critical outcomes of a robust mentoring program: quality assurance for new teachers’ and mentors’ skills and depth of knowledge in special education and the SEIS system, uniform service delivery across SEIS programs, effective dissemination of promising practices, and collaboration within SEIS education programs and across service delivery roles (education, clinical, and residential)

The box to the far right, Educational Impact, is the intended outcome of the Mentoring Program: enhanced student learning and self-efficacy.

The environment for the Preconditions for Mentoring Effectiveness, training and implementation of the Core Content, and Educational Impact is SEIS Institutional Culture, represented in Figure 1 as a box surrounding these elements. SEIS culture is defined by norms of collaboration within and across programs, role clarity, data-driven practice, and efficient and effective service delivery.
CORE COMPONENTS

Timeline:
Current SEIS instructional coaches will be trained in effective mentoring practices in late 2012. Their current caseloads include 17 new teachers and teachers new to SEIS. Criteria for the selection of mentor teachers for the first mentor cohort will be developed in spring 2013, for review by the SEIS Professional Development Committee. Selection of the mentor teachers to be trained will take place in March 2013, with training to be scheduled in late June 2013.

Roles and Responsibilities
In order for Implementation of the SEIS Mentoring Program as an effective strategy for improving teacher and student outcomes, it will require that participants in the SEIS educational programs assume the following important roles and responsibilities:

Students:
Provide feedback regarding the effectiveness of the teaching and adult support they experience.

Mentees:
Actively participate in the SEIS mentoring program by discussion of instructional planning and delivery, reflection, and goal-setting with mentor; improve knowledge of special education and the SEIS system; and implement strategies and practices that are presented in professional development activities and designed for SEIS program improvement.

Mentors:
Actively engage the mentees in discussion of instructional planning and delivery, reflection, and goal-setting; guide the mentees’ development of skills in special education and the SEIS system; provide support for the mentees’ implementation of strategies and practices that are presented in professional development activities and designed for SEIS program improvement.

Coaches:
Guide mentees and mentors as part of their coaching caseload; support teachers in refining and enhancing their classroom practice through evidence-based instructional strategies that are aligned with the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching; build teacher capacity and expertise around effective classroom practices that promote student engagement and increase student achievement.

Education Administrators:
Contact coaches regarding new teachers/mentees’ needs as observed during informal observations, walk-throughs; meet as necessary with coaches and mentors to gather feedback about mentees’ skill development throughout the mentoring process.
SEIS MENTORING PROGRAM

Figure 1
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SEIS MENTORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The SEIS Mentoring Program Implementation Plan is based on the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Guidelines for Induction Programs – 2001 and customized to meet the unique context of special education in institutionalized settings (see Appendix A: excerpt of Guidelines for Induction Programs – 2001).

MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA

Research indicates that the qualifications of mentors are critical to the success of the mentor-mentee relationship and to new teacher retention. Both the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Massachusetts Teachers Association’s Mentor Program Handbook emphasize the importance of establishing mentor selection criteria, and outline areas those criteria should address. SEIS mentor selection criteria incorporate this guidance.

Selection criteria for SEIS mentors were developed and organized under three areas:

- Knowledge of Special Education and Service Delivery in Institutional Settings
- Collaborative and Reflective Practice
- Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction.

(see Appendix B: SEIS Mentor Selection Criteria)

MENTOR RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

Information about the Mentoring Program will be distributed annually to all SEIS teachers (see Appendix C: SEIS Mentoring Letter and Frequently Asked Questions). Teachers can review and reflect on the selection criteria and the mentoring responsibilities, and then submit a Mentoring Commitment Form if interested (see Appendix D: Mentoring Commitment Form).

A Mentoring Selection and Assignment Committee comprised of SEIS Coordinators and administrators will review each of the applicants. The review will include input from supervisors, from past evaluations as applicable, and from any additional input and/or evidence that the mentor candidates may choose to provide.

---


MENTOR TRAINING

Before being assigned a mentee, each new mentor will complete 12 hours of introductory training modules to build skills in collaborative and reflective practice. SEIS instructional coaches will facilitate weekly debriefing sessions during the month-long training period, and will review written assignments and reflections with the mentors. Coaching will continue throughout the year of mentoring, with oral and written communication, electronic mentoring logs, and quarterly seminars.

MENTOR ASSIGNMENT

Onsite supervisors will be the primary source of mentor assignments, in coordination with each other and with other SEIS administrators. This will ensure that mentors across the SEIS system are deployed efficiently, and that no single mentor is over-extended.

During the year, if either a mentee or mentor raises a concern about their assignment, ongoing SEIS instructional coaching support will help them to resolve it. As needed, SEIS instructional coaches will consult with their supervisors (SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator or SEIS Professional Development Coordinator for MHS) for additional guidance or resources to facilitate a more productive relationship between the mentor and mentee. If, however, support beyond professional development is needed, the Professional Development Coordinators will inform the appropriate SEIS program supervisors of the mentor and mentee.

CORE MENTORING RESPONSIBILITIES AND BENEFITS

1. Completion of 12-hour initial training prior to becoming a mentor (12 PDPs) and a one-year mentoring assignment (15 PDPs). The initial mentor training consists of online modules to be completed in 12 hours during September, 2013 (approximately 3 hours per week). This includes viewing and reading materials, completing written reflections, and participating in a weekly discussion with the SEIS instructional coach.

2. Upon being assigned a mentee, arrange an introductory meeting and review/finalize the Individual Mentoring Plan. (See Appendix E: Individual Mentoring Plan)

3. Maintain a supportive and professional relationship with mentees that is confidential and not part of the supervision and evaluation system.

4. Log weekly contacts with mentees, noting the date, time and activities completed toward individual mentoring plan goal(s). Weekly contacts may be a combination of face-to-face, phone, email or other virtual meetings, depending upon the physical proximity of the mentor and mentee and the purpose of the activities. Mentors and mentees may observe each other and/or co-teach if

---

they are located convenient to each other and if supervisors approve the schedule (to minimize disruption to other classes or student instructional time). SEIS instructional coaches will also provide in-class observation and support.

5. Keep the electronic Individual Mentoring Plan Log of Activities updated weekly, so that SEIS instructional coaches can access current information and provide timely support and resources as needed. (See Appendix F: Individual Mentoring Plan Log of Activities)

6. Participate (online or in person) in quarterly 90-minute, coach-facilitated Mentor Seminars, to support and refine mentoring practice.

MENTORING PROGRAM EVALUATION

While completing research on mentor selection criteria and program design, the Mentoring Program work group also collected information on criteria and processes to evaluate mentoring programs. This will inform the next phase of work for 2013-14, development and implementation of a customized evaluation process for the SEIS Mentoring Program.

Formal surveys at mid-year and at the end of the year will collect information on the mentoring program from a variety of sources – mentees, mentors, SEIS instructional coaches, and supervisors of mentees and mentors.

Input will also be collected on an ongoing basis throughout the year, during mentoring activities. SEIS instructional coaches will analyze Individual Mentoring Logs to understand common needs and effectiveness of various mentoring activities to address individual goals. They will collect group feedback when facilitating quarterly mentor seminars. Coaches will also collect feedback from mentees as part of regularly scheduled coaching conversations.

Supervisors will also be able to collect targeted data on mentees’ skills and the impact on student achievement during walk-throughs, informal and formal observations.
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APPENDIX A

Excerpts from October, 2001 Guidelines for Induction Programs
Massachusetts Department of Education
For full guidelines see: http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/induct.pdf

Both the Education Reform Act and the Licensure Regulations require districts to provide a system of support for beginning educators. Induction programs offer this system of support through various components including an orientation, a mentoring relationship, a support team, opportunities for classroom observation and other mentoring activities.

These programs help beginning educators refine practice, understand professional roles and responsibilities, and, ultimately, positively affect student achievement.

Components of an Induction Program

- Orientation Program
- Beginning Teacher Support Structures
- Beginning Teacher Development and Training
- Beginning Teacher Evaluation
- Induction Program Evaluation

All school districts are required to provide an induction program for all teachers in their first year of practice [603 CMR 7.12].

These regulations, among other things, link beginning teacher support programs or induction programs to licensure by making participation in such a program one of the requirements for the Professional License for teachers.

Districts are encouraged to develop programs that meet the spirit of the statute and the basic standards included in the regulations while taking into account their own district needs and characteristics. The intention of this document is not to prescribe a specific course of action or program design, but to provide a resource to districts as they develop their programs.

Induction Programs for Teachers

All school districts are required to provide an induction program for teachers in their first year of practice. Induction programs provide the structure that maximizes beginning teacher learning in the context of classroom experience. New teachers learn from veteran teachers; schools increase the possibility of retaining strong, well-trained educators; and most important, student achievement can be elevated. Guidelines based on the following Standards will be provided by the Department. [603, CMR 7.12 (1)]

Standards

All induction programs shall meet the following requirements:

a) An orientation program for beginning teachers and all other incoming teachers.

b) Assignment of all beginning teachers to a trained mentor within the first two weeks of teaching.
c) Assignment of a support team that shall consist of, but not be limited to, the mentor and an administrator qualified to evaluate teachers.
d) Release time for the mentor and beginning teacher to engage in regular classroom observations and other mentoring activities. [603, CMR 7.12 (2)]

The intent of an induction program is to provide teachers with a systematic structure of support that helps them become familiar with their school and district, refine their practice and better understand their professional responsibilities. The program is an integral part of a teacher's first year of teaching and is the beginning of a teacher's professional development activities.

Districts are required to provide induction programs for teachers in their first year of practice [603 CMR 7.12 (1)]. Specifically, districts are required to provide beginning teachers – individuals holding a provisional or initial license and who have not participated in an induction program – in their first year of practice in the district with an orientation, mentoring relationship, support team and release time. Districts are also required to provide the orientation program to incoming teachers, but may choose not to offer them the other elements of the induction program. An incoming teacher is a teacher who is new to the district and who either holds: a provisional or initial license and participated in an induction program in another district, a professional license, or a temporary license. It is up to the district to determine whether the other elements of the induction program should be modified and offered to these incoming teachers. Districts may also consider offering these induction programs, in part or whole, to teachers who have changed content areas and/or grade level or who are returning to the district after a hiatus from the classroom. They may also choose to extend these programs through a beginning teacher’s second and third years of teaching.

Planning and Preparation
Districts should establish a steering committee that is charged with developing an induction program plan as part of their larger professional development plan. This plan may include, but not be limited to: program goals; a communications strategy for informing the school community about the program; roles and responsibilities of the key participants; orientation and training programs for beginning teachers and mentors; processes for mentor selection and matching; a confidentiality policy; reward and recognition of mentors; and evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.

Recertification Guidelines
The Recertification Guidelines state that educators who mentor may receive a maximum of 15 PDPs per year from their district for this activity.

Orientation Program
An orientation program launches the comprehensive induction program for both beginning and all other incoming teachers.

As part of the licensure regulations, districts are required to provide an orientation program to both beginning and incoming teachers [603 CMR 7.12 (2) (a)].

Beginning Teacher Support Structures
Beginning teacher support structures are the substance of the induction program. They are crucial to a successful first year in the classroom. In most cases, these support structures focus on linking the beginning teacher with a network of veteran teachers that they can rely on for assistance and guidance. As part of the licensure regulations, the Department of Education has identified support
teams and mentoring as two essential structures that all districts must provide to their beginning teachers.

Support Team

Districts are required to assign all beginning teachers a support team that consists of at least a mentor and an administrator qualified to evaluate teachers [603 CMR 7.12 (2) (c)].

It also provides the basis for a collegial learning community. The support team, thus, not only benefits those educators on the team, but also impacts and sets a collaborative tone for others in the learning community. The support team is crucial to internal capacity building, which districts need to support and foster the sustained professional growth of all teachers.

Mentoring

Mentoring provides the beginning teacher with a one on one relationship with an experienced teacher. The mentoring relationship can be very rewarding, both professionally and personally, for the beginning teacher and the mentor. While the beginning teacher acquires one on one support and a practical understanding of teaching through the mentoring relationship, the mentor teacher is able to reflect upon and improve his/her own practice by sharing experiences and expertise.

Core Mentoring Activities

The mentoring relationship is shaped by the activities that the mentor and beginning teacher participate in together. As part of the licensure regulations, districts are required to provide release time for both the mentor and the beginning teacher to engage in regular classroom observations and other mentoring activities [603 CMR 7.12 (2) (d)].

The activities may include:

- Meeting frequently during the school year to plan curriculum and lessons
- Observing one another's classroom
- Co-teaching the beginning teacher’s class
- Analyzing and assessing the beginning teacher's practice in relation to evaluation criteria in order to help the beginning teacher improve

Mentor Selection, Preparation, and Assignment

Districts should invest time to select individuals to be mentors; prepare these individuals for the mentoring relationship and responsibilities through training; and carefully assign mentors to beginning teachers. The proper selection, preparation, and assignment of mentors are crucial to a successful mentoring relationship.

Recruitment and Selection

Excellent veteran teachers should be recruited from all subject areas to serve as mentors. Districts may also want to consider recruiting recently retired teachers who have the knowledge and skills to serve as mentors. Districts with established programs should train a surplus of mentors to meet the varying subject needs of incoming teachers from year to year.

In determining the type of teacher who would perform well as a mentor, it is recommended that districts employ a criteria-based selection process. Such a process first outlines the desired characteristics of mentors, as determined by the district, and then uses these criteria in the selection process. Districts may want to look for candidates who are:
Outstanding, experienced teachers whose teaching reflects excellent content knowledge of the state curriculum frameworks
• Aware of the merits of different teaching styles and pedagogical strategies/methods
• Able to teach to the diverse learning styles of students
• Knowledgeable about the professional and community resources in the school and district
• Willing and able to invest time to develop mentoring skills and participate in the program for the duration of the year
• Able to maintain a confidential relationship
• Energetic and friendly

Mentor Training

All mentors need to be trained because good teachers of children do not necessarily make good coaches for adults [603 CMR 7.12 (2) (b)]. Mentors must receive training in the skills of effective mentoring and strategies for supporting new teachers to be successful in a standards-based classroom. This training should be managed at the district level because at this level districts can ensure the same quality of training for all of their mentors.

In choosing trainers, districts should look to their own teachers who are experienced mentors, to consultants, professional associations and other recognized professional development providers. Districts may also choose to have their prospective mentors participate in Department of Education sponsored Mentor Training Institutes.

Elements of the training may include:
• Role of a mentor
• Adult development
• Analysis of teaching strategies
• Observation skills
• Strategies for conferencing and feedback
• Diagnosing and analyzing classroom management issues
• Broad problem solving skills
• Designing portfolios and preparing for professional performance evaluation
• Reflective practice
• Using student work to evaluate and inform practice
• Standards-based curriculum, instruction and assessment

Ideally, initial training should occur in the spring or summer preceding the mentoring assignment.

Mentor Peer Support

For the mentor, participation in the mentoring relationship is an important form of professional development for experienced teachers. Meetings with other mentors will enable experienced teachers to build upon their mentor training and work with the beginning teacher to enhance their own practice.
# APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR CRITERIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Criteria measured by interview and evidence of Standards &amp; Indicators of Effective Teaching)</td>
<td>(*Not required, and not all-inclusive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. Knowledge of special education and service delivery in institutional settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has at least three years of experience in teaching, two with SEIS (AND professional special education license if mentoring a teacher who is working toward that license).</td>
<td>Understands and follows special education laws and regulations, and SEIS procedures in particular.</td>
<td>Understands the SEIS teacher’s role, working with program staff, with ETL’s, and with students who have a wide range of skill levels and needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experience comparable to 2 years with SEIS may be considered.**

**Knows and uses SEIS and program resources effectively (Aspen, Moodle, PD products, etc.).**

**IEP planning and progress notes show:**

- a) attention to integrated service delivery;
- b) appropriate access to curriculum with accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities;
- c) measurable IEP goals aligned with students’ post-secondary goals and vision;
- d) measurable evidence of progress

**Teacher schedule shows co-teaching or collaboration time as appropriate in different programs.**

**Lesson or unit plans align with general curriculum and appropriate access points, accommodations and modifications.**

**Collaborates with ETL to meet IEP and progress timelines (evidence in Aspen, etc.).**

**Teacher schedule shows co-teaching or collaboration time as appropriate in different programs.**

**Lesson or unit plans align with general curriculum and appropriate access points, accommodations and modifications.**

**Collaborates with ETL to meet IEP and progress timelines (evidence in Aspen, etc.).**
### MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA
(Criteria measured by interview and evidence of Standards & Indicators of Effective Teaching)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR CRITERIA (*Not required, and not all-inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Knows and understands the host agency and the student population it serves.</td>
<td>Plans and instruction reflect institutional knowledge and understanding of student population. Collaborates with host agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Collaborative and reflective practice

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recognizes and celebrates strengths and successes to support achievement and systemic improvement efforts.</td>
<td>Celebrates achievements of students and of the program (artifacts/reflections). Uses strength-based language with students and colleagues (lessons, planning and progress notes, meeting logs, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Reflects regularly on own practice, and seeks out resources for own professional development.</td>
<td>Engages in PD and incorporates PD into final PD products / instruction. Uses feedback to improve planning, instruction or fulfillment of other professional responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Builds and maintains respectful relationships with adult learners, and helps colleagues identify and use resources to improve practice.</td>
<td>Collaborates and is willing to model and to support others (evidenced in meetings logs, minutes, etc.). Uses Moodle/other PD resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Balances taking professional responsibility with seeking support when appropriate</td>
<td>Takes initiative to solve problems and enhance practice. Uses good judgment to inform supervisors of issues as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Accepts and gives constructive feedback, in interactions with students, colleagues and supervisors.</td>
<td>Understands and incorporates constructive feedback from coaches and supervisors into planning and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Understands the boundaries and the confidential, non-evaluative nature of mentoring.</td>
<td>Is non-judgmental and professional in conversations and reflections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR SELECTION CRITERIA</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE FOR CRITERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Criteria measured by interview and evidence of Standards &amp; Indicators of Effective Teaching)</td>
<td>(*Not required, and not all-inclusive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum, instruction, and assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Planning and teaching reflects excellent knowledge of MA curriculum frameworks and common core standards.</td>
<td>Develops mini-unit exemplars according to the PD Final Rubric. Incorporates college / career-ready standards in content area instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Provides accommodations and modifications that support student achievement in the general curriculum.</td>
<td>Plans and instruction reflect universal design for learning. Plans and instruction reflect appropriate accommodations and modifications, while developing independence and self-advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Effectively plans for and teaches students at different skill levels and readiness for learning.</td>
<td>Plans and instruction address all learners and ensure access to general curriculum with appropriate entry points and supports (e.g.: mini-units, student work, MCAS Alternative portfolios).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Planning and teaching reflects different teaching styles and pedagogical strategies/methods.</td>
<td>Incorporates key instructional strategies across content areas. Schedules and plans show understanding of and commitment to shared responsibility for instruction, through collaborative teaching and co-teaching models. Varies questioning techniques for different purpose or student need. Uses multi-sensory strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Effectively teaches to the diverse learning styles and needs of students.</td>
<td>Plans and instruction are strength-based and reflect respect of cultural and learning differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

June 6, 2013

Dear SEIS Teacher:

Are you interested in becoming a trained mentor teacher? Mentoring is part of the larger cycle of continuous improvement and professional development that supports SEIS teachers. Mentors provide personalized, confidential support to mentees, separate from the supervision and evaluation system. Activities are designed by mentees and mentors together and recorded on individual mentoring plans. SEIS instructional coaches, in turn, support mentors in this important work. Coaches will help ensure that all necessary resources are identified and accessed to support teaching and learning throughout the year.

Mentors will be selected using criteria that align with best practice in research and with Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Guidelines for Induction Programs. The criteria have been customized to address unique SEIS needs. Evidence will be solicited from supervisors, from prior evaluations if applicable, and from any additional evidence that mentor candidates may choose to offer. Possible examples of evidence are listed beside the selection criteria. Supervisors, SEIS instructional coaches and other colleagues may also be helpful in identifying evidence of strength in the areas covered by the mentor selection criteria.

It is understood that individual mentor candidates will be at different levels of exposure to and skill with different aspects of the selection criteria. No individual mentor can provide the entire range of comprehensive induction support that a mentee needs. Being a mentor for SEIS means commitment to a collaborative, professional relationship that supports a mentee’s development. Sometimes the mentor’s role will be to work directly with the mentee. At other times, the mentor will consult with the SEIS instructional coach about a plan to access different resources. At all times, both mentor and mentee will benefit from the process.

Mentors will earn 12 PDPs after successfully completing initial mentor training, plus 15 PDPs per year for each year serving as a mentor.

Please review the documents titled “Mentor Selection Criteria,” “Mentoring Program Frequently Asked Questions” and “Mentoring Commitment.” If you are interested, please fax a Mentoring Commitment form to Betsy Bender, CES Executive Assistant for SEIS, at 413-586-2798 by Monday, June 17th.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Chapman, Ed.D.
Administrator of Special Education and SEIS Project
Collaborative for Educational Services
APPENDIX C (cont.)

SEIS Mentoring Program

Frequently Asked Questions

1. **Who will require a mentor?** A teacher who is new to SEIS or who is working toward a professional level special education license will need a mentor. A teacher in the second year with SEIS may elect to have a mentor.

2. **What is the role of the SEIS mentor?** The mentor’s role is to provide collaborative, confidential and non-evaluative support to new SEIS teachers. Mentors will help new teachers understand special education and SEIS responsibilities and resources; develop lessons that include appropriate access, accommodations, modifications and assessments; develop IEP planning and progress notes, and reflect on progress and practice. SEIS mentors will be part of a comprehensive support system that includes SEIS instructional coaches, Moodle resources, webinars, direct support from onsite teaching coordinators, etc.

3. **What are the responsibilities of the SEIS mentor?**

   a. Completion of 12-hour initial training prior to becoming a mentor (12 PDPs) and a one-year mentoring assignment (15 PDPs).  

      The initial mentor training consists of online modules to be completed in 12 hours during September, 2013 (approximately 3 hours per week). This includes viewing and reading materials, completing written reflections, and participating in a weekly discussion with the SEIS instructional coach.

   b. Upon being assigned a mentee, arrange an introductory meeting and finalize the Individual Mentoring Plan.

   c. Maintain a supportive and professional relationship with mentees that is confidential and not part of the supervision and evaluation system.

   d. Log weekly contacts with mentees, noting the date, time and activities completed toward individual mentoring plan goal(s). Weekly contacts may be a combination of face-to-face, phone, email or other virtual meetings, depending upon the physical proximity of the mentor and mentee and the purpose of the activities planned. Mentors and mentees may observe each other and/or co-teach if they are located convenient to each other and if supervisors approve the schedule (to minimize disruption to other classes or student instructional time). SEIS instructional coaches will also provide in-class observation and support.

---

e. Keep the electronic Individual Mentoring Plan Log of Activities updated weekly, so that SEIS instructional coaches can access current information and provide timely support and resources as needed.

f. Participate (online or in person) in quarterly 90-minute, coach-facilitated Mentor Seminars, to support and refine mentoring practice.

3. What is an individual mentoring plan? The mentoring plan specifies a goal the mentee has identified and the plan of activities and timelines, set by the mentor and mentee together, to meet that goal. This goal will align with and directly support the mentee’s progress in his/her overall individual professional development plan (IPDP).

4. Can an individual mentoring plan have more than one goal? Yes. As long as the mentee and mentor agree that the plan is workable and appropriate, the number of goals can be flexible. The mentee should fill out a separate form for each identified goal.

5. How can I become a mentor? The mentor selection criteria will be measured by evidence from SEIS supervisors, coordinators and administrators regarding the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching, as well as any additional evidence a mentor candidate may choose to suggest. (Samples of evidence are listed beside the criteria.) The criteria are aligned with best practice in research and with the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Guidelines for Induction Programs. They have been customized to address SEIS needs.

*When reviewing the criteria it is important to remember that all teachers, including mentor candidates, are at different developmental stages in implementing initiatives of SEIS such as Integrated Service Delivery, mini-unit planning, transition-informed planning notes, differentiated and/or modified instruction, etc. No individual mentor is expected to be the sole expert resource to the new teacher. Mentors, with the support of SEIS instructional coaches, will also link mentees to other people or resources necessary to support their individual mentoring plans.

6. Who selects mentors and assigns them to mentees? Mentors are selected by a committee consisting of the mentor candidate’s supervisor and SEIS coordinators or administrators. Mentor candidates are advised to review the mentor selection criteria with their supervisors, as they may have evidence to support the process.

7. What are the benefits of being a mentor? Mentors will earn 12 PDPs for completion of initial training, plus 15 PDPs for each year of mentoring. Research has shown that mentoring others not only improves the practice of the new teacher, but also measurably benefits the mentor’s own instructional and professional practice. The entire professional learning community and outcomes for students are enhanced by this type of collaboration. Mentoring can also be a valuable step in developing a career as a teacher leader or administrator.
APPENDIX D

SEIS Mentoring Commitment

SEIS mentors will provide critical support to new teachers, along with other SEIS professional development resources such as SEIS instructional coaches, Moodle resources, webinars, direct support from onsite supervisors, etc. Mentors will, in turn, be supported by SEIS instructional coaches in this important work.

Mentor Responsibilities

a. Completion of 12-hour initial training prior to becoming a mentor (12 PDPs) and a one-year mentoring assignment (15 PDPs). 21

The initial mentor training consists of online modules to be completed in 12 hours during September, 2013 (approximately 3 hours per week). This includes viewing and reading materials, completing written reflections, and participating in a weekly discussion with the SEIS instructional coach.

b. Upon being assigned a mentee, arrange an introductory meeting and finalize the Individual Mentoring Plan.

c. Maintain a supportive and professional relationship with mentees that is confidential and not part of the supervision and evaluation system.

d. Log weekly contacts with mentees, noting the date, time and activities completed toward individual mentoring plan goal(s). Weekly contacts may be a combination of face-to-face, phone, email or other virtual meetings, depending upon the physical proximity of the mentor and mentee and the purpose of the activities planned. Mentors and mentees may observe each other and/or co-teach if they are located convenient to each other and if supervisors approve the schedule (to minimize disruption to other classes or student instructional time). SEIS instructional coaches will also provide in-class observation and support.

e. Keep the electronic Individual Mentoring Plan Log of Activities updated weekly, so that SEIS instructional coaches can access current information and provide timely support and resources as needed.

f. Participate (online or in person) in quarterly 90-minute, coach-facilitated Mentor Seminars, to support and refine mentoring practice.

I have reviewed the mentor selection criteria. I am interested in becoming a mentor for SEIS, and can commit to the above responsibilities.

______________________ / ________________________ / ________________________
Print Name / Signature / Date

(Fax to Betsy Bender, CES Executive Assistant for SEIS, at 413-586-2798 by Monday, June 17th.

### Individual Mentoring Plan

**Teacher:**

**Program:**

**Mentor:**

**SEIS Instructional Coach:**

---

Based on a self-assessment of your proficiency with the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching, your mentor’s input, and any school program or host agency initiatives, what goal have you (mentee) identified? What is an area of knowledge or skill that you would like to strengthen?

---

This individual goal must also align with and support the mentee’s progress in his/her overall Individual Professional Development Plan. The mentee, in consultation with the mentor, may adjust or add to the individual mentoring program goal as needed during the year.

---

Describe the connection between this goal and your current teaching assignment.

---

What would success on this goal look like? How will you know when you have achieved it? What would count as evidence of success?
What activities will help you to work toward your goal, and during what time frame will these activities take place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity and Date/Time Scheduled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What resources will you need to better achieve your goal?

Signature of Mentee / Date

Signature of Mentor / Date

Signature of SEIS Instructional Coach / Date
## APPENDIX D: Individual Mentoring Plan / Log of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mentor Notes / Initials</th>
<th>Benefits / Impact on Student Learning</th>
<th>Issues, Adjustments or Resources Needed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>SEIS Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mentee**

97 Magazine Street, Northampton, MA 01060 413 586 4000 | 413 586 0169 fax

collaborative.org

Collaborative for Educational Services

**Goal:**
SEIS MENTORING FRAMEWORK

A shared understanding of relevant research and state regulations regarding mentoring new teachers, and the implications of research and regulation for practice and professional development for SEIS educators.
SEIS Mentor Training
October 2013

Week 1 Notes
New Teachers as Adult Learners

Phases of a New Teacher

Learning Objective for Week 1

• Understand challenges and concerns of new teachers as adult learners
• Consider the phases that a new teacher typically goes through

New Teachers as Adult Learners

(continued)

New Teachers as Adult Learners

(continued)

New Teachers as Adult Learners

(continued)
New Teachers as Adult Learners
(continued)

The Life Cycle of the First Year Teacher

Phases of First-Year Teachers’ Attitude Towards Teaching (Moir, 1992)

Anticipation Phase
- Romanticizes role of the teacher
- Committed to making a difference
- Feeling of excitement carries beginning teacher through first several weeks
- Idealistic view to accomplish goals
- Elated but nervous with goal of outstanding teacher!

Survival Phase
- Reality occurs
- First several months are overwhelming
- So much to learn and so little time
- Bombarded with a variety of problems and situations not anticipated
- No time to stop and reflect on experiences
- Feel alone & want someone to reach out
- Looking forward to time of reduced stress
Disillusionment Phase

- Things are not going as smoothly as earlier envisioned
- Classroom management is more of a stress than anticipated
- Job time commitment brings complaints from family members & friends
- Express self-doubt, have lower self esteem, and question their professional commitment
- Most challenging phase

Disillusionment Phase?
What Would You Do?

Your mentee says:
“Sometimes I just don’t know about these kids and the other teachers in my setting. I hope in the future, possibly in another setting, I have more motivated kids. It is just hard in my setting because the other teachers do not care at all. The kids told me today that the other teachers don’t care and don’t enforce the rules so why do I try.”

Rejuvenation Phase

- Improvement in attitude
- Usually after the winter break
- Experience has taught coping strategies
- One-half year done; one-half to go
- Concerned about getting everything completed by end of the year
Reflection Phase

• **Can see light** at end of tunnel
• **Reflect** on what worked & did not work
• **Envision changes** and how things will be better!

Anticipation Phase

• Heightened sense of what they **hope to accomplish**
• Less concern for **survival**
• Focus more on **student impact** & less on themselves
• Look forward to **professional development**

Think About

• Reflect on your own experience (or experiences of other teachers you have had contact with).
  
  • How do these phases resonate with you?
  • How will this knowledge have impact on your mentoring?
  • What other factors or events specific to the SEIS school year could impact a new teacher?

Week 2 Notes

What Makes a Good Mentor
Mentoring Defined
Implementation
Requirements
Getting Results

Setting Personal Learning Goals

This Learning module will be valuable to me if...

What do you want the outcomes to be? What are the obstacles you foresee in this work? What skills do you need?
Learning Objectives for Week 2

• Create a construct for achieving positive results in our work
• Consider implementation requirements for mentoring
• Clarify roles and responsibilities of effective mentors
• Reflect of the qualities of an effective mentor

Underlying Assumptions

• Reflection by an individual on his/her practice can be enhanced by another’s observations and perceptions.
• Teachers working to master new materials or teaching practices benefit from ongoing assistance.
• Teachers are competent professionals whose experience, expertise, and observations are valuable sources of knowledge, skill development and inspiration for other teachers.

Think About

• What are the qualities of a good coach/mentor?

Mentor was the friend of Odysseus. Odysseus entrusted his son, Telemachus, to Mentor when he went on long journeys. Mentor's role was to provide advice, guidance, and support to Telemachus in his father's absence.

Good Coach / Mentor

• Leader
• Good listener
• Know his/her team
• Appreciates strengths
• Recognizes weaknesses
• Knowledge without a “know-it-all”
• Sees big picture / clarity
• Encouraging / supportive
• Honest
• Fair
• Confidentiality
• Well-liked by team
• Appreciates where individual members are at – their starting point

Mentoring Is…

• Mentoring is a demonstration of caring for colleagues in the profession.
• Mentoring is part of a comprehensive plan for professional growth grounded in what we know about adult learning and development.
• A successful mentoring program can help teachers intentionally respond with effective strategies to the needs of a diverse population of learners.
Mentoring Is... (SEIS Mentoring Framework 2012)

- An opportunity to build collaborative structures to increase
  - Positive student outcomes
  - Teacher effectiveness
  - Teacher retention
  - Professional Collaboration

(Mentoring Is... (SEIS Mentoring Framework 2012)

Mentors actively engage the mentees in discussion of instructional planning and delivery, reflection and goal setting; guide the mentees development of skills in special education and the SEIS system; provide support for the mentees' implementation of strategies and practices that are presented in professional development activities and designed for SEIS Program Improvement."

(The SEIS Mentoring Framework p.12)

The reality

30 - 50% leave the profession within the first three years of teaching

Source: Darling-Hammond, Linda. (2000). Teacher Quality and Student Achievement

Implementation Needs
- Climate of trust, collegiality and continuous growth
- Long-term commitment to interaction
- Skill building in coaching and mentoring
- Administrative support

(Mentor Learning Module SEIS 2013)

Getting Results
We need to consider:
- Task
- Process
- Relationships

Acquiring New Skills / Behaviors from Joyce and Showers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training &amp; Impact</th>
<th>Concept Understanding</th>
<th>Skill Attainment</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Week 3 Notes**

**Norms of Collaboration**

**Differentiated Mentoring**

---

**Week Three Learning Objectives**

- Consolidate mentor support Skills to effectively work with new teachers by considering:
  - Norms of Collaboration
  - Differentiated mentoring

---

**Collaboration**

- What skills do we need to have as mentors to effectively collaborate?

- Let’s consider how we enter into and conduct conversations and discussions with potential mentors.

Having good interactions is a skill.

---

**Norms of Collaboration**

- **Pausing**

---

**Norms of Collaboration**

- **Paraphrasing**
Norms of Collaboration

• Posing Questions

Norms of Collaboration

• Putting Ideas on the Table

Norms of Collaboration

• Providing Data

Norms of Collaboration

• Paying Attention to Self and Others

Norms of Collaboration

• Presuming Positive Intentions

Norms of Collaboration

• What personal connections are you making with this set of norms?
• Which of these norms might be most important for your full participation in a group?
• Considering these seven norms, which might you find most challenging?
• Given your selection, what strategies might you use to focus on this/these?
Differentiated Mentoring: Interpersonal Approaches

**Differentiated Mentoring**

- **Direct Informational** – provide information with restricted choice, determine action to follow
- **Collaborative** – problem solve, negotiate
- **Non-Directive** – listen, clarify and reflect

---

**Differentiated Mentoring**

- **Direct Informational**
  provide information with restricted choice, determine action to follow

**Differentiated Mentoring**

- **Collaborative**
  problem solve, negotiate

**Differentiated Mentoring**

- **Non-Directive**
  listen, clarify and reflect

---

Think About Differentiated Mentoring

Using the Approaches
**Week 4 Notes**

**Mentors**

**Using Your Toolkit**

---

**Week 4 Learning Objectives**

• While focusing on teaching and learning, we will deepen our understanding of and ability to apply the SEIS collaborative coaching model to the mentoring relationship

• Utilize learned tools to analyze potential obstacle in the mentoring relationship

---

**Mentoring Activities**

Trained mentors help mentees:

• create lessons, mini-units and IEP planning or progress notes
• gather information on best practice
• reflect on instruction through
  *observation, data analysis and feedback

---

**The Mentoring Cycle**

Components Overview

• The Individual Mentoring Plan
• Planning Conversation / Resource Sharing
• Data Gathering: (Observations, work products)
• Debrief, Reflect, Analyze

---

Components Overview

• Planning Conversation / Resource Sharing
• Data Gathering: (Observations, work products)
• Debrief, Reflect, Analyze

---
Planning Conversation–
Some Ideas to consider
Curriculum, Planning and Assessment:
Relationship of Goals and Objectives to the Frameworks

- How do lesson objectives help students progress toward the general curriculum standards referenced in the lesson plan?
- How do IEP Planning Notes goals and objectives help students progress toward general curriculum standards and post-secondary goals?

Planning Conference
Some ideas to consider

Lesson Plan and Lesson Design
Assessment: Evidence of Student Learning

Have you consider the learning styles of your students?
What will the students say or do that will demonstrate their learning? How will the students make their thinking and understanding public?
What is the plan for presenting the task or problem:
What activities will move students toward goals?
What are the different points of entry for the range of learners in your classroom?

Planning Conversation -
Some ideas to consider
Curriculum, Planning and Assessment:
Instructional Design and Assessment - Evidence of Student Learning

How have you considered the learning styles and cultural backgrounds of your students?
How will new learning tasks or problems be introduced:
What points of entry will engage the range of learners in your classroom?
What activities will move students toward goals?
What will students say or do to demonstrate learning?
How will their thinking and understanding be made public?

Components Overview
- The Individual Mentoring Plan
- Planning Conversation / Resource Sharing
- Data Gathering: (Observations, work products)
- Debrief, Reflect, Analyze
Best Practices - Observation

• Data Collected in objective (measurable and observable)
• Data collection can include questions to elicit mentee intentions (based on the data)
• The majority of the data collected is based on agreed upon issues prior to the lesson
• Mentee will have access to a copy of data collected

Types of observations
a sampling

• Selective Verbatim
• Verbal Flow
• At Task
• Interactional analysis
• Global Scan

Types of observations
a sampling

• Selective Verbatim

• Verbal Flow

• At Task

• Interactional analysis

• Global Scan

Types of observations
a sampling

• Selective Verbatim

• Verbal Flow

• At Task

• Interactional analysis

• Global Scan

Types of observations
a sampling

• Selective Verbatim

• Verbal Flow

• At Task

• Interactional analysis

• Global Scan

• At Task

• Interactional analysis

• Global Scan
Types of observations
a sampling

• Selective Verbatim
• Verbal Flow
• At Task
• Interactional analysis

• Global Scan

Components Overview

• The Individual Mentoring Plan
• Planning Conference
• Observation
• Observation Reflection/Debrief

Components Overview

• The Individual Mentoring Plan
• Planning Conversation / Resource Sharing
• Data Gathering: (Observations, work products)
• Debrief, Reflect, Analyze

Tool: Reflection Guide

Focus Question
General Thoughts
What seemed to work well in today’s lesson?
What didn’t work? What would you have done differently?

Teacher Moves
What strategies or tools did the teacher use to enhance the learning experience?

Assessment
What did the students say or do that demonstrated understanding?
What confusions, difficulties, or misconceptions arose?

Using Assessment to Guide Instruction
What next steps would you take to build on today’s lesson?

Reflection

Seek first to understand before being understood

-Stephen Covey

Reflection Conference

What can be covered in the context of student learning

• Analyzing formative assessment (what does the student understand?)
• Discussion of the content
• Looking at student work
• Issues of student participation
• Questioning skills
• What to do with challenging students
• Addressing the range of learners
• Alignment to the standards
• Ideas of lesson revision
Feedback
What is it and what is it not?

Feedback is information about what you did and did not do against the goal.

Feedback is not advice. Use advice to support feedback.

Tools from this training
• Getting Results: Task, Process, Relationships
• Needs of Adult Learners
• Phases of a First Year Teacher
• Engaging in Discourse – 7 Norms of Collaboration
• Differentiated Mentoring
• The Mentoring Cycle – Planning, Data Gathering and Analysis/Reflection

Obstacles/ dilemmas

• Think about utilizing some of the tools that we have explored in this training to respond to this case study.

• What kinds of questions, issues or concerns come up for you? Be specific regarding your use of “tools” from this training.

Diane Case Study Continued

At the core of our efforts is the recognition that all teachers, particularly new teachers, are learners. In addition to learning how to effectively work with a variety of students, new teachers are in the throes of developing a professional identity and navigating a new school culture. As Fuller’s classic (1969) research suggests, new educators often progress through predictable, developmental stages of concern, gradually shifting from a primary focus on survival to a primary focus on student learning.

“If you don’t evaluate where you are every three years, you get in a rut and you miss a lot. You need to shake up your thinking. ... and these new teachers help me do just that.”

Amanda Donovan – Teacher of 28 years
Newmarket Elementary School
Newmarket, NH

A Parting Thought

“If you don’t evaluate where you are every three years, you get in a rut and you miss a lot. You need to shake up your thinking. ... and these new teachers help me do just that.”

Amanda Donovan – Teacher of 28 years
Newmarket Elementary School
Newmarket, NH
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SOCIAL EMOTIONAL LEARNING CURRICULUM RESOURCES

Purpose:

The Social Emotional Learning Curriculum Resources Workgroup was charged with reviewing literature and curriculum resources for social and emotional learning and recommending resources for classroom use, educator training, and sharing with host agencies and families. The workgroup included the following:

- Kathi Titus, CES Assistant Director of the SEIS Contract
- Bill Benjamin, CES Professional Development and Curriculum Coordinator
- Debbie Corcoran, DMH Host Agency Coordinator
- Laura Finn-Heafey, CES DYS Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

The primary goals of this workgroup were to:

- research evidence-based social emotional learning (SEL) curriculum resources that align with Massachusetts guidelines for SEL and with clinical resources used in host agency programs;
- recommend a SEL curriculum resource to pilot, with input of host agency directors and potential pilot site(s);
- develop a training plan for educators; and
- compile program resources that can be shared with host agency staff and parents/families.

Activities:

The Social Emotional Learning Curriculum Resources Workgroup reviewed DESE resources and guidelines for social and emotional learning, established criteria for selecting curricular materials, and reviewed a wide-range of social emotional learning resources.

The review of DESE guidance on the components of social and emotional learning identified skills and proficiencies that may be incorporated into curricula or a student’s IEP, including:

- Self-awareness
- Self-management
- Social awareness
• Relationship skills
• Responsible decision-making

As the workgroup established review criteria aligned to SEIS and host agency needs, priority was given to resources that can be flexibly used across the curriculum and across a wide range of ages, student needs, and program types. The workgroup decided that the parent/family component of any curriculum resource should complement rather than complicate or conflict with clinical initiatives already in use across the different host agency programs (such as Dialectical Behavior Therapy, Attachment Regulation Competencies, and Sanctuary Model). The parent/family component should be simple and potentially useful to any programs or families that may wish to integrate it into their existing routines.

The workgroup established that appropriate resources meet the following criteria:

• They are evidence-based.
• They use a strength-based approach.
• They align with Positive Youth Development /Culturally Responsive Practice and with strength-based clinical initiatives in programs across different host agencies.
• They can be customized to a specific program or population’s needs or to engage students at different maturity levels.
• They can be flexibly introduced and practiced across the curriculum.
• They can be useful in both short and longer-term facilities.
• They offer parent/family materials that can align with and be useful in residential program and family settings if desired.

The Social Emotional Learning Curriculum Resources Workgroup reviewed a wide range of evidence-based social emotional learning resources. The workgroup first reviewed resources currently in use within SEIS programs, such as Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) (see reference sheets, attached). DBT is an evidence-based therapy used throughout all DYS clinical programs, and reinforced by DYS teachers in the school programs. DBT teaches the skills of mindfulness, distress tolerance, emotion regulation, and interpersonal effectiveness. All DYS teachers, including SEIS teachers who work in DYS programs, receive training in DBT principles, strategies and vocabulary as part of DYS Basic Training. The DBT reference sheets illustrate common prompts and reminders used to practice skills that have been introduced in clinical sessions.

Clinical approaches used in the residential programs of other host agencies (DMH and DPH) vary according to the different vendors involved (e.g., DBT, Attachment Regulation Competencies, and the Sanctuary Model). In all cases, SEIS teachers work with clinical program staff to understand and to learn how to reinforce the principles, strategies and vocabulary students are learning through the clinical component of the residential program. The content and availability of training and resources to help teachers follow-up with students varies from program to program.
The workgroup also reviewed other evidence-based resources. These resources were chosen from the DESE website, from the OJJDP Model Program Guide, and from Columbia University’s Teen Screen Program Database for review. The criteria listed above were used, with highest ranking given to resources that aligned with the strength-based initiatives used in SEIS and host agency programs.

The following list summarizes the materials reviewed:

• **Bullying: Ignorance is No Defense, from Utterly Global** – This high school/collegiate manual focuses on diversity, bullying, and its effects. It does not address social emotional skill building beyond those topics. It goes into detail on cyber-bullying, which SEIS already addresses within its comprehensive Internet Safety Curriculum.

• **Character Counts** – This is a collection of character-building resources for all ages, with specific anti-bullying lessons for elementary-age students. The website offers books, videos, plays and other resources, revolving around six pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. Materials are aligned with national social studies standards defined by NCSS, and connect to literature and historical figures.

• **Michigan Model** – This comprehensive health education program includes a focus on healthy relationships, which build social and emotional learning and help to prevent bullying.

• **Olweus Bullying Prevention** – This systemic positive behavior support resource includes an anti-bullying focus. Its research base addresses only effectiveness with elementary-age children, although it has been used with adolescents with anecdotal evidence of success.

• **Positive Action** – This consists of sequential, scripted lessons to build character and prevent bullying. The scripted lessons are critical to the effectiveness of this model.

• **PeaceBuilders** – This violence prevention resource is based on six principles and common language which can be integrated across the curriculum in a residential program and/or family settings. The focus is on everyone’s responsibility to build, celebrate and maintain a peaceful environment. More information is included in the attachments.

• **Teen Health Modules** – The Teen Health Modules are another comprehensive school health curriculum for grades 6 to 12. Modules include: risk assessment, self-assessment, communication, decision-making, goal setting, health advocacy, and healthy self-management.
Preliminary Recommendations:

To identify appropriate SEL curriculum resources, sample materials from the vendors listed above were reviewed. Michigan Model and Teen Health Modules, both recommended for their positive effects on social and emotional learning, are actually comprehensive health education curriculum resources as well.

The workgroup therefore recommended that the Michigan Model and the Teen Health Modules be piloted not as SEL curriculum resources, but as comprehensive health education resources. Information gleaned from the pilot will help the SEIS Professional Development and Curriculum Committee select consistent teaching resources for Health/PE across DMH facilities.

For SEL curriculum resources, Olweus and PeaceBuilders met the priority of having a strength-based approach, and focused on the key components of SEL as defined in the DESE and CASEL guidelines. Follow-up conference calls were held with both vendors to discuss whether and how their material could be customized to SEIS.

As a result, PeaceBuilders by PeacePartners, Inc. was recommended. It is the most adaptable resource to use across the curriculum and across different programs, and the easiest to customize for different audiences. It consists of a Leadership Guide, Support Staff Manual, “Peace Pack” lessons that integrate with core content areas, “Recipes for Peace” learning activities, and “Peace Pack” supplementary activities for family settings. There is a component to develop student leadership in the implementation process.

The Six Core Principles of PeaceBuilders create common language and identity. The principles are as follows:

- Praise People
- Give Up Put Downs
- Seek Wise People
- Notice Hurts I Have Caused and Make Amends
- Right Wrongs
- Help Others

The PeaceBuilders program has been used across age levels and types of programs, including a locked alternative program. It can fit into existing classroom activities rather than requiring stand-alone classes, and it aligns well with the protective factors and the vocabulary of existing initiatives (Positive Youth Development, Culturally Responsive Practice) and social-emotional curriculum resources used by different vendors and host agencies. It addresses the key components of social emotional learning, and the wide-ranging needs of SEIS.
Outcomes:

Many resources for social emotional learning have been reviewed by SEIS Coordinators and Administrators in researching this project. This information has been shared with host agency Directors and with the Program Director for two of the adolescent DMH programs, increasing collaboration between the educational program and the clinical/residential programs of our host agencies.

All of the researched information on state regulations and best practice for social and emotional learning was made available electronically for reference. This will enhance understanding of evidence-based practices and the differences between various resources.

We expect the 2013-14 implementation plan for this project to enhance the skills of all SEIS teachers and students’ social and emotional learning. SEIS teachers in DYS will have more tools to integrate DBT into their instruction. SEIS teachers in DMH will benefit from professional development provided by DMH program vendors, and from either participating in or reviewing data from the PeaceBuilders SEL pilot. SEIS teachers at MHS will renew their focus on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and may also pilot a new SEL curriculum resource later in the 2013-14 school year.

In summary, all SEIS teachers and students will benefit from this increased emphasis on social and emotional learning and positive youth development, whether it occurs through a PeaceBuilders pilot or through increased integration of clinical resources already in place.

Feedback from Host Agency Directors: Next Steps

DYS:

The preference of DYS leadership was to focus on integrating DBT skills taught in DYS clinical settings into the school-day programs, rather than to introduce PeaceBuilders or any other new SEL resource into the school-day programs. DBT strategies are already taught consistently across all residential sites. All DYS teachers, including SEIS teachers who work in DYS settings, already have a basic familiarity with the skills and techniques of DBT. Both teachers and students use the activities and prompts on the DYS-customized DBT reference sheets. In addition, the Empower Your Future life skills curriculum reinforces certain SEL competencies including self-management, self-regulation, and social awareness.

Next steps will include increasing the connection between existing clinical and school programs, offering the most seamless and comprehensive way to advance social emotional learning for students. A DBT training reference for teachers, such as a webinar, is also being considered to help teachers apply DBT prompts that strengthen social and emotional learning. Members of this workgroup will ensure that any new teaching resources to help SEIS teachers integrate DBT in DYS settings are incorporated into SEIS teacher resource binders. SEIS instructional coaches will also support the incorporation of DBT resources.
DMH:
The DMH Director of Program Management for Child and Adolescent Services reviewed the research of the SEL workgroup, and provided the group with additional research on anti-bullying. A follow-up meeting was held with a Program Director for two of the adolescent program sites. The consensus after these discussions was that SEIS/DMH collaboration on social and emotional learning is multi-faceted.

SEIS teachers need to understand the core principles and key vocabulary used in the clinical components of DMH programs, and maximize opportunities for youth to practice and develop these social and emotional learning skills throughout the school day. To do this, SEIS teachers participate in all required trainings of DMH program vendors as part of orientation to their teaching assignments.

Daily schedules are flexibly designed to allow SEIS teachers or Teaching Coordinators to participate in key meetings organized by the clinical staff at the programs. This is another important avenue of collaboration that supports social and emotional learning.

Lastly, two DMH programs, UMass Continuing Care Units I and II, will pilot SEL curriculum resources from PeaceBuilders, Inc. This vendor was chosen because its strength-based approach aligns well with the clinical approaches in DMH programs, and its vocabulary and graphics can be customized as needed. CES will make PeaceBuilders SEL resources and training available to these programs beginning in January, 2014. The purposes of the pilot are to determine how easily adaptable this SEL resource actually is, and how successful it is as a learning tool for both students and teachers. Its strength-based foundation and positive focus on social/emotional skill development gives PeaceBuilders a strong foundation on which to build connections with other DMH clinical resources.

PeaceBuilders, Inc. will provide coaching via email, phone or onsite meetings, after the SEIS Assistant Coordinator for DMH and the Teaching Coordinators for the UMass Unit I and II programs work with the materials and develop questions and training needs.

DPH:
A final recommendation is on hold pending more detailed review of the curriculum resources described in this report by the Director of the Massachusetts Hospital School and the MHS clinical staff. MHS has participated in professional development and follow-up consultation on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Any new SEL resources introduced by SEIS would need to align with the existing PBIS initiative.
References:
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1. DBT Reference Sheets One and Two (2008)

2. Introduction to PeaceBuilders

3. The Science of PeaceBuilders

4. Research & Publications About PeaceBuilders
### Mindfulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wise Mind</td>
<td>A combination of &quot;emotion mind&quot; (emotional experiencing) and &quot;reasonable mind&quot; (problem solving and logical experiencing). <strong>Example:</strong> If you're angry at a friend, explaining your anger in a gentle manner using your words and not your fists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>Just notice. Allow yourself to experience in the moment whatever is happening. <strong>Examples of things to observe:</strong> objects, events, emotions, thoughts, situations, the way your body feels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>Put into words. Use your words to describe things you observe. <strong>Examples of things to describe:</strong> objects, events, emotions, thoughts, situations, the way your body feels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate</td>
<td>Become completely involved in an activity. &quot;Losing yourself&quot; in what you are doing in the moment. <strong>Examples:</strong> losing yourself in a video game, book, drawing, sport, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonjudgmental stance (nonjudgmentally)</td>
<td>Using just the facts rather than stating your opinion. Seeing things as neither good nor bad, but just &quot;as it is.&quot; <strong>Example:</strong> Instead of saying someone is &quot;stupid,&quot; you could say that &quot;he does not understand.&quot; Instead of saying &quot;pizza is the best food in the world&quot; (judgment), you could say that &quot;you really like to eat pizza&quot; (the facts).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (effectively)</td>
<td>Focusing on what works. Doing what is necessary in a situation without focusing on what is &quot;fair.&quot; <strong>Example:</strong> Instead of thinking of how unfair your circumstance is, focus on how you will get through it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Mindfulness (one-mindfully)</td>
<td>Doing things in the moment. Focusing your mind and awareness on the current moment's activity, rather than splitting your attention among several activities or thoughts. <strong>Example:</strong> Focusing completely on a favorite activity, conversation, a chore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distract with Accepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRACT with ACCEPTS</td>
<td>Activities: Doing something active. <strong>Examples:</strong> exercise, hobbies, cleaning, calling a friend or family member. Contributing: Contributing to someone. <strong>Examples:</strong> do volunteer work, give something to someone, do something nice for someone. Comparisons: Comparing yourself to someone less fortunate. <strong>Examples:</strong> thinking of those who do not have a roof over their heads or food to eat. Emotions: Doing something that creates a different emotions than the one you are feeling. <strong>Example:</strong> If you are sad, watch a funny television show. Pushing away: Pushing the situation away by leaving it for a while. Leaving the situation mentally. <strong>Example:</strong> Build an imaginary wall between yourself and the situation a while, take space from someone who is bothering you. Remember to not avoid! Thoughts: Distract yourself with thoughts. <strong>Examples:</strong> count to ten, count colors in a painting or tree, do puzzles, watch TV, read. Sensations: Distract yourself with an intense sensation. <strong>Example:</strong> Hold ice in your hand, squeeze a rubber ball, take a hot shower. (IMPORTANT: the sensation cannot be so intense that it is harmful to your body. Example: scalding water, cutting, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF SOOTHE</td>
<td>Comforting, nurturing, and being gentle and kind to yourself. <strong>Example:</strong> Eat &amp; savor your favorite food, smell your favorite scent, listen to soothing music, touch something soft, look at soothing pictures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IMPROVE | Imagery: Imagining relaxing scenes. Imagining everything going well. Imagining hurtful emotions draining out of you. **Example:** Imagining the beach, a safe place in your life, feeling calm. Meaning: Finding or creating some purpose, meaning, or value in the pain you are feeling. Remembering spiritual values (if they are important to you). **Example:** Realizing that there is a reason for having to go through this pain.) Prayer: Opening your heart to a supreme being, greater wisdom, God, or your own wise mind. Asking for strength to bear the pain in the moment. Relaxation: Relaxing your muscles. Find other ways to relax. **Examples:** listening to relaxing music, exercising, taking a shower. One thing in the moment: Focusing your entire attention on just what you are doing right now. Keeping yourself in the present. Focusing your entire attention on one task. Vacation: Giving yourself a brief vacation. **Examples:** getting in to bed and pulling the covers over your head for 10 minutes, taking a break from the task you are doing.) Encouragement: Cheerlead yourself. **Example:** "I can do this!"
<p>| PROS AND CONS | Thinking of the positive and negative things about tolerating distress and the positive and negative things about not tolerating distress. <strong>Example:</strong> Thinking of the good and bad things about punching someone when angry. Thinking about the good and bad things about not punching someone when angry. |
| Radical ACCEPTANCE | Letting go of fighting reality. Accepting that a situation is what it is, especially when it cannot be changed. This has to come from deep within and be complete. <strong>Example:</strong> Accepting that you are in DYS at this moment in your life and moving on to work on your goals. |
| Turning the Mind | Turn your mind toward an acceptance stance. Make a conscious effort to re-commit to acceptance. <strong>Example:</strong> Accept you need to take medication at every dose. |
| Willingness v. willfulness | Be willing and open to doing what is effective. Let go of a willful stance which goes against acceptance. Keep your eye on your goal in front of you. <strong>Example:</strong> Do chores, groups, etc. even when you don't want to as it later gets what you may want more—an improved life, more independence, etc. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M</strong></th>
<th><strong>O</strong></th>
<th><strong>T</strong></th>
<th><strong>E</strong></th>
<th><strong>O</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Story of emotion”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Story of Emotion:</strong> Prompting event (What started the problem?) → Interpretation of the event (What did you think about that?) → Body sensations (What did you feel in your body? What was your experience?) → Body language (What was your body doing at the time?: facial expression, posture, etc. What did you say?) → Action urge (What did you want to do at that moment?) → Action (What did you actually do?) → <strong>EMOTION NAME</strong> (What emotion were you feeling as a result of this situation?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposite Action</strong></td>
<td>Change emotions by acting opposite to your current emotion. Do it ALL THE WAY. <strong>Example:</strong> When you are angry, gently avoid the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive activity</strong></td>
<td>Building positive experiences in your life. Increasing pleasant activities that give you positive emotions. (Be sure to focus on that positive feeling.) <strong>Example:</strong> Playing a game you enjoy and be mindful of the experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Please Master</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P L (Treat Physical Illness)</strong></td>
<td>Treat Physical Illness: Take care of your body. Seeing a doctor when you need to. Taking prescribed medication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E (Balanced Eating)</strong></td>
<td>Balanced Eating: Don’t eat too much or too little.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A (Avoid Mood-Altering Drugs)</strong></td>
<td>Avoid Mood-Altering Drugs: Don’t take non-prescribed drugs, including alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S (Balanced Sleep)</strong></td>
<td>Balanced Sleep: Try to get the amount of sleep that makes you feel good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E (Get Exercise)</strong></td>
<td>Get Exercise: Do some sort of exercise each day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build MASTERY</strong></td>
<td>Build Mastery: Try to do one thing a day that makes you feel competent and in control. (Example: lean a new skill, practice a skill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mindfully Experiencing Emotion, Letting Go of Emotional Suffering</strong></td>
<td>Observing and experiencing your emotion, remembering you are not your emotion, and accepting your emotion. Thinking that emotions are like waves: they overwhelm you, and then they pass. <strong>Example:</strong> Observing and experiencing your anger, realizing you are not an angry person (you are just experiencing anger), and accepting the anger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEARMAN</strong></td>
<td>Describe: Describe the current situation (if necessary). <strong>Example:</strong> “I had a horrible day today.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D (Describe)</strong></td>
<td>Express: Express your feelings and opinions about the situation. <strong>Example:</strong> “I’m feeling really upset about what happened.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E (Express)</strong></td>
<td>Assert: Assert yourself by asking for what you want or saying no clearly. Don’t assume that people can read your mind. <strong>Example:</strong> “Do you think we could sit down and talk for a few minutes?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A (Assert)</strong></td>
<td>Reinforce: Reinforce or reward the person ahead of time by explaining the positive effects of giving you what you want or need or for accepting “no.” <strong>Example:</strong> “I think I would feel a whole lot better if I could just talk about it.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R (Reinforce)</strong></td>
<td>Stay Mindful: Keep your focus on your goals in the situation. Maintain your position. Don’t get distracted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M (Stay Mindful)</strong></td>
<td>Appear Confident: Appear confident and competent. Use a confident tone of voice and physical manner. Make good eye contact. No stammering, whispering, staring at the floor, or saying “I’m not sure,” etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A (Appear Confident)</strong></td>
<td>Negotiate: Be willing to give to get. Offer and ask for alternative solutions to the problem. Reduce your request. Maintain no, but offer to do something else or solve the problem another way. Focus on what will work. <strong>Example:</strong> “If you can’t meet with me now, maybe later?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (Negotiate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Things to consider for DEARMAN...6 Ws</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give</strong></td>
<td>Who is the right person to ask or say not to? What is the question you want to ask or is the request the you are declining? When is a good time to ask or say no? Where should this communication take place? Why are you asking or saying no? Which of the other Interpersonal Effectiveness skill should you use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G (Be Gentle)</strong></td>
<td>Gentle: Be courteous. No verbal or physical attacks. No threats. No judging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I (Act Interested)</strong></td>
<td>Interested: Listen and be interested in the other person, his or her point of view, opinion, reasons for saying no, or reasons for making a request. Don’t interrupt or talk over. Be sensitive to the other person’s desire to have the discussion at a later time. Be patient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V (Validate)</strong></td>
<td>Validate: Acknowledge the other person’s feelings, wants, difficulties, and opinions about the situation. Be nonjudgmental out loud. <strong>Example:</strong> “I can understand how you feel, but…” “I realize this is hard for you, but…” “I see that you are busy, and…”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E (Use an Easy Manner)</strong></td>
<td>Easy Manner: Use a little humor. Smile. Ease the person along. Be light-hearted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast</strong></td>
<td>Be Fair: Be fair to yourself and to the other person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F (Be Fair)</strong></td>
<td>No Apologies: Don’t over-apologize. Don’t apologize for being alive or for making a request. Don’t apologize for having an opinion or for disagreeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A (No Apologies)</strong></td>
<td>Stick to Your Values: Stick to your own values. Don’t sell out your values or integrity for reasons that aren’t very important. Be clear on what you believe is the moral or valued way of thinking. <strong>Stick to your guns.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S (Stick to your values)</strong></td>
<td>Be Truthful: Don’t lie, act helpless when you are not, or exaggerate. Don’t make up excuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T (Be Truthful)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to PeaceBuilders

**Purpose Statement:**

PeaceBuilders provide staff development and curriculum in the areas of resiliency skill building, violence/bullying prevention, character education, positive site culture to certificated and classified personnel who work with youth in grades Pre-K through 12.

**PeaceBuilders:**

Science-based and research-validated, the PeaceBuilders experience is designed to become a “way of life”, not merely a curriculum. It assists site leaders and staff in developing a core sense of safety, belonging, support, and competency in dealing with life’s most stressful situations and disappointments.

PeaceBuilders’ goal is to alter the climate and culture by positively changing characteristics of the site that can trigger aggressive behavior, developing positive relationships between peers, site leaders, and staff; directly teaching nonviolent attitudes, values, and beliefs; and by providing incentives for young people to display these behaviors in the school, after school and/or community setting. At a PeaceBuilders site, it is these positive behaviors that are more likely to earn attention from peers and adults alike.

PeaceBuilders is recommended for all staff and community members, young and old, on the right track or not, and is practiced daily in all places on and around campus. PeaceBuilders teaches six simple principles through the use of our flexible, skill-based curriculum and adult training along with follow-up coaching and instructional support:

- **Praise People**
- **Notice Hurts**
- **Give-Up Put-Downs**
- **Right Wrongs**
- **Seek Wise People**
- **Help Others**

These daily practices, which are based on scientific studies, become routine, and, when taught, modeled and practiced faithfully, move youth, according to the writers of *Antisocial Behavior in School: Evidence-Based Practices*, in the direction of “caring, altruism, self-regulation and positive relationships with key social agents in their lives (peers and adults)”.

**Rationale:**

Documented published results of implementing the PeaceBuilders program:

- **February-May 2000, 82% decrease in physical aggression** and August 2000-February 2001, 89% decrease in physical aggression *Developmental Psychology, 2003, pages 292-308*

- **Between 1994-1996, rates of confirmed fighting-related injuries did not change significantly in the PeaceBuilders intervention schools, but increased 56% in the control schools and visits to the nurse for injury-related visits decreased by 12.6%** *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 1997, pages 459-463*
• 94% of teachers saw decreased school violence and 94% increase pro social interactions. *School Counseling Brief, 3.1*

• **PeaceBuilders is a universal cost effective program** and benefits an entire population of children not just the at-risk group. *Evaluation of a school-based universal violence prevention program, Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, Vol. 2, No. 2, April 2004*

Testimonials:

• **Suspensions Decreased by 50%** in the first year (Bragg Elementary, Cerritos, CA)

• **Fights Decreased by 80%** in the first year (Pima County Elementary Schools, Tucson, AZ)

• **Office Referrals Decreased by 50%** (PS 132, Bronx, NY)

• **Calls to the Police Decreased by 73%** (Deborah Tennant-Zinewicz 7-12 school, Norwich, CT)

• **Standardized Test Score Rankings Increased by 80 Points in 3 Years** (Christopher Elementary, San Jose, CA)

• **Assaults Decreased by 58% and Thefts Decreased by 67%** (Hemet Unified School District, Hemet, CA)

• **Bullying Drastically Reduced and Student Attendance Increased to 94%** (Assabet Valley Regional Vocational High School, Marlborough, MA)

Awards & Recognitions:

• **The White House – Helping Americas Youth Community Guide** identifies PeaceBuilders as a Level 1 Program – Level one reflects programs with the highest quality research design

• **U.S. Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools** names PeaceBuilders as a “Promising Program”

• **U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**, recognizes PeaceBuilders as an “Exemplary Program”

• **California Department of Education** names PeaceBuilders to its “Science-Based Programs” list

• **California Healthy Kids Resource Center** recognizes PeaceBuilders as “Research-Validated”

1st Trimester, staff will be trained and begin implementation of the PeaceBuilders curriculum.

• A four-hour on-site training on the basic PeaceBuilders model is offered to all certificated and classified staff on campus.

• A two-hour implementation meeting with your PeaceBuilders planning committee or coordinator facilitated by a PeacePartners representative.

2nd Trimester, coaching and implementation begin.

• PeacePartners also offers access to a “Wise Person” via phone or email to help coach each site. This continues throughout the year, for up to ten hours (per site) for the first year.
• Each site begins by setting expectations and norms for a positive culture by introducing youth to the six PeaceBuilders principles. This is followed by focusing individually on each of the six principles in monthly installments. An abbreviated version of the month-to-month implementation is provided by PeacePartners. See attached.

3rd Trimester, daily implementation plan continues.
• Coaching continues.
• Month-to-month implementation continues.
• Included with the curriculum are black-line masters, supplemental activities and translated materials available online at the PeaceBuilders website.

Options to Ensure Success of PeaceBuilders in Subsequent Years:
(Also available during the first year of implementation)

Parent Workshops
PeaceBuilders Parent workshops are designed to teach parents techniques to create a peaceful home and a positive learning experience for their child. Parent workshops are a perfect way to develop parental involvement with the site and to increase the use of the PeaceBuilders common language at school, home and throughout the community.

New Activities and Solution Building Workshops
This three hour workshop is designed to offer current sites solution building strategies that address any challenges the site is experiencing along with new activities to enhance the program. The workshop is customized to meet the site’s needs, invigorate the staff and jumpstart the program.

New Activities Workshops
This two hour workshop will offer staff members new ideas and activities to refresh and rejuvenate the PeaceBuilders program. This is ideal for sites that have been using the program for a while and are ready for some new and inspirational ideas.

PeaceCoach Workshops
This three hour workshop trains young PeaceBuilders, 10 years old and above, to be leaders and role-models at your site and in your community. They will explore the PeaceBuilders Principles from a leadership perspective and enjoy hands on practice to put those principles into action in the form of activities they can recreate with youth groups at your site. One adult, from the participating site, must be present for every twenty youth trained. To accommodate your needs we are providing this workshop in either a two and three hour session.

PeaceBuilders Abbreviated Month by Month Implementation Plan

In order to meet the needs of each individual site, the PeaceBuilders program has been designed to allow flexibility in the manner of implementation. In order to get the same results that were obtained in the original research on PeaceBuilders, however, some standard practices must be implemented faithfully and these practices are listed below.

Faithful Implementation:
• PeaceBuilders Pledge is recited daily.
• Adults model the PeaceBuilders Principles.
• PraiseNotes are given daily and displayed on Praise Boards.
• PeaceBuilders language is used.
• An active leadership team is present and young people are involved.

741 Atlantic Avenue • Long Beach, California 90813
1-877-4-peaceNow • Fax: 562-590-3902 • www.peacebuilders.com
• PeaceBuilders posters and signs are visible.
• Adults greet each young person daily.
• PeaceBuilders strategies are used in behavior management.
• PeaceBuilders lessons are taught.

The following month by month implementation plan is a suggested plan and will ensure everyone at your site is focusing on the same principle at the same time. Such a plan creates unity and also ensures that each principle is thoroughly ingrained in the hearts and minds of all children and staff. This is an abbreviated version of the month by month implementation plan; the full version provides lesson ideas for each PeaceBuilders principle.

**Months 1 & 2: What is Peace? An Introduction to PeaceBuilders Principles**

**Month 3: Praise People**

**Month 4: Give Up Put-Downs**

**Month 5 & 6: Seek Wise People**

**Month 7: Notice Hurts**

**Month 8: Right Wrongs**

**Month 9: Help Others**

**PeaceBuilders Approximate Pricing in a PreK-12 Setting**

PeacePartners’ goal is to create a custom implementation plan for each of our partners. Actual costs vary, based on site-specific factors, such as:

- Number and age of kids you serve
- Curriculum needs and implementation tools you select
- Size of your staff and staff development arrangements you prefer
- Number of sites you have

As a general rule of thumb in the school-based Pre-K through 12 setting, our all-inclusive pricing including site license, curriculum and professional development training factors to less than $200 per adult trained.

**Each site pays one initial lifetime site license fee. Unlike other programs, we charge NO annual site license renewal fees!**

PeaceBuilders sites range in size from a single adult working with a handful of kids...to entire cities, such as the city of Burbank, California!

*PeaceBuilders is NOT a one-size-fits-all program. We DO NOT just sell you a book and wish you luck!*

**PeacePartners...Building Peace...One Partner at a Time!**

741 Atlantic Avenue ★ Long Beach, California 90813
1-877-4-peacenow ★ Fax: 562-590-3902 ★ www.peacebuilders.com
PeaceBuilders is a science-based program. This means that when the program was created by a team of psychologists and education professionals, they applied the proven findings of a number of research studies. PeaceBuilders is also a research-validated program. This means that after PeaceBuilders was implemented, research was done to measure the impact of the program on the lives of children. Those findings are significant.

In one of the most famous studies on resiliency, Dr. Emmy Werner conducted a 31-year study looking at “at-risk” children. These children were exposed to many “risk factors” in their environments, such as poverty, abuse, substance abuse, mental illness and lack of education. Many of these children grew up having some of the same issues as their parents, resulting in a lack of success in interpersonal relationships, education and employment. Yet, some of these children grew up to be “resilient,” that is, they were able to “bounce back” from the risk and to be successful in relationships, education, and employment.

The study focused on why some children “made it” and others did not. The most significant and profound factor in the lives of successful children was the presence of a caring, nurturing adult in their childhood; someone who believed in them and expected the best from them. Most often, this person was a teacher. PeaceBuilders teaches young people to seek out these adults in their lives and to gain the skills and integrity to become the kind of adults who can provide this kind of care and dedication to others.

In a famous study called the “Robbers Cave,” two groups of eleven-year-old boys were chosen to attend a special camp during the summer. Each group was given a group name with t-shirts and flags. Soon, there were put-downs, name-calling and aggression. Merging
the two groups did not help. Only when there was a **common language** and **common purpose**; getting food and water for the whole camp, was the aggressive behavior changed and there was a sense of camaraderie established.

In another study by Dr. Dennis Embry, a **language of identity** was used to help young children choose safe behaviors. I am a Safe Player. Safe Players (desired behavior, eg. Wear a bike helmet, look both ways before crossing, etc.) Thus, in the PeaceBuilders Pledge™, all people at the site, adults or young people say, “I am a PeaceBuilder.” The pledge also describes the kind and caring behaviors that PeaceBuilders do. When young people misbehave, adults ask, “What would a PeaceBuilder do?” This reminds children of their positive identity and helps them align their behavior with it.

PeaceBuilders uses the practice of praising young people for kind, caring, and responsible behavior. This is based on the Seattle Social Development Study, which showed that when all school adults greeted students, using their names and showing personal interest in them, and gave out “caught being good” notes, substance abuse and teen pregnancy were dramatically reduced ten years later.

G. Roy Mayer also did studies in south central Los Angeles. Adults did two things: Avoided accidental reinforcement of negative behavior, such as calling out a young person’s name in front of the class or writing a name on the board and gave notes of praise for prosocial behavior. Problem behavior, vandalism and school dropping out were reduced and academic achievement increased.

PeaceBuilders is also based on brain science. Two substances in the human brain are notable in the discussion about aggression and violence or peace: serotonin and dopamine. When levels of serotonin are normal, people are more able to think abstractly and therefore more ready to learn and achieve. They feel positive, friendly and cooperative. Serotonin is decreased by insults, perceived threats and through being the target of aggression. This leads to depression, which decreases the ability to learn. It can also lead to aggression and violence as seen in some of the school violence incidents that have been publicized in the past few years. Dopamine is released when a person achieves a goal, such as in winning a game, or learning something new, or getting a good grade. It may also be released when someone does something that is wrong. It may be helpful to think
of it as “the thrill of getting away with something.” It is therefore, important that adults who work with young people are both strict and caring, and that they do not reinforce negative behavior. PeaceBuilders promotes a style of positive classroom management, designed to achieve the highest possible prosocial behavior on the part of young people.

PeaceBuilders is research-validated. In a comparison study funded by the Centers for Disease Control, nine of 80 schools implemented PeaceBuilders. These schools were chosen because of violence, crime, drugs and poverty. Students in these schools were followed for five years. When there is violence, there are symptoms of victimization. Young people usually go to the school nurse’s office for these. In the PeaceBuilders schools, there were far fewer visits to the nurse’s office for fighting injuries and illnesses. Young people who are bullied are often affected by real or imagined illnesses in order to escape the threatening environment. These problems affect attendance, legal liability and the potential for a “persistently dangerous” ranking. There were also significantly fewer office visits for discipline and therefore, fewer suspensions. Students at the PeaceBuilders schools demonstrated increased social competence. They were better adjusted to school and had improved social skills. Low levels of social competence predict juvenile delinquency, violent crime and school failure. The study also found that PeaceBuilders benefits high risk aggressive children the most. These children reported more decreases in aggression and more increases in social competence in comparison to children at medium and low levels of risk. This is a remarkable finding, but is predictable from the core theory of the science of peace that predicts aggressive and difficult behaviors are adaptive for children living, learning and navigating social environments with high levels of violence.

When introduced to the simple philosophy and strategies of PeaceBuilders, most people think, “Why of course it works!” PeaceBuilders stands upon a strong foundation of research, yet some may also say that we must only go to the “Academy of Common Sense.”

As PeaceBuilders is implemented in more than 600 sites across Northern America and U.S. Territories in schools, after-school organizations, youth groups and community programs, reports indicate more positive environments, fewer discipline problems and much happier places to live, grow, learn, work and play.
Research & Publications About PeaceBuilders

2012

- PeaceBuilders is currently under review by the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP).

2011

- **Hope Through Housing Foundation Violence Prevention Program: Year III Results** - Joelle K. Greene, Ph.D. & Yoon Elle Uh, M.A.


- **Child Trends: Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Social Interventions (March 2011)** - Tawana Bandy, B.S. and Kristin A. Moore, Ph.D.

2010

- **Hope Through Housing Foundation Violence Prevention Program: Year II Results** - Joelle K. Greene, Ph.D. & Yoon Elle Uh, M.A.

2009

- **Hope Through Housing Foundation Violence Prevention Program: Year I Results** - Joelle K. Greene, Ph.D. & Yoon Elle Uh, M.A.

2008

- **The School Practitioner's Concise Companion to Preventing Violence and Conflict** - Cynthia Franklin, Mary Beth Harris, Paula Allen-Meares

2007

- **Success in Education Through Peace, Healing, and Hope** - Karen J. Rusthoven, Ed.D., Community of Peace Academy

- **Case Study on the Impact of the PeaceBuilders**, Department of Educational Leadership, Azusa Pacific University

- **Effectiveness of Universal School-Based Programs to Prevent Violent and Aggressive Behavior**, Robert Hahn, Ph.D., et. al.
• **Examining a Global Pastoral Care Program To Create Safer School Communities** - Lisa McKay-Brown, PhD Candidate MEd, BA(Psych), DipT(Prim) Cert IV Workplace Training and Assessment, The University of Melbourne

• **A Prevention Process for Schools and their Communities.**

2005

• **Does the PeaceBuilders Intervention Reduce Violence in Schools?** School Counseling Research Brief 3.1. Center for School Counseling Outcome Research

• **Creating Persistently Peaceful Homes, Classrooms, Schools and Communities: Theory, Strategies, Science, and Results in National Safe Schools Conference.** Hamilton Fish Institute, Phillidelphia, PA - Embry, D.D. and L. Quiles.

2004

• **Comprehensive Classroom Management: Creating Communities of Support and Solving Problems** - Vern & Louise Jones

• **Antisocial Behavior in School: Evidence-Based Practices** - Hill M. Walker, Elizabeth Ramsey, Frank M. Gresham

• **City of Burbank PeaceBuilders Survey** Pupil Services Department

• **Evaluation of a School-Based, Universal Violence Prevention Program: Low-, Medium-, and High-Risk Children.** Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice - Vazsonyi, A.T., L.M. Belliston, D.J. Flannery

  “The current investigation examined the differential effectiveness of PeaceBuilders, a large-scale, universal violence prevention program, on male and female youth identified as low, medium, or high risk for future violence. It included eight urban schools randomly assigned to intensive intervention and wait-list control conditions.”

2003

• **Santa Clara Vallley Health Department PeaceBuilders School Evaluation Data**

• **Initial Behavior Outcomes for the PeaceBuilders Universal School-Based Violence Prevention Program.** Developmental Psychology - Flannery, D.J., et al.

  “Results over a two-year period demonstrated a statistically significant increase in student pro-social behavior in favor of the intervention group, as measured by teacher reports of social competence. Results also showed a decline, although not to a statistically significant degree, in student aggressive behavior in favor of the intervention group, as measured by teacher reports of social competence and student reports of peace-building behavior.”
• **Evaluation Plan: PeaceBuilders Implementation**, San Diego State University

**2001**

• **Lake Washington School District PeaceBuilders Project.**

• **PeaceBuidlers as a Model for Social Skills Improvement in Arizona**, Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind

**2000**

• **CDC Grant U81 Evaluation of PeaceBuilders**, Daniel J. Flannery, Ph.D., Kent State University

• **Best Practices of Youth Violence Prevention**, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

**1999**

• **Two sides of the coin: Multi-level prevention and intervention to reduce youth violent behavior**, in *Youth Violence: Prevention, Intervention and Social Policy* - Embry, D.D. & D.J. Flannery

• **Reducing and Preventing Violence in Schools: A case for PeaceBuilders**, Queensland University of Technology.

• **Youth Violence Prevention: The State of the Science.**

**1998**

• **Reducing Violence through Community**, Associate Professor Simon Petrie & Dr. Gayre Christie, Justice Studies, Faculty of Law - Queensland University of Technology

• **Children, schools, and communities united in a celebration for peace**, Loma Linda University. Adventist Health Sciences Center.

**1997**


“Between 1993-1994 and 1994-1995, the rate of visits/1,000 student days decreased 12.6% in the intervention schools while remaining unchanged in the comparison schools. The same trend was detected for injury-related visits. Rates of fighting-related injuries changed little in the intervention schools but increased 56.0% in the control schools. An analysis of covariance confirmed that injuries and visits to nurses decreased in intervention schools relative to control schools.”
GOAL 1

SECTION 5

Curriculum and Planning at the Massachusetts Hospital School

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
CURRICULUM AND PLANNING
AT THE MASSACHUSETTS HOSPITAL SCHOOL

Purpose:

CES’s curriculum and planning work at the Massachusetts Hospital School was designed to help teachers access curriculum resources and plan lessons in support of standards-based teaching and learning. The primary purpose of the Curriculum and Planning Project is to develop a uniform approach to lesson planning organized around the three basic elements of content, skills, and assessment.

The MHS Curriculum and Planning Project is a multi-year initiative to develop an online curriculum data-base, and identify and address curriculum gaps. The curriculum is composed of “mini-units,” or lesson plans that include standards-based content, skills, and assessment.

The goals of the Curriculum and Planning Project are to:

• train teacher leaders in curriculum mapping technology;
• train and coach teachers in how to access planning resources to develop mini-units; and
• assess and refine alignment of mini-units to standards-based content, skills, and assessment.

The central focus of this work is development of an electronic curriculum map of mini-units taught across ELA, Math, and Science content areas and inclusive of Life Skills. It is described below under Curriculum Mapping. The map is intended to allow teachers to understand what is going on with other classes, and to borrow and adapt lesson plans from a plan library for their own instruction. It also provides a mechanism for supervisors and administrators to determine what standards from the current Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks are being taught at the Massachusetts Hospital School.

There are two additional activities related to this work that support teachers in creating the mini-unit and/or lesson plans, which form the foundation of the curriculum map:

Unique Learning System (ULS): The Unique Learning System is an online curriculum resource that allows educators to download monthly thematic units of study, geared toward students with special needs. ULS is aligned with the Common Core State Standards in ELA and/ Literacy, and Mathematics, and uses instructional targets as a bridge between the standards and the special education curriculum content. It is described in more detail below.
**MHS Curriculum Resources Wiki:** Wikispaces was used to create a website listing online resources available to MHS educators which can be added to and accessed by teachers throughout MHS. It is described in more detail below.

## CURRICULUM MAPPING

### Activities:

During the 2011-2012 school year (the first year of the initiative), instructional coaches and consultants provided professional development to three cohorts of teacher leaders in support of curriculum mapping technology in a “train the trainer” modality. In year two of the initiative, MHS educators developed essential questions and associated instructional delivery plans through a mini-unit planning process. Through this process, teachers created 65 standards-based mini-unit plans.

A mini-unit plan template helped teachers identify and align learning goals with standards-based content, skills and assessments. Teacher aides assisted with data collection of content area skills and assessment to inform mini-unit planning decisions. Mini-unit planning was further supported by job-embedded instructional coaching as well as ongoing one-on-one, small-group, and large-group professional development sessions.

The instructional coach began to build a MHS curriculum map by entering the mini-unit plans into the Instructional Planner/Curriculum Mapper software. The coach provided support to teachers for mini-unit planning across content areas, and helped administrators, head teachers, teachers, and teacher aides understand the goals and outcomes of the MHS Curriculum Mapping process.

Outside content area consultants accessed the curriculum map and used the mini-unit review rubrics to analyze the mini-unit plans for alignment of learning and language objectives with standards-based content, skills and assessments. The consultants made recommendations to the SEIS/MHS Administrative Instructional Group concerning ways to support the current and future mini-unit planning.

### Completed Activities:

**Year One**

- Introductory work with each of three cohorts of teachers
- Collating, building, and aligning the curriculum with the standards within a small representative team of teachers in each core area
- Reviewing, revising and planning for implementation with each of the three teacher cohorts
- Coaching teachers in curriculum mapping with support from content area consultants
• Utilizing the Curriculum Mapper software system
• Beginning the process with Math, then ELA, then science, with Life Skills embedded across all content areas

Year Two
• Building the curriculum map
• Coaching teachers in curriculum mapping with support from content area consultants
• Utilizing the Curriculum Mapper, Instructional Planner and Unique Learning Systems software
• Continuing the development of the Math, ELA and Science curriculum map, and adding the Social Studies component (Life Skills was embedded across all content areas.)

Outcomes:

During the 2012-2013 school year, all MHS educators submitted at least one mini-unit plan each quarter that described a lesson’s content, delivery, and assessment. Mini-unit plans were in four areas: ELA, Science, Math, and Life Skills (some topics lent themselves to lessons in more than one area). Content area consultants reviewed the mini-unit plans and made recommendations for ways in which the plans could be strengthened within the following three areas:

• Alignment within the mini-unit plan of the learning and language objectives, content, and activities with the targeted standards
• Instructional supports (responsive to varied student learning needs)
• Assessment

Over the course of the year, content area consultants reported an increased number of mini-unit plans that did not require any recommendations for improvement, from two or three during the first half of the year to eight in the final quarter (see attached MHS Mini-Unit Plan Outcomes report). The number of recommendations related to assessment dropped sharply after peaking during the second quarter, and the number of recommendations related to instructional supports declined during the second and third quarter but increased again during the fourth quarter. The number of recommendations related to alignment within the mini-unit plan stayed about the same over the course of the year.

The Instructional Planner/Curriculum Mapper software also allowed users to create reports (see attachments for sample report) that show which curriculum areas are covered by existing lesson plans and where gaps still remain. The tables below show examples of the analysis that can be done from the Curriculum Mapper reports, showing what percent of standards are covered for different content areas and types of assessment.
### Common Core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Number of Standards</th>
<th>Number/Percent of Standards Covered by Mini-Unit Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anchor</td>
<td>Grade-Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts Grades 9-10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (as applied to Transitions)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Number of Standards</th>
<th>Number/Percent of Standards Covered by Mini-Unit Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Concepts/Topics/General Standards</td>
<td>Learning Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Concepts/Topics/General Standards</td>
<td>Learning Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAS Math Alternative Assessment Grades 9-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Grades 9-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US History 1 &amp; 2 Grades 9-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAS English Language Arts Alternative Assessment Grades 9-10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Steps:

A Curriculum and Learning platform has been added to the existing Aspen Student Information System, and existing data from the Instruction Planner/Curriculum Mapper online curriculum mapping software will be migrated to this platform. During year three of the initiative, teachers will begin to implement the entire mini-unit planning process and curriculum mapping electronically, using the new platform. The X2 Development Corporation will provide onsite training for supervisors and administrators to help them assist teachers to use the new software to create mini-unit and/or lesson plans, and to build the MHS curriculum map across content areas.
UNIQUE LEARNING SYSTEM

Activities:

MHS began subscribing to Unique Learning System (ULS) in spring of 2012. Over the spring and fall of that year, the instructional coach downloaded and archived ULS curriculum units as they were published.

CES contracted with Dale Gardner-Fox, an education consultant and professional development facilitator, to review materials, brainstorm with teachers and the coach about access issues, and provide support to individual teachers on request. Unit topics were provided to MHS teachers during cluster meetings and individual planning sessions.

In November 2012, the Transition grade band of ULS was demonstrated to MHS teachers during a professional development day. Teachers provided feedback and suggestions for refinement of the indexing system used for archived units.

During the winter and spring of 2013, the instructional coach revised the indexing system for ULS, creating an Excel template for each grade band. The coach also continued downloading and categorizing monthly units as they were published, and continued to provide support to teachers who were using the materials to construct instructional units. Several teachers were supported in modifying materials to meet the access needs of specific students.

Outcomes:

By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, MHS supervisors observed teachers using ULS in five of the 16 MHS classrooms. In the fall of 2012, supervisors observed ULS elements in eight classrooms.

ULS materials were listed in eight instructional units submitted for the Curriculum Mapping Project during the 2012-2013 school year.

In the spring of 2012, the ULS resources were introduced to all teachers through Cluster meetings and individual planning sessions.

The ULS Transition Passport was incorporated into the routines of two different classrooms. Students who commenced this year took their binders with them to their next placement.

As of the end of the 2012-2013 school year, five teachers requested the indexed DVDs (see next steps below) be mailed to their home so they could plan over the summer. Of these five teachers, only two had previously used the materials in their instructional planning.
Next Steps:

MHS supervisors will complete the indexing of downloaded ULS units for each of the five grade bands and create DVDs of the index to be distributed to MHS educators.

MHS supervisors expect to continue the subscription to ULS, with the MHS coach downloading all units each month for archiving and indexing. ULS will be supported through the following:

- Sharing of instructional units
- Standardization of Transition Passport development
- Planning meetings
- Cluster meetings

MHS will also consider exploring different indexing tools and the use of tags for their digital archive of curriculum units. In addition, the possibility of web-based centralized digital storage of index units will be explored, so teachers can review materials and construct their plans off campus.

WIKI

Activities:

This project started in April of 2012. The instructional coach used Wikispaces, a free online service that allows users to create a website that others can add to and modify, to create a “wiki,” or designated space on the web for sharing information. The wiki contained a list of resources available to MHS educators. Educators were then invited to create an account and access the wiki. Technology teachers used the wiki to post links to useful websites, and the wiki was demonstrated during an MHS professional development day. The instructional coach oriented new teachers to the wiki as they started work at MHS.

Outcomes:

- The wiki was accessed by 32 educators and administrators out of a total 40 invitations.
- The wiki was also used by the tech teachers to create useful websites for teachers’ reference.

Next Steps:

While Wikispaces was a useful tool to start to provide teachers with easy access to resources, it required an additional username/password combination for teachers to remember before they could get to the resource information they needed. Combining the information contained in the wiki with a listing of ALL instructional resources would be most beneficial for MHS educators in the form of a one-stop tool. Until such a tool is acquired, the wiki will be updated as needed as resources are added and sign-in information is changed.
SECTION 5– ATTACHMENTS

Curriculum and Planning
at the Massachusetts
Hospital School

Supporting Teachers,
Strengthening
Educational Services

2008-2013
Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
ATTACHMENTS

Goal 1 | Section 5: Curriculum and Planning at the Massachusetts Hospital School

1. Mini-Unit Plan Template
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## Mini-Unit Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Name and Email:</th>
<th>Program Name:</th>
<th>Program Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Title:</th>
<th>Theme or Content Area:</th>
<th>Duration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasized Standards:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Essential Question(s)</strong> (“big ideas” and concepts that lead to deeper level thinking and understandings):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transfer Goal(s)</strong> (how students can apply their learning to other content and contexts):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Progress Monitoring:**

**Performance Task(s) - Summative Assessment(s)**

*Pre-Assessment(s)*

*Formative assessment(s)*

**Learning and Language Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know: factual knowledge, basic skills, key vocabulary</th>
<th>Understand: connections to essential and contextual concepts</th>
<th>Do: application and demonstration of knowledge and understandings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Universal Design for Learning/Access for All</strong> (PYD/CRP, differentiation, accommodations and modifications, technology use, arts integration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literacy and/or Numeracy across Content Areas:** Reading, writing, speaking, listening and thinking

**Outline of Lessons** (lesson tasks and activities to support students’ achievement of learning objectives):

*Introductory* (stimulate interest, assess prior knowledge and connect to new information)

*Instructional* (build upon background knowledge, make meaning of content, incorporate ongoing formative assessments)

*Culminating* (includes the **Performance Task**, i.e., summative assessment - measuring the achievement of learning objectives)

**Post-unit Reflection** (on meeting the **Learning and Language** objectives):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom:</th>
<th>II. Instructional Supports</th>
<th>III. Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Alignment within the Mini-Unit Plan</td>
<td>The lessons/mini-unit plan is responsive to varied student learning needs:</td>
<td>The mini-unit plan regularly assesses whether students are mastering standards-based content and skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning and language objectives, content, and activities align with the standards targeted in the mini-unit plan:</td>
<td>o Includes clear and sufficient guidance to support teaching and learning of the targeted standards, learning and language objectives, and mini-unit goals, including, when appropriate, the use of technology and media.</td>
<td>o Is designed to elicit observable evidence of the degree to which a student can demonstrate the targeted standards and meet the learning and language objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Focuses teaching and learning on a targeted set of standards.</td>
<td>o Engages students through relevant, thought-provoking questions, problems, and tasks that stimulate interest and elicit reading, writing, speaking, listening, and using language effectively in a variety of content areas.</td>
<td>o Includes assessments that align with the learning standards and learning and language objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Includes in the mini-unit content and activities that align with selected standards and learning and language objectives.</td>
<td>o Provides appropriate level and type of scaffolding, differentiation, intervention, and provide access for all learners.</td>
<td>A mini-unit plan should:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mini-unit plan should:</td>
<td>o Provides extra supports for students working below grade level.</td>
<td>o Use varied modes of assessments, including pre-, formative, summative and self-assessment measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Recommend and facilitate a mix of instructional approaches for a variety of learners, including such strategies as modeling, using a range of questions, checking for understanding, flexible grouping, pair-share, etc.</td>
<td>o Provides extensions for students with high interest or working above grade level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gradually remove supports, requiring students to make progress toward demonstrating their mathematical understanding independently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mini-Unit Plan Review Rubric**

**Classroom:**
**Reviewer’s Observations, Comments, and Recommendations for Targeted Support:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Alignment within the Mini-Unit</th>
<th>II. Instructional Supports</th>
<th>III. Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations and Comments:</td>
<td>Observations and Comments:</td>
<td>Observations and Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for support:</td>
<td>Recommendations for support:</td>
<td>Recommendations for support:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rubric based on the work of the Tri-State Collaborative (Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island) – facilitated by Achieve 4/12/2012*
During the 2012-2013 school year, MHS educators were expected to submit at least one mini-unit plan each quarter that described a lesson’s content, delivery, and assessment. Mini-unit plans were in four areas: ELA, Science, Math, and Life Skills (some topics lent themselves to lessons in more than one area). Content area consultants reviewed the mini-unit plans and made recommendations for ways in which the plans could be strengthened, within three broad areas:

- Alignment within the Mini-Unit Plan
- Instructional Supports
- Assessment.

This report summarizes the recommendations made by consultants during each quarter of the 2012-2013 school year.

1st Quarter
Content area consultants reviewed 25 mini-unit plans in four different subject areas:
- ELA (12 mini-unit plans)
- Life Skills (7 mini-unit plans)
- Science (4 mini-unit plans)
- Math (2 mini-unit plans).

Consultants most frequently made recommendations within the area of instructional supports, and within that area, in the categories of instructional design\(^1\) (24 recommendations with 13 mini-unit plans), using graphic organizers (24 recommendations within 10 mini-unit plans), and vocabulary and content understanding (15 recommendations within 9 mini-unit plans). Approximately half of all mini-unit plans had no recommendations regarding alignment within the mini-unit plan, and approximately half had no recommendations for assessment. For mini-unit plans that did have recommendations with these areas, the most common categories concerned aligning with curriculum standards (10 recommendations within 9 mini-units) and assessing comprehension (20 recommendations with 9 mini-units).

2nd Quarter
Content area consultants reviewed 28 mini-unit plans in four different subject areas:
- ELA (13 mini-unit plans)
- Life Skills (6 mini-unit plans)
- Science (5 mini-unit plans)
- Math (4 mini-unit plans).

---

\(^1\) Instructional design is defined here as suggestions to teachers about how they present the material. This might include providing extensions for students who are ready to learn more, providing sequential descriptions of activities, providing additional resources, etc.
Twenty-four out of the 28 plans had recommendations related to Assessment. Only four mini-unit plans had no Assessment recommendations. Reviewers most commonly suggested assessment methods (19 recommendations within 11 mini-unit plans, mostly within ELA) and identified the need for summative assessment (7 recommendations within 6 mini-unit plans).

Fifteen out of the twenty-five plans had recommendations related to Instructional Supports, while ten had no recommendations in this area. Recommendations were most frequently in the categories of instructional design (21 recommendations with 12 mini-unit plans), vocabulary and content understanding (8 recommendations within 4 mini-unit plans), and using graphic organizers (7 recommendations within 4 mini-unit plans). The area of Instructional Supports yielded the greatest number of recommendations across all mini-unit plans reviewed (38 total recommendations).

Within the area of Alignment Within the Mini-Unit Plan, 14 out the 25 mini-unit plans had recommendations. The most common source of recommendations was that the mini-unit plans addressed alignment with standards (8 recommendations within 5 mini-unit plans) and too many standards within the plans (6 recommendations within 6 mini-units). Eleven mini-unit plans had no recommendations within the category of Alignment Within the Mini-Unit Plan.

3rd Quarter

There were 28 mini-unit plans within MHS that were reviewed within four different subject areas:
- ELA (7 mini-unit plans)
- Life Skills (9 mini-unit plans)
- Science (7 mini-unit plans)
- Math (5 mini-unit plans).

Fifteen out of the 28 plans had recommendations related to Alignment Within the Mini-Unit Plan, while 13 mini-units had no recommendations in this area. Reviewers most commonly suggested removing standards (7 recommendations within 7 mini-unit plans, mostly within math) and adding standards (6 recommendations within 5 mini-unit plans).

Nine out of the 28 plans had recommendations related to Instructional Supports, while 19 had no recommendations in this area. Recommendations were most frequently in the categories of instructional design (18 recommendations within 9 mini-unit plans, primarily in Life Skills) and using instructional technology (7 recommendations within 3 mini-unit plans, all within Life Skills). The area of Instructional Supports yielded the greatest number of recommendations across all mini-unit plans reviewed (28 total recommendations).

Within the area of Assessment, 13 out of the 28 mini-unit plans had recommendations. The most common source of recommendations was suggested assessment methodology (7 recommendations within 5 mini-unit plans) and the need for a summative assessment (5 recommendations within 5 mini-units, primarily in Life Skills). Fifteen mini-unit plans had no recommendations within the category of Assessment.
It should be noted that five of the reviews (one ELA, one Life Skills, and three in Science) cited exemplary mini-units and had no recommendations. Several others had a only a few recommendations in targeted areas.

4th Quarter
There were 33 mini-unit plans within MHS that were reviewed within four different subject areas:
- ELA (12 mini-unit plans)
- Life Skills (8 mini-unit plans)
- Science (10 mini-unit plans)
- Math (3 mini-unit plans).

Fifteen out of the 33 plans had recommendations related to Alignment Within the Mini-Unit Plan, while 18 mini-units had no recommendations in this area. Reviewers most commonly suggested additional instructional supports (11 recommendations within 6 mini-unit plans), including more detailed information (7 recommendations within 7 closely-related science mini-unit plans), and aligning with standards (2 recommendations within 2 mini-unit plans).

Twenty out of the 33 plans had recommendations related to Instructional Supports, while 13 had no recommendations in this area. Recommendations were most frequently in the categories of instructional design (23 recommendations within 18 mini-unit plans), accessibility/accommodations and modifications (7 recommendations within 7 closely-related science mini-unit plans), using graphical organizers (7 recommendations within 5 mini-unit plans, all within ELA), and vocabulary and content understanding (3 recommendations within 3 mini-unit plans, all within ELA). The area of Instructional Supports yielded the greatest number of recommendations across all mini-unit plans reviewed (34 total recommendations).

Within the area of Assessment, 15 out of the 33 mini-unit plans had recommendations. The most common source of recommendations was suggested assessment methodology (7 recommendations within 6 mini-unit plans), followed by the need for a summative assessment (5 recommendations within 5 mini-units) and the need for evaluation criteria (5 recommendations within 4 mini-unit plans, all within ELA). Eighteen mini-unit plans had no recommendations, or only a recommendation to attach referenced materials, within the category of Assessment.

It should be noted that eight of the reviews (two in ELA, three in Life Skills, and all three in Math) cited exemplary mini-units and had no recommendations. Several others had a only a few recommendations in targeted areas.

Total for Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Alignment within the Mini-Unit Plan</th>
<th>Instructional Supports</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>No recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### G1.5 Attachments List

**Standards Addressed in Maps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoro, Sandy</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>PK,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,A,B,C</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Massachusetts Hospital School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Select Standards**

**Massachusetts Common Core Curriculum Frameworks - English Language Arts (2010) - Grades 9-10 English Language Arts**

- **RL Reading**
  - **Literature**
    - **Key Ideas and Details**
      - Anchor Standard RL.CC.1 Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.
      - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
      - Anchor Standard RL.CC.2 Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.
      - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.2 Determine a theme or central idea of a text and analyze in detail its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.
      - Anchor Standard RL.CC.3 Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.
      - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.3 Analyze how complex characters (e.g., those with multiple or conflicting motivations) develop over the course of a text, interact with other characters, and advance the plot or develop the theme.

- **Craft and Structure**
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.4 Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.5 Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.5 Analyze how an author’s choices concerning how to structure a text, order events within it (e.g., parallel plots), and manipulate time (e.g., pacing, flashbacks) create such effects as mystery, tension, or surprise.
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.6 Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.6 Analyze a particular point of view or cultural experience reflected in a work of literature from outside the United States, drawing on a wide reading of world literature.

- **Integration of Knowledge and Ideas**
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.7 Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.7 Analyze the representation of a subject or a key scene in two different artistic mediums, including what is emphasized or absent in each treatment (e.g., Auden’s “Musée des Beaux Arts” and Breughel’s Landscape with the Fall of Icarus).
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.8 Deconstruct and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.8 (Not applicable to literature)
  - MAELA: Relate a work of fiction, poetry, or drama to the seminal ideas of its time.
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.9 Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.9 Analyze how an author draws on and transforms source material in a specific work (e.g., how Shakespeare treats a theme or topic from Ovid or the Bible or how a later author draws on a play by Shakespeare).

- **Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity**
  - Anchor Standard RL.CC.10 Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.
  - Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.10 By the end of grade 9, read and comprehend literary, including stories, dramas, and poems, in the grades 9–10 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range. By the end of grade 10, read and comprehend literary, including stories, dramas, and poems, at the high end of the grades 9–10 text complexity band independently and proficiently.

- **RI Informational Text**
  - **Key Ideas and Details**
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.1 Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.2 Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.2 Determine a central idea of a text and analyze its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.3 Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.3 Analyze how the author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas or events, including the order in which the points are made, how they are introduced and developed, and the connections that are drawn between them.
  - **Craft and Structure**
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.4 Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.5 Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.5 Analyze in detail how an author’s ideas or claims are developed and refined by particular sentences, paragraphs, or larger portions of a text (e.g., a section or chapters).
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.6 Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.6 Determine an author’s point of view or purpose in a text and analyze how the author uses rhetoric to advance that point of view or purpose.
  - **Integration of Knowledge and Ideas**
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.7 Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.7 Analyze various accounts of a subject told in different mediums (e.g., a person’s life story in both print and multimedia, determining which details are emphasized in each approach).
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.8 Deconstruct and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.8 Deconstruct and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning.
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.9 Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.9 Analyze seminal U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (e.g., Washington’s Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms speech, King’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”), including how they address related themes and concepts.
  - **Range of Reading and Level of Text Complexity**
    - Anchor Standard RI.CC.10 Read and comprehend complex literary and informational texts independently and proficiently.
    - Grade Level Standard RI.9-10.10 By the end of grade 9, read and comprehend literary nonfiction in the grades 9–10 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range. By the end of grade 10, read and comprehend literary nonfiction at the high end of the grades 9–10 text complexity band independently and proficiently.
  - **Strand Writing**
    - **Text Types and Purposes**
      - Anchor Standard W.CC.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.
      - Grade Level Standard W.9-10.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.
      - W.9-10.1a Introduce precise claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that establishes clear relationships among claim(s), counterclaim(s), reasons, and evidence.
      - W.9-10.1b Develop claim(s) and counterclaim(s) fairly, supplying evidence for each while pointing out strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience’s knowledge level and concerns.
      - W.9-10.1c Use words, phrases, and clauses to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaim(s).
      - W.9-10.1d Establish and maintain a formal and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are written.
      - W.9-10.1e Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.
      - Anchor Standard W.CC.2 Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.
      - Grade Level Standard W.9-10.2 Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.
### Standards for Curriculum Maps for Year 2012-2013

**Standards Selected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards Selected</th>
<th>ELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard RLCCR.1 Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.</td>
<td>Shoro - 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard RLCCR.2 Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</td>
<td>Shoro - 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard RLCCR.3 Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard RLCCR.4 Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard RLCCR.5 Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text (e.g., a section, chapter, scene, or stanza) relate to each other and the whole.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.2 Determine a theme or central idea of a text and analyze in detail its development over the course of the text, including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by specific details; provide an objective summary of the text.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.3 Analyze how complex characters (e.g., those with multiple or conflicting motivations) develop over the course of a text, interact with other characters, and advance the plot or develop the theme.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard RL.9-10.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the cumulative impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone (e.g., how the language evokes a sense of time and place; how it sets a formal or informal tone).</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard W.CCR.9 Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard W.9-10.9 Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.9-10.9.a Apply grades 9–10 Reading standards to literature (e.g., “Analyze how an author draws on and transforms source material in a specific work (e.g., how Shakespeare treats a theme or topic from Ovid or the Bible or how a later author draws on a play by Shakespeare”).</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.9-10.9.b Apply grades 9–10 Reading standards to literary nonfiction (e.g., “Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, assessing whether the reasoning is valid and the evidence is relevant and sufficient; identify false statements and fallacious reasoning”).</td>
<td>Shoro - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Standard L.CCR.4 Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases by using context clues, analyzing meaningful word parts, and consulting general and specialized reference materials, as appropriate.</td>
<td>Shoro - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Standard L.9-10.4 Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on grades 9–10 reading and content, choosing flexibly from a range of strategies.</td>
<td>Shoro - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.9-10.4.a Use context (e.g., the overall meaning of a sentence, paragraph, or text; a word’s position or function in a sentence) as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase.</td>
<td>Shoro - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.9-10.4.b Identify and correctly use patterns of word changes that indicate different meanings or parts of speech (e.g., analyze, analysis, analytical; advocate, advocacy).</td>
<td>Shoro - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.9-10.4.c Consult general and specialized reference materials (e.g., dictionaries, glossaries, thesauruses), both print and digital, to find the pronunciation of a word or determine or clarify its precise meaning, its part of speech, or its etymology.</td>
<td>Shoro - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.9-10.4.d Verify the preliminary determination of the meaning of a word or phrase (e.g., by checking the inferred meaning in context or in a dictionary).</td>
<td>Shoro - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implement efficient and effective management structures to ensure appropriate services are provided to all eligible youth.
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TECHNOLOGY

Report on SEIS Technology Goals Through FY 2013

A significant expectation of the SEIS contract was to address technology challenges and to increase the appropriate use of technology tools to support efficient and effective communication, information management, program administration, delivery of professional development, and instructional delivery. During the first year of the contract, CES technology staff worked with DESE to conduct a technology needs assessment to inform a comprehensive planning process. During the 2009-2010 year, CES’s Chief Technology Officer facilitated the development of the SEIS Technology Plan with members of the SEIS Technology Committee (see SEIS 2010-2013 Technology Plan in the attachments). This plan outlined several goals to be accomplished by 2013.

Goal 1: By the end of FY13, SEIS will support increasing the integration of technology into administrative areas. At the end of this period, at least 70% of SEIS teachers will use technology for administrative tasks as demonstrated by participation in the following: development and posting of mini-unit plans; posting of learning team logs; using applications for communication and collaboration; and completing progress reports, planning notes and attendance on Aspen.

As established by the Technology Committee, a primary focus of technology implementation was to enhance the capacity of the teaching and support staff to communicate and collaborate electronically. The following outcomes provide evidence of CES’s effectiveness in supporting teacher use of technology for administrative tasks.

- 100% of the educators completed progress reports and planning notes in Aspen, and the ETL tracking has been transferred into Aspen.
- 100% of the educators have email and used it for communication with supervisors, coaches, and peers.
- 95% of all SEIS educators completed at least one survey using Survey Monkey during the 2012-2013 school year.

1 This report is adapted from the CES Report on Technology Goals: FY 13 (August 2013), which was prepared to document achievement of the goals outlined in the SEIS Technology Plan. An earlier CES report, Report on SEIS Technology Goal: FY09 – FY11, is included in the attachments.
• 92% of the educators across host agencies developed and posted at least one mini-unit plan using technology during FY13, as compared to 63% in FY12.

• 36% of the educators across host agencies logged into Moodle during the course of the 2012-2013 year.2

• 34% of the educators used the Collaborative Coaching Log, an electronic database of teacher/coach interactions, as a communication tool with coaches.

Goal 2: By the end of FY13, at least 60% of educators will have reached the LoTi 3 level or higher as defined by the Levels of Teaching Innovation Tool (LoTi).3

The LoTi tool was completed by educators during the spring of 2013, with the following results:

• 61% of the educators reached the LoTi 3 level – Infusion.

• 36% of the educators only reached the LoTi 2 level – Exploration.

• 3% of the educators only reached the LoTi 1 level – Awareness.

Goal 3: By the end of FY13, 95% of student and staff data processing, including the student MCAS assessment, attendance and census will be done through a centralized computer based system.

As of the end of FY 13, the following items had been developed and fully implemented within the Aspen system:

• Progress reports

• Planning notes

• MCAS data import

• Census (DPH and DMH youth programs)

• DMH and DPH attendance

• SIMS uploads

• IEP uploads

• Monthly reports (data exported from Aspen to complete reports)

Items/forms that are currently being developed for implementation in FY14 include:

• DYS/CHC/DMH adult census and attendance

• Teacher log

---

2 The Moodle platform provides educators with access to professional development resources and forums and allows educators to share documents with colleagues.

3 See: www.loticonnection.com
• Student intake form
• Consultation log
• Team meeting notes
• Educational Assessment A and B
• Academic report
• Teacher schedule
• Release of information form
• Discharge notification

Goal 4: By the end of FY13, at least 80% of teaching staff will have participated in 20 hours of professional development that includes technology skills and the integration of technology into the curriculum.

During the professional development offerings, facilitators modeled and incorporated the use of classroom technology and software as part of the trainings. In FY13, SEIS educators participated in an average of 28 hours of professional development with embedded technology integration. Of the total number of educators, 75 met the objective of participation in 20 hours of professional development that includes technology integration, representing 70% of all educators.

Goal 5: By the end of FY13, where the host agency policies permit, 90% of the programs will be equipped with high-capacity internet connected computers in all classrooms.

As of June 2013, since DPH has a secure network, all classroom computers at the Massachusetts Hospital School are connected to the internet. This site was also included in the most recent eRate application, and plans are being made to implement and manage a student network there during the upcoming school year.

Since the eRate application was approved in 2012, all of the DMH programs have been set up with eRate networks. During the FY13 school year, teachers in each program were trained in internet safety, and student training has been scheduled for the fall.

In DYS programs, SEIS students have access to secure computer labs in the programs. It is the responsibility of the SEIS teacher to request and access the use of the labs for the SEIS students.

In the CHC sites, connection to the internet in the classrooms is not allowed, and the use of technology also varies by site.
Goal 6: By the end of FY13, 100% of SEIS educators will have participated in at least 3 professional development options delivered by distance learning (i.e., Moodle, NASET, Collaborative Coaching Log, Curriculum Mapper, Unique Learning Systems, webinars).

According to available data from the 2012-2013 school year, SEIS educators participated in an average of 2.35 professional development options delivered by distance learning; 48 educators met the goal of participation in 3 events, representing 45% of all educators. It is also possible that individual teachers may have participated in events on their own or during the summer.

Goal 7: By the end of FY13, 100% of educators will integrate technology into their instructional practice as demonstrated in at least one of the following areas: use of Curriculum Mapper; use of Unique Learning Systems; posting mini-unit plans, or use of Collaborative Coaching Log during classroom observations.

The following data from the 2012-2013 school year indicate educator integration of technology into instructional practice:

- 92% of SEIS educators developed mini-unit plans that included technology integration.
- 34% of SEIS educators worked on technology integration as indicated by the Collaborative Coaching Log.
- 33% of SEIS educators integrated technology into instructional practice by the use of Unique Learning Systems.
- 47% of SEIS educators were observed by coaches during coaching visits to integrate technology into instruction.
- 95% of all SEIS educators demonstrated integration of technology into instructional practice in at least one of the above areas.

Next Steps:

The Collaborative for Educational Services has worked closely with the SEIS Technology Committee since the inception of the contract. Notable progress was made on each of the seven goals of the Technology Plan. This work will continue as CES develops a follow-up plan for the 2013-2014 school year, as well as protocols, procedures and measures to promote and accurately represent the attainment of the Technology Plan goals.
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Executive Summary

This Technology Plan supports SEIS students, educators and host agencies. The ultimate goal is to make the best possible use of technology in the classroom, including the use of assistive technology hardware and software. The plan includes evaluation of every host agency’s technology resources to ensure better utilization of hardware, software, internal network infrastructure, professional development, and technical support. The plan focuses on four major areas; technology resource equity across host agencies and technology accessibility through the entire project, technology integration and literacy, technology professional development for SEIS staff and utilization of distance learning capabilities where appropriate. The plan will also address security and confidentiality issues that may be unique to each agency.

We consider that all children can learn when appropriate instruction and technology is available to them. Therefore, we consider technology development as a means to provide educational services rather than a goal by itself. In order to implement sound instructional technology at the classroom level, we will pursue a multidisciplinary TEAM approach with staff from host agencies. By having the participation and collaboration of the Technology Committee, Professional Development Committee and the Leadership Team on the development of the technology system, we plan to include each and every agency’s needs.

As a first step for implementing the needed technology at SEIS, we have assessed the hardware and software needs at the program level, and the results of such needs assessment are informing this plan. We believe that we will be better equipped to prepare students for success through the implementation of our Technology Plan. We anticipate that we will meet the issues, concerns, and challenges outlined by the state curriculum frameworks, and design and structure environments which promote lifelong learning. Considering the guidelines provided by the Educational Technology Advisory Council (ETAC), the current technology available, the budget constraints and other project goals, we have developed the following vision:

Commitment to a Clear Vision and Implementation Strategies

SEIS will implement a technology plan that includes a clear set of goals and action plans aligned with host agencies and DESE expectations. The plan will be evaluated annually.

Technology Integration and Literacy

SEIS staff will be supported in the integration of technology into curricular areas to better prepare students to become proficient and to meet the Massachusetts Instructional Technology Standards. Students will be provided with the technology
tools, including assistive hardware and software, to prepare them to become productive members of society.

**Technology Professional Development**
SEIS educators will gain competency in the use of a variety of technological tools and assistive technology concepts through a well-planned professional development program.

**Accessibility of Technology**
SEIS staff and students will be provided with equitable access among the host agencies to current technology and technical support.

**E-learning and Communications**
SEIS teaching staff will be provided with opportunities to use E-learning as an alternative professional development delivery method and other modes of electronic communications. We will explore E-learning environments for students.
Introduction

SEIS recognizes the importance of technology in education, and particularly with our population where instructional and assistive technology is sometimes the only means to access information. The Technology Committee and the Leadership Team have identified the need for a collaborative model for implementing technology at all levels of the project settings, starting at the classroom level. In 2009, based on the needs assessment performed by HEC, a number of computers and software titles were acquired to create a baseline across the host agencies as a first step to start a sound technology implementation. In future years and through this plan, we will evaluate the effectiveness of the current technology and recommend further improvement to keep or improve the level of literacy and integration.

In 2001, Massachusetts recognized the importance of the role of technology in the classroom by publishing the, “Massachusetts Recommended Instructional Technology Standards.” The primary purpose of this document is to define what preK – 12 students should know and be able to do in order to use technologies for learning. Currently, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has posted a Revised Recommended K-12 Technology Literacy Standards. Massachusetts is also a member of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills whose mission is “to position 21st century skills at the center of US K-12 education.”

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills states in its policymakers' guide, "To thrive in the world today, students need higher-end skills, such as the ability to communicate effectively beyond their peer groups, analyze complex information from multiple sources, write or present well-reasoned arguments about nuanced issues and develop solutions to interdisciplinary problems that have no one right answer. In this light, technology is not a panacea for education, but a powerful springboard to higher-level learning." A September 2007 survey commissioned by the Partnership for 21st Century Skills reported that American voters ranked computer and technology skills as second only to reading comprehension in importance for becoming successful competitors in the global economy.

As educators we have a responsibility to provide our students with an education that uses technology to engage them, and provides them with the tools to compete in a global, information-based economy. We have an obligation to be open to the expanding possibilities which technology offers, and we must be prepared to adapt to the changes and uncertainties we encounter and to grow with them.

The plan also includes the implementation of a Student Information System (SIS) which enables centralizing all student and staff data into one system, with the expectation that such a system will allow for great flexibility in data reporting and
analysis. The system allows for remote access to necessary data over secured Internet connections. All systems have high-level security, similar to e-commerce sites, to prevent unauthorized access to data. The SIS provides the ability to manage user accounts and assign access permissions in a way that staff logging in can access only the student data assigned to them. Thus, as students move and are assigned to different sites, the System Administrator and identified staff with the required permissions will be able to switch who has access to student information, as necessary.
Technology Plan

Commitment to a Clear Vision and Implementation Strategies

1. By the end of FY11, SEIS will support the integration of technology into administrative areas. At the end of this period, at least 60% of teachers use technology, including some of the following areas: lesson planning, administrative tasks, communications and collaboration.

   a. By the end of FY13, SEIS will support increasing the integration of technology into administrative areas. At the end of this period, at least 70% of teachers use technology for administrative tasks as demonstrated by participation in the following: development and posting of mini-unit plans; posting of learning team logs; using applications for communication and collaboration; and completing progress reports, planning notes and attendance on Aspen.

2. By the end of FY11, SEIS will support the development of technology literacy for all teachers. At the end of this period, at least 60% of teachers will have reached the developing technology level as defined by the Massachusetts Technology Self-Assessment Tool (TSAT).

   a. By the end of FY13, at least 60% of educators will have reached the LoTi 3 level or higher as defined by the Levels of Teaching Innovation Tool (LoTi).

3. SEIS supports the use of technology to improve administrative efficiency. By the end of FY11, 85% of student data processing, including the student MCAS assessment, attendance and census will be done through a centralized computer based system.

   a. By the end of FY13, 95% of student and staff data processing, including the student MCAS assessment, attendance and census will be done through a centralized computer based system.

4. By the end of FY11, at least 60% of teaching staff will have participated in 20 hours of professional development that includes technology skills and the integration of technology into the curriculum.

   a. By the end of FY13, at least 80% of teaching staff will have participated in 20 hours of professional development that includes technology skills and the integration of technology into the curriculum.
5. SEIS supports technology accessibility at all levels of the project. By the end of FY11, where the host agency policies permit, **80%** of the programs will be equipped with high-capacity Internet connected computers in the classrooms.

   a. By the end of FY13, where the host agency policies permit, **90%** of the programs will be equipped with high-capacity Internet connected computers in all classrooms.

6. SEIS supports the use of alternative delivery methods for teaching. By the end of FY11, **25%** of teaching staff will have participated in 12 hours of professional development delivered by distance learning.

   a. By the end of FY13, **100%** of educators will have participated in at least 3 professional development options delivered by distance learning (i.e., Moodle, NASET, Collaborative Coaching Log, Curriculum Mapper, Unique Learning Systems, webinars).

7. SEIS supports the integration of technology into curricular areas. By the end of FY11, **60%** of educators will integrate technology into their instructional practice. Additionally, we will continue to provide technical support to educators and administrators and maximize procurement of software and hardware as resources permit.

   a. By the end of FY13, **100%** of educators will integrate technology into their instructional practice as demonstrated in at least one of the following areas: use of Curriculum Mapper, Unique Learning Systems; posting mini-unit plans, use of Collaborative Coaching Log; and during classroom observations.

**Technology Team**

SEIS has a technology committee which meets monthly to monitor progress and implementation of the Technology Plan. The committee serves as an advisory board to the Leadership Team regarding technology initiatives. Guidance on technology initiatives, technical support and maintenance is provided by HEC to all educators. All technology implementation efforts shall be performed by HEC Technology staff or designated.

**Needs Assessment**

A thorough technology needs assessment was performed during the 2008-2009 year and findings were used to inform this plan. During this period, the Technology Committee will continue monitoring the fulfillment of needs identified and progress of recommended measures taken. Future major technology acquisitions and
professional development shall be reviewed by the Technology Committee to ensure alignment with Technology Plan.

**Acceptable Use Policy**

HEC’s Acceptable Use Policy is part of the Employee Handbook and applies to every facility where our educators work. This policy establishes what constitutes acceptable use of Internet, network and computer systems.

**Budget**

The Technology Committee will review the implementation plan and will recommend an annual budget for technology to the Leadership Team. The budget narrative shall link specific requests to individual benchmarks at this plan.

**Evaluation**

The technology plan includes an annual evaluation process that enables it to monitor its progress in achieving its goals and to make adjustments as needed in response to new challenges or opportunities. The Technology Committee will review goals, achievements, and challenges periodically by performing formal and informal assessments.
Technology Integration and Literacy

Technology Integration at administrative and support tasks
SEIS will implement several initiatives regarding use of technology for the administrative tasks performed by educators. Those initiatives will allow staff to communicate, perform planning, research and data processing by using Internet-connected computers and other devices. For data processing, we will implement a secured web-based Student Information System that will allow educators to share information and reporting on students’ information, progress, attendance, assessments, transfers and census reports. The data will be accessible through an Internet browser achieving portability and progress discussion over the spectrum of SEIS structure. Student records will be accessible only to staff members and other system parties that have permissions granted. Protocols will be in place to request and grant permissions only after properly authorized by designated personnel. Other initiatives will enable staff to perform a good deal of tasks electronically, including but not limited to; share information within the project settings via virtual spaces, such as MassONE and create and/or participate on discussions groups and other social networking activities.

Technology Integration at the classroom
SEIS will implement several strategies to maintain and enhance the use of curriculum materials using technology. Educators will be provided with standardized curriculum titles and necessary training to employ them as an essential part of the delivery of individualized instruction. In conjunction with updated computers, instructional software titles and the correspondent training, SEIS educators will implement a design of instructional materials and methods that makes learning goals achievable by individuals with wide differences in their abilities through Universal Design for Learning. This is an approach to learning in which educators consider the scope of student abilities and learning styles, taking into account varying abilities to see, hear, speak, move, read, write, comprehend English, attend, organize, engage, and remember. In order to introduce the use of UDL at the current settings, a strategic plan shall be implemented, including a controlled pilot within a selected number of classrooms at chosen programs.

Technology Professional Development
Technology professional development for this period will be included in school workshops and in selected PD days. Professional development will continue to focus on providing teachers with the training to integrate available technology in the classroom and implementing curriculum software. The goal is to use technology to build a more rigorous and responsive curriculum that addresses the needs of all
students, while preparing educators to integrate available technology for instruction to keep their students engaged, motivated and learning.

**Accessibility of Technology**

While it is possible to have UDL in a low tech classroom to some degree, technology opens many doors to UDL, particularly with the teaching resources and technologies available today. To have a viable UDL system that includes AT, students and teachers require easy access to technology and digital content that is aligned with the curriculum. LCD projectors, which project what is on the laptops to a large screen for a class, can be used as multi-media tools for presentation by teachers and students alike. To make these alternatives available, hardware will be needed in many programs, including new computers, memory upgrades, and software. Ongoing technical support will also essential to make sure that systems operate smoothly. SEIS will encourage the responsible use of technology and promote an understanding of ethics and safety issues in using electronic media at home, in school, and in society.

**E-Learning and Communications**

SEIS educators will be provided with opportunities to use E-learning as an alternative professional development delivery method and other modes of electronic communications. We will explore E-learning environments for students as a delivery mode to enhance differentiated instruction. The online learning literature has explored the effects of using computer-based instruction elements to individualize instruction so that the online learning module or platform responds dynamically to the participant’s questions, needs or performance. There were two online learning studies of the effects of individualizing instruction, both found a positive effect. Nguyen (2007) compared the experiences of people learning to complete tax preparation procedures, contrasting those who used more basic online training with those who used an enhanced interface that incorporated a context-sensitive set of features, including integrated tutorials, expert systems, and content delivered in visual, aural and textual forms. Nguyen found that this combination of enhancements had a positive effect. Grant and Courtoreille (2007) studied the use of post-unit quizzes presented either as (a) fixed items that provided feedback only about whether or not the student’s response was correct or (b) post-unit quizzes that gave the student the opportunity for additional practice on item types that had been answered incorrectly. The response-sensitive version of the tutorial was found to be more effective than the fixed-item version, resulting in greater changes between pre- and post-test scores.
At the beginning of FY 2009, the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES; formerly known as the Hampshire Educational Collaborative) was awarded the contract by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) to provide educational services to students in institutional settings. As part of this effort, CES facilitated the development of the SEIS Technology Plan, along with members of the Technology Committee. CES is pleased to report on the status of technology goals through the FY 11 contract period.

1. **By the end of FY11, SEIS will support the integration of technology into administrative areas. At the end of this period, at least 60% of teachers use technology, including some of the following areas: lesson planning, administrative tasks, communications and collaboration.**

The following activities represent efforts by the Collaborative to support teachers’ use of technology for administrative uses. As discussed in the Technology Committee, the focus of technology implementation was to enhance the capacity of the teaching and support staff to communicate and collaborate electronically.

- During the first year of the SEIS contract (FY09), the student information system, Aspen/X2, was presented to SEIS leadership, Coordinators and State Principals, and discussions were initiated regarding the development of a plan for a pilot. The group reached a final agreement on a pilot of X2 at the DMH sites in the FY 10 school year.
- At the end of FY11, 33 educators in DMH programs were using the Aspen/X2 system for attendance, progress reporting, and sharing of student data; at the Massachusetts Hospital School, 17 educators were using the system to report attendance. This represents approximately 43% of all educators across host agencies.
- All of the educators who participated in professional development trainings at Norwood were trained to use Moodle for the purposes of communication and collaboration. At the end of FY11, this represents approximately 70% of the instructional staff across host agencies.
- 100% of the educators have email and use it for communication with supervisors, coaches and peers.
- A sample of coaching data from the FY11 school year indicates that approximately 70% of the educators were observed to utilize Microsoft Office software for lesson planning, report writing, etc.

2. **By the end of FY11, SEIS will support the development of technology literacy for all teachers. At the end of this period, at least 60% of teachers will have**
reached the developing technology level as defined by the Massachusetts Technology Self-Assessment Tool (TSAT).

CES worked with the SEIS Technology Committee to administer the TSAT tool to SEIS administrators and educators during the second year of the SEIS contract. A total of one hundred and sixty-five (165) employees took the test on Technology Operations and Concepts, Ethics and Safety and Teaching and Learning with Technology. After tabulating and evaluating the responses, the Technology Committee decided that the TSAT evaluation does not focus on the skills that SEIS educators need to demonstrate in the settings. The Technology Committee agreed to explore new tools and/or develop a self-assessment tool to implement with educators in SEIS programs.

3. SEIS supports the use of technology to improve administrative efficiency. By the end of FY11, 85% of student data processing, including the student MCAS assessment, attendance and census will be done through a centralized computer based system.

In 2009-2010, Collaborative staff worked with the members of the SEIS Technology Committee to develop and complete a technology plan that supports SEIS students, educators and host agencies. A plan for piloting X2 in DMH sites was developed, with the goal of producing an accurate census along with attendance information. As of June 2010, X2/Aspen was implemented successfully in DMH and DPH settings for attendance purposes, starting the process of sharing student data through a centralized web-based system.

The following tasks were accomplished:

- Worked with host agency and program staff to set up internet connectivity for administrative use in DMH program sites.
- DMH program data, including school calendar, staff, schedules and attendance codes, were uploaded and validated
- Developed customized data process and census report
- Initial Aspen/X2 training was provided for DMH staff
- Additional Aspen/X2 training was provided online
- Aspen/X2 help documents developed and made available online
- DPH program data, including school calendar, staff, schedules, and attendance codes, were uploaded and validated
- Aspen/X2 training provided for DPH staff
- Developed plan for using IEP module for progress reports

During the 2010-2011 school year, CES continued the implementation of integrated student data management system in DYS, DMH, and DPH to more effectively manage and share data among educators. At the end of June 2011, 599 out of 698 students, or 85%, were included in the centralized data system; the Massachusetts Hospital School is not a centralized system yet, but the data from their system is incorporated and merged into the centralized Aspen/X2 system. In addition, standardized reporting of census, attendance, length of stay, IEP status, staffing, and sending district data is
updated monthly and utilized by SEIS leadership to make staffing and program
improvement decisions.

4. **By the end of FY11, at least 60% of teaching staff will have participated in 20
hours of professional development that includes technology skills and the
integration of technology into the curriculum.**

   During the professional development offerings at Norwood in all three years, facilitators
   modeled and incorporated the use of classroom technology and software as part of the
   trainings. All of the Collaborative SEIS educators participated in the professional
development, and represented approximately 70% of all SEIS educators.

   The instructional coaches extended the support to teachers in their individual visits to
   programs, or as requested. For example, a sample of one coach’s data from 2010-2011
   indicates that 32 teachers were trained to utilize 25 out of 35 available software tools
during a total of 343 visits, or an average of 10.71 visits per teacher. It can be assumed
that similar numbers would apply for the other coaches, and would thus meet the criteria
of 60% (as of June 2011, 60% would equal 68 educators).

5. **SEIS supports technology accessibility at all levels of the project. By the end
   of FY11, where the host agency policies permit, 80% of the programs will be
   equipped with high-capacity Internet connected computers in the classrooms.**

   As of June 2011, since DPH has a secure network, all classroom computers at the
   Massachusetts Hospital School are connected to the internet.

   Generally, DMH does not allow classroom computers to be connected to their network.
   As a result, only classroom computers at Salamon School are currently connected to
   the internet; CES installed a secure content filter there to better manage the student
   use. Last year, CES applied for an e-rate network in order to provide connectivity to the
   programs, and this is currently in process.

   In DYS programs, SEIS students have access to secure computer labs in the programs.
   It is the responsibility of the SEIS teacher to request and access the use of the labs for
   the SEIS students.

   In the CHC sites, connection to the internet in the classrooms is not allowed, and the
   use of technology also varies by site.

6. **SEIS supports the use of alternative delivery methods for teaching. By the end
   of FY11, 25% of teaching staff will have participated in 12 hours of
   professional development delivered by distance learning.**

   The following are examples of educator participation in professional development
   through distance learning:
9 of the SEIS educators participated in an online course on Co-Teaching that was developed and presented by the Collaborative.

4 instructional coaches participated in webinars, such as UDL presented by CAST.

During the professional development offerings, educators were trained to utilize Moodle as part of the professional development. Assignments (structured inquiry process) were posted for the teams to utilize; teams uploaded the logs to Moodle for review and comments from the professional development facilitators. All of the Collaborative SEIS educators participated, which represents approximately 70% of all SEIS educators.

7. SEIS supports the integration of technology into curricular areas. By the end of FY11, 60% of educators will integrate technology into their instructional practice. Additionally, we will continue to provide technical support to educators and administrators and maximize procurement of software and hardware as resources permit.

A sample of coaching data from 2010-2011 indicates that all 32 of the teachers in the caseload were observed to integrate one or more technology tools/software into their instructional practice. It can be assumed that similar numbers would apply for the other coaches, and would thus meet the criteria of 60% (as of June 2011, 60% would equal 68 educators). In addition, all of the teachers at the Massachusetts Hospital School integrate augmentative and assistive technology tools/software across curriculum areas.

Over the course of the 3 years, CES has implemented a centralized helpdesk support system for assigning support tickets to technology support issues; as well as initiated remote support (GoToAssist Express) for a more prompt response to technology issues at programs and area offices. At the end of the 2010-2011 school year, with the support of the SEIS Technology Committee, CES purchased additional technology hardware, as well as updated software licenses.

Closing Statement
The Collaborative for Educational Services has worked closely with the SEIS Technology Committee since the inception of the contract. This work will continue as CES develops protocols, procedures and measures to more accurately represent the attainment of the Technology Plan goals.
GOAL 2

SECTION 2

Aspen Student Information Management System

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
ASPEN STUDENT INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Purpose:

CES purchased, designed, and implemented a student information management system for use in DYS General Education and SEIS in order to improve the efficiency of student data collection, management, and reporting. An integrated data management system is critical to support:

- clear expectations across SEIS and DYS for student data collection and recording;
- consistent data management procedures;
- integration of data from partner agencies (e.g., DYS JJEMS, DESE SIMS data);
- ease of access to information on individual students and groups of students; and
- standardized reporting.

Implementation of the Aspen (originally called X2) student information management system enables SEIS staff to identify students eligible for special education. The system allows staff to provide more effective and efficient services for youth entering host agencies. Sharing the system with DYS General Education provides better access to data by all those involved, enhances individualized educational planning, and facilitates transitions to other placements or the community.

Activities:

Over the past five years, SEIS and DYS staff have collaborated to design and implement the Aspen System to ensure coordinated data entry and management across programs. Figure 1 presents the original concept for a fully integrated, centrally located enterprise database system.
Based on this initial vision, CES administrators designed system specifications, then implemented and refined the system to enhance information sharing and use. Implementation activities included the following:

- Needs analysis and system specifications
- Procurement
- Initial training of system administrators
- System design specifications to accommodate SEIS needs
- Pilot training and implementation
- Data management and sharing policies/agreements between DYS, DYS General Education, SEIS, and DESE
- Full scale implementation and training of staff across host agencies
- Documentation to support consistent teacher use and training of new staff
- Troubleshooting and addressing connectivity challenges
- Systems development and refinement; development of customized reports
- Support for effective information sharing and data use
The key activities for the design, implementation, and use of Aspen are described below by year.

2008-2009:

During the first year of the contract, the CES Director of Technology presented an overview of Aspen/ X2 Student Information Management System to SEIS leadership, Coordinators and State Principals. The CES Contract Administrator and the Director of Technology facilitated initial discussions regarding the development of a plan for a pilot.

2009-2010:

CES staff worked with the members of the SEIS Technology Committee to develop a plan for piloting X2 (Aspen) in DMH sites, with the goal of producing an accurate census along with attendance information. The following tasks were accomplished:

- Worked with host agency and program staff to set up internet connectivity for administrative use in DMH program sites
- Uploaded and validated DMH program data, including school calendar, staff, schedules and attendance codes
- Developed customized data process
- Provided initial X2 Aspen training was provided for DMH staff
- Provided additional X2 Aspen training was provided online
- Developed X2 Aspen help documents and made them available online
- Uploaded and validated DPH program data, including school calendar, staff, schedules, and attendance codes
- Provided X2 Aspen training for DPH staff
- Entered attendance data for DPH and DMH into Aspen
- Developed plan for using IEP module for progress reports

As of June 2010, X2 Aspen was implemented successfully in DMH and DPH settings for collecting and reporting attendance statistics, initiating the sharing of student data through a centralized web-based system.
2010-2011:

CES continued the implementation of the integrated student data management system in DYS, DMH, CHC, and DPH to more effectively manage and share data among educators. In this school year, CES staff accomplished the following:

- Hired a full time SEIS Aspen Student Information Systems Specialist (Rebecca Lincoln)
- Provided Refresher Training for DMH & DPH educators
- Reviewed and revised the User Guide
- Developed Evaluation Team Liaison (ETL) training materials
- Re-designed IEP Module to do progress reports, developed training materials, and trained Teaching Coordinators
- Developed system for ETLs to scan IEPs into Aspen
- Created progress reports and piloted in 3 programs
- Implemented progress reporting across DMH programs

At the end of FY11, 33 educators in DMH programs were using the Aspen/X2 system for attendance, progress reporting, and sharing of student data. At the Massachusetts Hospital School, 17 educators were using the system to report attendance. This represents approximately 43% of all educators across host agencies. At the end of June 2011, 599 out of 698 students, or 85%, were included in the centralized data system. The Massachusetts Hospital School was not yet fully integrated. Standardized reporting (exporting data from Aspen to Filemaker) of census, attendance, length of stay, IEP status, staffing, and sending district data is updated monthly and utilized by SEIS leadership to make staffing and program improvement decisions.

2011-2012:

In this school year, CES staff accomplished the following tasks:

- Provided refresher trainings
- Imported MCAS data to Aspen
- Developed and generated DMH attendance report
- Developed ETL Tracking conversion to Aspen
- Initiated move of Detained Data Match to Aspen
- Developed DPH Progress Reports in Aspen, created user guide, and trained SEIS educators
- Enabled progress reports in DYS and CHC: planned phased in roll-out over the course of the year, provided training to SEIS educators, and expanded to all programs by June 2012
- Developed planning notes: reviewed needs, piloted in DMH, and expanded program across DMH
2012-2013:

In this school year, CES staff supported the following activities:

- Provided refresher trainings
- Converted Detained Data Match to Aspen:
  - Developed template and letters
  - Created user guide
  - Designed workflow
- Fully implemented ETL Tracking in Aspen:
  - Developed letters
  - Designed template
  - Refined DPH Tracking template
  - Created user guide
  - Trained ETLs
  - Designed workflow
- Captured and reported out census now in Aspen through the ETL Tracking:
  - Continued progress report implementation and training
  - Reviewed workflow
- Rolled out planning notes to all agencies and staff:
  - Updated user guide
  - Updated roles to include planning notes
  - Trained DYS, DMH, CHC staff
- Imported SIMS data to Aspen:
  - CHC every two weeks
  - DMH & DPH two times per year
- Developed several monthly reports to print out of Aspen
- Developed 60-day report to provide easy access and updating by principal
- Converted MHS clerical from Filemaker to Aspen
- Completed initial plan for:
  - Intake sheet
  - Consultation log
  - CHC Detained Data Match
  - Attendance in DYS report
Outcomes:

All SEIS teachers, ETLs, and Coordinators are trained in using Aspen for routine student data entry and management. The use of Aspen allows SEIS to centralize all data across the state and to ensure educators have consistent and timely access to data. For example, when students move from the East Region to the West Region, their historic data, current tracking information, and “paperwork” are available through Aspen. This allows SEIS staff to access files quickly and efficiently. Additionally, data and file management in Aspen provides added security of student information, as the system offers multiple levels of data access and protection, replacing the sharing of information via paper files.

Aspen is consistently being used across host agencies for the following functions:

- Accessing MCAS data
- Attendance
- Census
- IEP sharing
- Evaluation Team Liaison (ETL) Tracking notes, to document admission and discharge dates and communication with school districts
- Development and sharing of IEP planning and progress notes

Reports generated out of Aspen include:

- Monthly attendance by program
- IEP Service Delivery Rate report, comparing the date of entry into a program with the initial date of special education services
- 60-day report, identifying students whose IEPs are expired or in process, and tracking activities to get IEPs updated
- CHC Pending, matching names of CHC inmates with data from the school district last attended and determine whether or not the inmate has ever received special education services
- CHC Tracking, showing the status of inmates' IEPs and efforts to update IEPs
- Non-SEIS Services, documenting any special education services that will remain the responsibility of the school district
Next steps:

Refinement, development of new modules, troubleshooting and addressing training needs are all ongoing processes to ensure that educators and administrators are able to fully utilize the Aspen system and, more generally, to enhance staff efficiency in managing student records and reporting. There are a number of projects underway or in the assessment and planning stages. Some of the activities planned for the 2013-2014 year include:

- Make SEIS Binders and professional development materials available on Aspen (completed Summer 2013)
- Design Aspen “pages” to record DYS, CHC, and DMH adult program attendance and Census (completed Summer 2013)
- Provide ETL Tracking updates: revise letters and template (completed Summer 2013)
- Convert CHC Detained Data Match to Aspen (completed October 2013)
- Design DMH and DPH academic reports on Aspen (completed October 2013)
- Assess staff training needs and provide refreshers (completed August-November 2013)
- Establish naming conventions for all documents uploaded to ensure correct uploading and ease of access
- Explore possibility of viewing progress reports directly in “School View” on Aspen
- Continue systems development to include:
  - Intakes
  - Consultation Logs
  - DYS Discharge Form
  - Census capturing for DPH and DMH from attendance
  - Alerts for students no longer qualified for SPED
  - ETL Tracking fields with “hints” of what goes in that field
  - Teacher Notes
  - A Teacher Tracking system similar to the ETL Tracking which will build upon data already in the system
- Generate report of standardized monthly, quarterly, and annual reports
- Continue report development:
  - Refine Class Trends report
  - Collect attendance hours per quarter for the academic report
- Explore expanded use of Aspen for managing curriculum and learning resources
  (Accomplished November 2013, with planning and training to follow during 2013-14)
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PROMETHEAN TECHNOLOGY

Purpose:

Promethean technology, which consists of ActivInspire Software, assessment tools, student responders, electronic resources, and interactive white boards, is a system that allows teachers to provide engaging and interactive lessons while organizing curriculum resources and lessons in concert with curriculum mapping activities. It also provides an interactive way for students to demonstrate what they have learned. Promethean technology is used in many classrooms around the world. The company offers free resources and lesson plans to educators using their technology, and has developed specific tools that have been proven to be highly effective in meeting the educational needs of developmentally disabled students. See the attachments at the end of this section for an outline of the Promethean/ActivInspire functionality.

SEIS Professional Development staff and consultants began work with SEIS educators in 2010 to explore the feasibility of enhancing instructional delivery through use of these technology tools. The overall goals of this work were to:

- build teacher skills to effectively use these tools to support their pedagogy in a way that is relevant to their students and aligned with the curriculum;
- build student engagement and understanding through interactive lessons;
- create an interactive lesson plan system that would help teachers become more effective and efficient in their lesson planning and delivery; and
- have one type of software for use throughout DMH and MHS so that teachers can collaborate more easily.

2010-11 Goals
(Pilot year at MHS):

- Explore the feasibility of classroom use of Promethean technology at the MHS
- Begin training technology staff and teacher leaders in using the Promethean technology in specific classrooms and lab classroom
2011-12 Goals  
(Expansion to all MHS teachers and introduction for DMH UMASS Worcester programs):  

- Build teacher understanding regarding the capabilities of Promethean/ActivInspire technology with Mass Hospital School teachers and Worcester Hospital teachers  
- Develop school leader understanding of how the technology can support teachers with lesson planning and organization  
- Provide embedded coaching for technology leaders and coaches supporting teachers in the classroom  

2012-13 Goals  
(Expansion to central area DMH programs):  

- Create an interactive lesson planning and delivery system that would engage students and increase understanding while creating an organizational system that would increase teacher effectiveness  
- Build teacher understanding and skills in the use of Promethean/ActivInspire systems and support 22 teachers in five DMH programs  
- Have 50% of targeted DMH teachers using interactive technology (boards and/or responders) in their lessons by the end of the year  
- Have 50% of targeted DMH teachers writing and creating interactive lesson plans by the end of the year  

Activities:  

The Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) conducted a pilot at MHS during the 2010-2011 school year, expanded the project at MHS the following year (2011-12), and extended Promethean training and support to central area DMH programs the following year (2012-13).  

During the pilot year, eight MHS educators (including lead teachers and technology leaders) participated in a training workshop, and the technology staff received more in-depth training. Thirteen teaching staff members were also introduced to the technology.  

During the 2011-2012 school year, MHS educators and two DMH educators received four day-long training sessions, as well as site visits and troubleshooting support to enhance use of Promethean technology. A CES consultant provided an in-depth coach and teacher leader training on using the technology and developing ways in which the technology could facilitate teachers in lesson organization. Trainings at MHS were offered to instructional coaches, building leaders, librarians, and teachers identified by the MHS leadership.
• Thirteen teachers were given in-depth training in the technology with the intention they would become implementation resources for other teachers.

• Embedded coaching was provided to all teachers that received the training.

• Twenty-six paraprofessionals and support staff received trainings, introducing them to the technology and its use in the classroom.

Additionally, work was begun to develop links to curriculum, support instructional use, and create a guided release program for the instructional coaches. This work was continued in 2012-13 by the instructional coaches.

Full day trainings covered the following:

• Core Essentials
• Beyond Core Essentials
• Using responders

See the attachments for an outline of the content covered.

During the 2012-2013 school year, Promethean training promoted teacher skills and use at five DMH programs: UMass Connections, Continuing Care Unit 1, Continuing Care Unit II, Transitions IRTP, and Centerpoint. All 23 educators at these facilities, as well as one DMH coach, received four half-day training sessions, each of which included a 90-minute group session and 90 minutes of individual coaching/troubleshooting as needed. At Centerpoint, teachers received a fifth day of instruction concerning the use of interactive responders for students to use and an additional 90 minutes of coaching.

The group training topics included the following:

• Introduction to ActivInspire software
• Using interactive technologies (SmartBoard™, Promethean board, the ActivInspire Software, and responders) to engage and focus students
• Introduction to creating and using interactive lesson plans
• Using online educational resource tools

As teachers were already working on learning how to plan lessons using the Understanding by Design framework, an interactive template was developed that could mesh backward planning with use of this technology resource.
Outcomes:

In general, teachers who have implemented the technology in their classrooms report higher student engagement and note that students really enjoy the use of the technology, as they can actively engage in the lesson.

Pilot outcomes:

During the pilot year, a total of eight educators (technology instructors and lead teachers) at MHS received training and were encouraged to try the technology in the classroom (see summary report attached). Three teachers noted improved levels of student involvement.

“Students with visual or attention issues are more focused and their performance is improved. I think the small group lessons are more active, and students are more willing to participate,” reported one teacher.

Two of the three teachers noted improvements in student-teacher interactions, improved student motivation to learn or participate, and improved classroom management. One noted that “interactions are active rather than passive, and students own their learning.”

Year 2 outcomes:

- Thirteen MHS teachers developed the skills to use and support others in use of Promethean/ActivInspire.
- The site-based coach was able to provide on-site support for effective use.

Year 3 outcomes:

- Twenty-three teachers across five programs developed skills in creating interactive lessons, using responders, and developing organizational strategies to enhance lesson development and delivery.
- At UMass Worcester, SmartBoards were installed in each classroom.
- Interactive lesson and mini-unit plan templates were made available for teachers to use to create lesson plans using the Understanding By Design (UbD) approach and ActivInspire Software.

Because of hardware installation challenges, many teachers did not receive Promethean training until the spring of 2013. Even with these challenges, coaches and supervisors report high levels of enthusiasm and interest among most teachers for the technology and the ways in which teachers can use it to educate students.
In the first quarter of the 2013-2014, supervisor reports indicate the following:

- Twelve out 16 teachers in the UMass Worcester programs used the technology frequently (3-5 times/week).
- Nine out 16 teachers planned lessons which include the students using the technology.
- Four out of 16 teachers used flipcharts they've created with the ActivInspire software.
- Eight out of 16 teachers have included increasing their skills and effectiveness in using interactive whiteboards/ActivInspire in their Educator Plans for this year.
- Four out of four teachers at Centerpoint reported using Promethean technology and creating interactive lesson plans.

**Next Steps:**

The pilot and the initial two years of training and implementation have shown that implementation of Promethean technology in SEIS settings is feasible and likely to be well-received by teachers and students. In 2013-14 the implementation efforts will continue at UMass Worcester and Centerpoint. All schools have instructional coaches and/or supervisors that are trained in the use of the technology and additional embedded coaching is provided on an “as needed basis” by the Promethean trainer.

CES staff suggest further training and site-based targeted support for SEIS educators to enhance the effective use of the Promethean technology:

**Training/Coaching:**

- As teachers move forward in using the technology, they will need more in-depth training on tools that the software provides (e.g., responders, math tools, recording tools, and hyperlinks).
- Teachers, especially ones who are not very tech-savvy, will need coaching as they deliver interactive lessons.
- Teachers would benefit from additional support in creating interactive lesson plans. This might take the form of training coaches to assist the teachers in developing interactive lesson plans.
- Teachers will also need further coaching on using the data from student responders to encourage higher order thinking as well as lesson development and lesson plan refinement.
Logistics:

- There remained some challenges to be addressed with the SmartBoard™ technology. In the small classrooms, the harsh lighting and long throw projectors had been problematic. (This was addressed over the summer of 2013, but will need to be monitored to determine if the modifications have fully addressed the problem).
- Additional technology may be needed. As teachers begin using the responders, more responders and hubs will be helpful. Additional hubs would allow more than one teacher to use the technology at a time.
- Teachers at the MHS have requested 1-to-1 iPads, as there is an app that allows the students to switch technology to work with Promethean through the iPad. This would allow greater student participation and engagement.
- Efforts need to be taken to ensure that lesson plans developed can be archived and saved for future use and adaptation.

References and Research Supporting this Approach:


Ricci, A. (2010). Evaluation Study of the Effect of Promethean’s ActivClassroom on Students with Special Needs (see attachments). This report summarizes a pilot project implementing Promethean technology in Toronto with special needs students in 15 different schools. Pre- and post-surveys conducted with teachers showed improvement in student learning indicators as well as behavior.
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ActivInspire Overview

Award-winning ActivInspire software helps teachers bring lessons to life with rich, powerful activities that grab students’ attention, blending real-time assessment and real-world experience into the learning process.

ActivInspire software at a glance:

- Dual-user capability* and interactivity tools promote collaboration and engagement in whole-class or small-group lessons.
- Built-in lesson resources and 90,000+ resources on Promethean Planet give teachers a head start on the creation of innovative, engaging lessons.
- Integration with Promethean’s student response systems facilitates ongoing learner participation and real-time assessment.

Visually Engaging and Impactful Lessons

With ActivInspire software, teachers transform traditional, lecture-based classrooms into learning environments infused with imaginative, interactive experiences that captivate students’ attention while granting them the freedom to take ownership of their achievement.

Designed to foster collaboration and active learning, ActivInspire empowers teachers to blend real-time assessment and real-world experience into the learning process.

ActivInspire integrates ActivArena’s dual-user functionality and Promethean’s award-winning student response systems to support collaborative teamwork and ongoing assessment in the classroom. With access to premium content, including assessment templates and unlimited visual and auditory resources, ActivInspire provides you with all the building blocks you need to create differentiated lessons filled with rich, hands-on activities in a fraction of the time.

Why ActivInspire?

Increase collaboration
Dual-user input* and pen and touch functionality encourage students to engage, interact and work together during lessons, resulting in communication-building teamwork.

Enhance classroom efficiency
Deliver more effective lessons with fully functional, integrated tools like Revealer and Spotlight focus tools, Magic Ink, Clock and Math Tools.

Simplify lesson preparation and delivery
ActivInspire’s intuitive interface allows teachers to easily create lessons, enhance collaboration and engage students through interactive tools.
Discover timesaving resources
With curriculum-based templates and an assortment of tools, images and activities, ActivInspire provides you with all the building blocks you need to create an interactive learning environment. Connect with Promethean Planet, one of the world’s largest online educator communities, to discover a wide variety of free resources for use in the classroom.

Key Features

- Dual interface—Easily switch between Primary for young learners and Studio for older students.
- Support for mathematical equations—Use the Equation Editor to add mathematical equations into a flipchart or into questions or response options for ActivExpression learner response devices.
- Cross-platform and flexible—Compatible with Windows, Mac and Linux and can be used with most any interactive display.
- Embedded web browser—Stream content and data directly from websites into flipcharts, rather than downloading it and storing locally.
- Import-friendly—Integrate files and content from a variety of other applications, such as Microsoft® PowerPoint®, Adobe® and Smart Notebook™.
- Extensive customization features—Create a profile to suit your teaching style and lesson requirements.
- Easily share — Access the Send as Email feature to attach a flipchart to email from within ActivInspire.

*Availability of dual-user capability within ActivInspire is dependent upon interactive whiteboard used.*
Evaluation Study of the Effect of Promethean’s ActivClassroom on Students with Special Needs

Prepared by
Anne Ricci

The Toronto Public District School Board’s Special Education and Support Services Department conducted a Pilot Study Project in 2006 and 2007 to evaluate the effect of Promethean’s ActivClassroom on students with special learning needs. The study included students in 15 schools ranging from Elementary, Middle and Secondary levels. Each quadrant in the Toronto Public District School Board was represented, including one detention centre. All students were identified with special needs in one or more of the following areas: DD, PD, LD, LD/ Gifted, Behavior and MID.

Participating instructional staff measured student learning by observing student performance based on a variety of performance indicators. The control was obtained by measuring student performance on each indicator in classrooms during the 2006 school year before the Promethean technology was installed. The same group of students were then measured, using the same indicators, during the 2007 school year after the Promethean ActivClassroom was installed. The difference in each indicator between the 2006 data period and the 2007 data period can be reasonable inferred as the effect of the Promethean ActivClassroom on student learning performance indicators.

The participating schools’ instructional staff included classroom teachers, special education teachers, support staff and consultants. Participants were required to participate in a three day training and complete pre and post data collection, including, but not limited to: EQAO, DRA, writing exemplars, in depth interview, questionnaires, research department surveys or other educational assessments aligned to the Ontario Curriculum.

Participating teachers indicated that the technology met the individual learning needs of a broad range of students with special needs from those with learning disabilities to developmentally disabled students. Teachers felt that the Promethean learning system was easy to use, increased their students’ attention and focus, created a highly interactive classroom, and appeared to improve students’ self-esteem because they were so successful.

Teachers also found that the hard surface of the Activboard had a positive effect for students with special needs since the placement of students’ hands or fingers on the ActivBoard did not
inadvertently act as a “mouse” and therefore “muck things up.” Student use of the ActivPen also had a positive effect on handwriting while ActivWand had a positive impact for students whose physical disabilities made gripping a pen difficult.

The methods in which learning materials were presented were easily and efficiently adapted – which also supports teachers’ needs. Teachers also found that that using the Promethean technology had a positive effect on student social interactions as evidence by increased turn-taking, sharing, collaborating and interacting in group work activities. The ActiVotes provided students with immediate feedback of their learning through a visual graph or pie chart which reduced students’ fears and increased their willingness to take risks.

The results from pre and post teacher survey showed that the utilization of the Promethean ActivClassroom had a significantly positive effect on each student learning indicator measured. The findings also clearly illustrate a substantive decrease in the measured indicators of behavioral issues that impede student learning. These indicators include: student engagement, fine motor skill development, classroom participation, focused time on task, on time assignment completion, student collaboration, behavior, and attendance.

The success of the Pilot Study Project conducted in 2006 and 2007 demonstrated a type of “Reverse Integration” in that the Promethean technology has the potential to serve all students, not just students with special needs. The project was expanded and approved as part of the Toronto District School Board’s submissions for the Council of Directors of Education (CODE) Special Education Projects for the 2007-2008 school year.

Indicator 1: Student Engagement

The findings in Figure 1 indicate that the use of the Promethean ActivClassroom led to a significant increase in student engagement as measured by teacher observation. The level of student engagement was plotted on a 5 point scale with 5 denoting the highest level of engagement. In the Level 5 category, student engagement increased 30.8 percent, while the level of students highly disengaged – a Level 1 Category – decreased to 0%. Promethean ActivClassroom provides auditory, visual and kinesthetic stimulation to students. This allows students to interact with and process new knowledge and information in a multisensory fashion, thereby increasing their multisensory engagement in the learning process. Student engagement is a strong indicator for increases in other learning and skill development areas such as academic achievement, class participation, time on task, attendance, improved behavior and work completion (Marzano, 2009).
Indicator 2: Contribution to Discussions

Figure 2 illustrates that the percentage of students who never or seldom contributed to class discussions decreased, while the number of students contributing usually and always increased significantly. A logical inference can be made that actively engaged students are more focused on the learning and therefore are better able to contribute to class discussions. Students who actively contribute to class discussion integrate better in the least restrictive environment with their same age, nondisabled peers. Actively contributing students are also more likely to communicate effectively and transfer skills to other settings and are also more likely to have strong self advocacy skills.
**Indicator 3: Working With Peers**

Figure 3 indicates that after the Promethean technology was installed, the percentage of students who were never observed working with peers decreased significantly, while the percentage of students who were observed to work with their peers most or all of the time increased significantly. Working with peers helps students with special needs learn new communication and problem solving skills. Students who effectively work with peers in the least restrictive environment are also more likely to have success when they transition to other settings.

![Bar Chart: The Student Works with Peers](Figure 3)

**Indicator 4: Finishing Activities on Time**

The data in Figure 4 illustrates how the percentage of students who never completed assignments on time decreased by 22 percent, while the percentage of students who always completed their activities on time increased by 10.2 percent. Additionally, the percentage of students who seldom finished their activities on time decreased, and the percentage of students who usually completed their work on time increased by 15%. When students have information presented in a multisensory format they are more likely to be engaged and complete their learning tasks within the time allotted.
**Indicator 5: Regular Participation**

As Figure 5 illustrates, the amount of regular student participation increased in an ActivClassroom environment. The percentage of students that never and seldom participate decreased, while the percentage of students that usually and always contribute increased. Multisensory environments provide students opportunities to actively engage with new learning in collaboration with their peers. This leads to the development of improved communication skills within a meaningful context.

**Indicator 6: Level of Function**

Figure 6 indicates that the level of student function increased in an ActivClassroom environment. The percentage of students with poor and fair motor skills decreased, while the percentage of students with
good motor skills increased by 22.2 percent. The use of the stylus on the board makes it easy to identify students with motor development issues. The use of the stylus on the board also supports the development of fine motor skills.

**Indicator 7: Time on Task**

Figure 7 depicts that in an ActivClassroom environment, the percentage of students that never focused for the appropriate time on task was dramatically reduced to 0%. Every student was able to focus on the multisensory stimulation. The percentage of Students that seldom were “on task” decreased by over 40 percent, while the percentage of students categorized as “usually” or “always” focused increasing by 30 percent and 20% respectively. The multisensory stimulation provided by the ActivClassroom was more engaging for students as measured by the dramatic increase of students on task.
Indicator 8: Reading Ability Meets Grade Expectations

The percentage of students more than 2 years below grade level decreased by over 15%, while the percentage of students reading at grade level increased by over 13%.

Indicator 9: Self Motivation

Figure 9 shows that the percentage of students who were categorized as never displaying self motivation decreased by 26%. The percentage of students usually or always engaged increased by more than 10%. This is particularly meaningful for students with disabilities who generally experience failure year after year and quickly lose motivation. A logical inference is that there is a strong correlation between student engagement and self motivation.
Indicator 10: Expectations for Volume of Written Work

Figure 10 shows the percentage of students who never met expectations for written work decreased by 26%, while the percentage of students meeting this expectation increased significantly.

Indicator 11: Expectations for Legibility of Written Work

Figure 11 indicates that in an ActivClassroom environment, the percentage of students who were below grade level for written work decreased by 15%, while the percentage of students meeting this expectation increased by 15%.
Indicator 12: Following Written Instructions

Figure 12 shows that in an ActivClassroom environment, the percentage of students who were below grade level for following written instructions decreased by 15%, while the percentage of students meeting this expectation increased by 15%.

Indicator 13: Working Independently

Figure 13 shows that in the ActivClassroom environment, the percentage of students categorized as never working independently decreased by over 18%, while the percentage of students always working independently increased by 36% The more students are engaged and working collaboratively, the
greater the communication and exposure they have to other students’ styles of learning as opposed to the teacher’s learning and teaching preference. This leads to opportunities for students to demonstrate their strengths in a group setting, while gaining exposure to other styles and ways of problem solving that could potentially strengthen their weaknesses and equip them with tools and skills for working independently.

Indicator 14: Understanding Verbal Instructions

Figure 14 shows that in an ActivClassroom environment, the percentage of students understanding complex instructions increased by over 25%. This is a significant indicator of student comprehension.

Indicator 15: Age Appropriate Computer Skills

Figure 15 illustrates that in an ActivClassroom environment, student computer skills increase significantly. The percentage of student categorized as 2 years below age appropriate computer skills
decreased by 30%, while the percentage of students categorized as at age appropriate levels increased by 25%.

Indicator 16: Student Behaviour

Figure 16 illustrates that student behavior in an ActivClassroom trend towards significantly improved social behaviors. The percentage of students that were categorized in all the lowest behavioral ratings decreased, while the percentage of students exhibiting the highest level of behavioral interaction, category 4 and 5, increased by 10% and 20% respectively. When students are engaged and provided lessons in a meaningful and relevant context, behavioral improves which is highly correlated to increased student achievement.
Figure 17 shows that in an ActivClassroom student attendance trends upward. The percentage of students in lowest 2 categories decreased to 0%. All student attendance improved and the majority of students fell into the two best categories (4 and 5).

Indicator 18: Reading without Losing Place

Figure 18 illustrates that in an ActivClassroom environment students increased skill of reading without losing their place. The percentage of students in the lowest categories (“Never” and “Seldom”) were reduced, while the percentage of students categorized as “usually” and “always” able to read without losing place increased by 22% and 8% respectively, which is highly correlated to increases reading fluency and comprehension.
Conclusion:

The results from pre and post teacher survey showed that the utilization of the Promethean ActivClassroom had a significantly positive effect in each student learning indicator measured. The findings also clearly illustrate a substantive decrease in the measured indicators of behavioral issues that impede student learning.

ActivClassroom Components:

- ActivBoard
- Learner Response Systems
- Lessons Aligned to Ontario Curriculum
- Interactive Software
- Professional Development
- Professional Learning Community

“I think the advent of this new technology that Promethean does so well, The ActivClassroom, will change the face of teaching in terms of how we interact with students and what we use as content. I think this technology will help add a whole new set of strategies that were never available before.” – Dr. Robert Marzano

References

Promethean Pilot results – June 2011

For the most part teachers at MHS are just beginning to explore Promethean technology. Most, if not all have had a 90 minute to 2 hour workshop on Promethean Technology. The technology staff has had more in-depth training, but are still in one of the initial steps of learning the technology and what advantages it may bring to the students at MHS.

In late May, of the 6-8 faculty members that have used the technology either in their classroom or in the computer lab were asked to complete a survey talking about the technology and the impact on the students at MHS. Highlights of their responses are provided below.

How has Promethean technology impacted MHS students and staff?

1. Please describe any changes you have observed in student involvement because of the Promethean?
   - Students with visual or attention issues are more focused and their performance is improved. I think the small group lessons are more active, and students are more willing to participate. There is an excitement when learning is so active and involves some many senses. I also believe that it encourages some students to be leaders, and they are able to demonstrate to others what they know. It is a very exciting tool that we have only just begun to see the many benefits for our students.
   - Active involvement, asking to take turns, excitement to use voting devices.
   - Big screen group activity draws in some students that are harder to reach.

2. Please describe any changes you have noticed in student/teacher interaction that can be attributed to use of the Promethean.
   - The primary change is the student can take charge of their learning, and are actively demonstrating what they know. For some students, it gives them an opportunity to teach other students or educational staff how to use technology.
   - Interactions are active rather than passive, and students own their learning.

3. Please describe any difference in student motivation to learn or participate in class that can be attributed to use of the Promethean.
   - When you give students the opportunity to be actively engaged in their learning their motivation increases. There may be some students who don't like the attention, and the promethean responders give them an opportunity to respond privately, thus they are more apt to be actively involved.
   - Students are interested in using the board and pens. They enjoy the hands on aspect and being able to work on a big screen.
4. Please describe the ways in which the Promethean has impacted classroom management.

- Again, when students are given the tools to be in charge of their own learner with the teacher being a facilitator there are less occurrences of behavioral issues. The Promethean is also fun, and there are so many resources available on Promethean Planet.
- A boring or difficult concept becomes engaging when it is presented in a multiple of different and creative ways.

Issues and challenges

1. Please describe any ways that you have modified or would like to modify Promethean technology to suit your needs.

- The pointer is difficult for some students to use, so an adapted pointer was made to hold the device.
- Need to have activities be single switch accessible, ability to scan.
- Extension handles for pens.
- Would be nice to make a couple of ActivExpressions switches accessible.

2. Please describe any Promethean functionality that you or your students would like.

- I would like software to create different ways a student could respond using a computer as a responder. For example, I would like to take the screen, have the four choices be pictures instead of letters, and have the capability of setting up scanning so a physically handicapped student could hit a switch to indicate their response.
- Touch-screen use without pens, ability to use other devices for access besides the responders, i.e., laptops

Future ideas and thoughts

1. Do you believe it would beneficial to have Promethean technology in your classroom? Please explain your answer.

- Promethean technology in each classroom would make curriculum more visible, interactive and accessible for all our students. The inspire software is an excellent authoring tool to differentiate curriculum to meet the individual needs of a student. Individuals learn when they do, and Promethean technology gives students the tools to be actively involved in their learning.
- Yes, many of our classrooms could use an interactive board with their students, some with minor accommodations, others may need more accessibility. Many of the students have enjoyed using BrainPop and taking the quizzes
2. **Briefly describe what you would like to learn about Promethean.**
   - I don't do lesson, rather I either direct teachers to materials that may be appropriate to be used in their classrooms. I would like to look at using other devices to input information. I would also like to continue to learn how to adapt and create accessible curriculum.
   - More instruction on creating activities/flipcharts
   - How to interface with the virtual hub.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MHS and DMH Promethean trainings and site visitations</th>
<th>2011-2012 School year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2011</td>
<td>Researched Promethean technology with national promethean staff and end users regarding using switch technology and promethean responders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2011</td>
<td>Met with Promethean sales staff to obtain contacts of instructors using Promethean technology with severely engaged students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| November 2011                                        | 1. Observational Site visit at MHS  
   2. Met with Bill Benjamin on several occasions to bring him up to discuss the applications of the ActivInspire technology and the MHS classrooms and staff. |
| January 4                                            | Hands-on training  
   Introduction to the ActivInspire Software |
| January 18                                           | Hands-on training  
   Part 1 – Core Essentials |
| January 25                                           | Hands-on training  
   Part 2 – Core Essentials |
| February 8                                           | Developed and implemented a Google spreadsheet to track SEIS Promethean software technology and licenses within DMH and MHS |
| February 21                                          | Site Visit MHS  
   Troubleshoot active engage responders implementation issues. |
| March 21                                             | Site Visit MHS  
   Visit to trouble shoot with teachers and Sandy Shoro |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 28 | Site Visit MHS  
Be a resource for and trouble shoot with teachers, Sandy Shoro and Ann LeBrecque |
| April | Hands on training  
Beyond Core Essentials |
| May | Site Visit to DMH  
1. Work with instructors that had gone through the January trainings.  
2. Gave an introduction to Promethean technology to non-trained staff |
| June | Hands –on training – MHS  
Classroom aids on Learning responders and Promethean resources. |
Implementing Promethean Technology at MHS and DMH – Consultant Progress Report (June 2012)

During the 2011 and 2012 school year, CES in collaboration with SEIS launched an initial implementation of Promethean Technology into the MHS and DMH SEIS campuses. The work was based on the initial finding of the pilot study on the student and staff reaction to the advantages of the technology in the classroom and the specific needs of the SEIS student populations.

Among the many instructional strengths that the technology offers the faculty and students, we have found that one of the strengths the ActivInspire software offers MHS teachers is a way to organize their curriculum and provide easy access to curriculum resources. This underscores our initial thoughts of the advantages that ActivInspire would provide the MHS staff and faculty. In addition, it allows them to organize their curriculum resources and lesson in concert with their curriculum mapping activities. This is not to minimize that importance of the responders and the interactivity of the software. The students love the responders; however we are still having some issues implementing them with this population. Many of the students lack the dexterity needed to use the keyboards and small buttons that are on the responders often used in classrooms, e.g., ActivExpressions and ActiVotes. We have found that the most effective way for this population to utilize the responders is through ActivEngage. Furthermore, preliminary exploration of the technology has shown that the ActivEngage response system on an iPad would be a perfect resolution that would allow all of the students to interact with the curriculum. Currently there are not enough iPads to implement the ActiveEngage for students although we have been working with the software, apps and technology and it appears to have great promise.

Recap of the year to date:
Summer – Time was spent researching the technology required to connect the ActivEngage to switch technology.

Fall – Bill Benjamin and Rachel Porter (CES Promethean Training Consultant) met several times to discuss and brainstorm how Promethean technology could be best used to support the MHS teachers. They noted that teachers use several software tools, notably Classroom Suite and BoardMaker, both in the classroom and on the Promethean Board. Questions and strategizing revolved around what difference would learning ActivInspire make for the MHS classroom teacher. The real advantage for MHS teachers was probably going to be that it would provide a way for the teachers to organize their curriculum and supporting resources into retrievable and easy to manage lesson plan tool. The advantage for the students we felt was in the use of the responders. In November, Rachel Porter observed a PD day at MHS to get to know the faculty and staff better and to understand the initiatives that they are grappling with.

January
1. We completed the “Core Essential” training. This two day training, attended by staff selected from MHS and DMH.
2. We also completed the training on using responders to develop formative assessments. This one day training, attended by staff selected from MHS and DMH.
February
1. With the newly acquired understanding of the software the strategic work began of how help staff and teachers work with this new technology and how it fits into their pedagogy in a way that is relevant to their students and their curriculum.
   a. Consultant (Rachel Porter) spent a day February devoted to sorting through the technology resources at CES and assigning items to either MHS or DMH and researching the information that staff and faculty needed to:
      1. Implement the active engage responders
      2. Support teacher issues as they came up
      3. Develop a tracking system for cataloging SEIS Promethean equipment and licenses
   b. Consultant spent one day at MHS working with staff to activate ActiveEngage.
   c. Time was also spent responding to staff emails trouble shooting various issues that they were having regarding their implementation issues and providing technical support.

March
In March, Ann LaBrecque, Sandy Shoro and Rachel Porter began discussing how ActivInspire might best be used to support the teachers. Ann and Sandy said that the teachers were feeling overwhelmed by the amount of information and initiatives this year. It quickly became evident that ActivInspire could provide a unique way of organizing all of the different activities, websites, formative assessments, etc., that make up a lesson or unit, and thereby augmenting curriculum maps. Additionally, this solution allows teachers to have all the lesson resources they need at their fingertips and provides a way of presenting differentiated material within their lesson plans to their students.
1. Day 1 in March was devoted to:
   a. Working with Sandy and Ann to show how to create flip charts flipcharts that could serve as computer lesson plans through applying actions or Hyperlinks within the flipcharts that allow the user to easily navigate through the resources.
   b. Strategizing best ways to support teachers
   c. Talking with the librarian to brainstorm ways in which to resolve her implementation issues and providing technical support.
2. Day 2 in March was devoted to:
   a. Continuation of Day 1 in March working with Ann and Sandy to develop flipcharts that supported teachers’ curriculum and lesson themes, including technical support using ActivInspire.
   b. Met with librarian to discuss technology uses for gathering student survey data.
   c. Documenting the progress to date

April
In April we held our final training of the original teachers and staff that were chosen for this pilot. This will encompass many of the skills that are taught in the
Beyond Core Essentials training and will be accompanied with the Beyond Core Essentials manual. Additionally, we introduced staff to the concept using flipcharts as lesson organization tools that have built in formative assessment capabilities using the learning responders and can feed the curriculum map.

May

One day was spent at DMH conducting 2 trainings. Teachers that had been trained were invited to work more discuss the issues and challenges that they were facing in regards to Promethean Technology Implementation. Additionally staff that had not had the chance to see the technology in action were introduced to the software

June

Classroom aides were given a half day training in June on the how to assist with the learning responders technology and take advantages of the resources that the software offers.

Next Steps

Additionally, next steps for the implementation efforts might include:

1. Strategic planning and implementation of Promethean technology in classrooms.
2. Continue to work with teachers and staff to support in developing lesson units and plans. This should be in integrated with their curriculum maps and other assistive technology.
3. Additional resources and work to implement ActivEngage in classrooms.
4. Work with faculty and staff to create curriculum resources and organizers for the teachers at MHS and DMH.
5. Strategize how we can best support DMH in their implementation of Promethean Technology.
6. Having time to work and brainstorm with the faculty to strategize the implementation of the technology at MHS has been invaluable. As funding allows, provide this to the DMH teachers and coaches as well.

Of note: there are some items that would help teachers take greater advantage of the technology, they are:

1. iPads for classrooms to use as ActiveEngage responders. The larger and flexible format would be especially helpful for teachers and even more so for this population.
2. Large flat screen monitors so that teachers can use the technology in their classrooms. Although it would not provide the depth of interactivity that Promethean boards in every classroom would provide, it would allow teachers to use the responders and the software in their classrooms. Ideally we would install more Promethean boards, however this would be a great step forward.
ActivLearning with ActivInspire

Core Training Outline

Core Essentials

- Build understanding and knowledge of Promethean technology
- Develop ways to use this technology in lesson planning
- Explore how the software works
- Learn how to create and modify flip charts
- Explore ways to use the technology in the classroom

Beyond Core Essentials

- Build on initial training to develop flipcharts to organize lessons and curriculum
- Explore what colleagues have been constructing with ActivInspire
- Learn how to create containers, interactive calendars, insert actions, and explore the property browser

Using Responders

- Overview of classroom practices to engage students in learning
- Ways to use responders:
  - Questioning techniques
  - Formative assessment
  - Solicit student questions
  - Generate ideas/brainstorming
  - Differentiate by tailoring questions
  - Pair work and group work
  - Collect data for student use
  - Immediate student feedback
  - Generating classroom discussion
  - Summative assessment
Lesson Plans

SEIS Interactive Templates

Mini-Unit Lesson Plans
Promethean Training at DMH Programs: 2012-2013

Sample Slides From Presentations
Day 1 - Objectives

Use our educational expertise to evaluate Promethean technology.

Understand how we might be able to engage students by expanding our curriculum with the technology.

Explore the software and technology.

Become familiar with the goals of the training.

Why Promethean?
I have a Smart Board.

Our goal: To create and use interactive lesson plans.

ActivExpression

Visual (seeing & reading)
- ... involves the use of seen or observed things, including pictures, diagrams, demonstrations, displays, handouts, films, flip charts etc.

Auditory (listening & speaking)
- ... involves the transfer of information through listening: the spoken word, of self or others, of sounds and noises.

Kinesthetic (touching & doing)
- ... involves physical experience - touching, feeling, holding, doing, and practical hands-on experiences.

Watch the following video and pay close attention to ALL the details!

What type of

Financial Planning

Animal Supply Store

E Educator recruitment

Retail Store

Data Management
Promethean Technology includes:

🌟 System powered by ActivInspire software
🌟 Learner responders - ActivExpressions, ActiVote, ActivPen, ActivSlate and ActivEngage
🌟 Global community of users pooling free downloadable lesson plans, resources and ideas.
🌟 On-line user forum for discussions and troubleshooting
🌟 Accredited Software Partnerships with BrainPop, National Geographic, Scholastic and many more.

English
red
orange

Spanish
amarillo

Pull a fact from the leaves. Is it True or False about Reptiles?
cold blooded scales

Pictures provide interest and a place to hide con

Learn about some other parts of the cell...

Pull down the shade to look inside a volcano.
Essential Questions
1. How can I create interactive lesson plans
2. How can I save my files so that they will be available next year.

Our objectives:
Briefly discuss the anatomy of a Flipchart
Explore how to create and save lessons using the SEIS interactive template
If time allows - Using the camera tool

Any insights or questions since our last meeting.

Used videos
Ed head - interactive surgery (10-15min) Surgery
My doctor games - warm-up
Mattie's step book - Poetry song

Flipchart Structure
A flipchart is built in four layers
Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013
Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
PROGRAM OF STUDIES

Purpose:

The SEIS Leadership Team convened a workgroup during the 2012-2013 school year to develop a consistent program of studies for the DMH adolescent programs. The primary goals of this effort were to:

- align course offerings in DMH programs with MassCore guidelines and CommonCore standards in all academic content areas;
- develop a consistent set of high school course offerings across all DMH Programs and develop clear course descriptions;
- identify teaching and curriculum resources for each content area; and
- develop grading scale recommendations for DMH educational programs.

The work of this group relied on the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, aligned with the Common Core State Standards (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore); the MassCore recommended progression of high school courses (http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/masscore); the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) course descriptions, and a review of course descriptions from ten high schools in the home school districts of many students in SEIS.

While the focus of this effort was to develop consistent academic program offerings at each DMH high school program, it is important to note that students enter DMH programs at very different skill levels and different stages of readiness to take on academic content. Teachers personalize instruction and assessment to engage students, and to maximize opportunities for them to meet rigorous course standards. In addition, IEP teams specify when accommodations and/or modifications to course content will be necessary due to a student’s educational disability. These decisions are recorded in IEP planning notes, and referenced on the Academic Report that is shared with home school districts.
Activities:

The primary activities of the workgroup included the following:

- Review of current curriculum in all DMH programs
- Development of a crosswalk of DMH curricula with DYS course descriptions, other course descriptions, and MassCore
- Creation of a standard set of course offerings and course descriptions including English, math, science, and social studies, as well as four standard electives for all students
- Initial planning of a process for the development and approval of other electives
- Identification of training, curricula, and other resource needs
- Design of pilot projects to assess use of health curricula in DMH programs
- Initial planning regarding grading criteria

Outcomes:

The workgroup was successful in creating a DMH High School Program of Studies that outlines the academic course offerings across all adolescent programs (see attachments). It provides course descriptions for the following:

- ELA courses for grades 9-12
- Four history and social studies classes (US history I and II and world history I and II)
- Four math classes (pre-algebra, algebra I and II, and geometry)
- Three science classes (chemistry, biology, and physics)
- Academic enrichment, focusing on literacy, numeracy, organizational, and study skills
- Arts electives, aligned with the Massachusetts Arts Curriculum Frameworks
- Career development and life skills
- Health and physical education

(Note that the list of courses in the Program of Studies is not an exhaustive list. As needed, students will be able to access more advanced coursework in core content areas, including virtual and other individualized options.)

Aspen includes a revised Quarterly Academic Report form to document student progress in each of the content areas. In addition, the workgroup has provided input regarding the development of a personalized course selection/planning process, but agreed that full rollout of the Program of Studies should occur before this personalization process can be formally articulated.)
Next Steps:

Based on the recommendations and current activities, the workgroup identified the following next steps:

- Continue informal investigation of art curriculum and teaching resources
- Pending SEIS leadership review and feedback on the Program of Studies:
  - Finalize a personalized course selection/planning process and add a description of this process to the Program of Studies
  - Include finalized, approved information in the Program of Studies on criteria and documentation used in grading
  - Expand the Program of Studies with sections for elementary and middle school grades
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1. DMH Program of Studies (2013)
PROGRAM OF STUDIES
Department of Mental Health Programs: Grades 9-12

Introduction

SEIS (Special Education in Institutional Settings) provides educational services to students who reside in DMH facilities, subject to available resources and in collaboration with responsible school districts. SEIS services address students' special education and transition needs as outlined in their Individual Education Plans, and provide instruction in the content areas described in this Program of Studies.

SEIS staff review educational records and input from students, families and school district representatives to align instruction with the students' projected graduation and transition needs. SEIS teachers then analyze assessment data such as informal reading and math inventories, writing samples and transition planning data, to further tailor instruction to each student's individual needs.

Alignment with MassCore (Appendix A)

MassCore, the recommended program of studies for Massachusetts high school students, includes four years of English, four years of Math, three years of a lab-based Science, three years of history, two years of the same foreign language, one year of an arts program and five additional "core" courses such as business education, health, and/or technology. MassCore also recommends additional learning opportunities including AP classes, dual enrollment, a senior project, online courses for high school or college credit, and service or work-based learning.

Aligning with the above, a typical student's daily schedule will include instruction in English, math, science, social studies and, on an alternating schedule, Career Development and Life Skills, Health and Physical Education, The Arts, and Academic Enrichment. Technology is integrated into all course options.

Individualized Options

Online or additional learning opportunities may be accessed or developed as needed for a student's individual graduation plan.

Also, IEP teams specify when modifications in course content, methodology or performance criteria will be necessary due to a student’s individual needs. These decisions are recorded in IEP planning notes, and referenced on the Academic Report.
Alignment with Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks / Common Core State Standards

All content area instruction addresses the standards in the corresponding Massachusetts Curriculum Framework and the Common Core standards that are aligned to the Curriculum Framework.

Courses

*Note: The following list of core courses can be supplemented as needed for individual students. Examples include using course resources from home school districts, virtual courses and project-based learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Content</th>
<th>English Language Arts:</th>
<th>English 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics:</td>
<td>Pre-Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Algebra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Algebra II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science:</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies:</td>
<td>U.S. History I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. History II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World History I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>World History II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Content:</td>
<td>Academic Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career Development and Life Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Descriptions

Core Content:

English Language Arts

English 9
In this course students analyze character and theme closely to become skillful readers of literature. The concepts of literacy elements and devices are used by students to observe and discuss themes and characters’ motivations, values, actions, conflicts, and thoughts. Students demonstrate their ability to comprehend, construct, and convey meaning through thoughtful responses to all forms of written literature. Writing tasks include both open response questions and essays. Students, as writers, develop their own voices as they make conscious choices about content, organization, and style.

English 10
In this course students examine the quality of the language that writers use as well as the varied style that makes writers individuals. Through a close study of literature, students analyze intricate and subtle language patterns, connotative suggestions, diction, tone, figurative language, word choice and style, and analyze how these devices contribute meaning to writing. Writing tasks assigned include both open response questions and essays. Responses to all forms of written literature provide students a venue to demonstrate their ability to comprehend, construct, and convey meaning. As writers, students develop their own voice as they make conscious choices about content, organization, and style. Finally, students develop skills in test taking strategies including multiple choice, open response, and long composition.

English 11
In this course students continue to develop their application of reading comprehension strategies building upon skills learned in freshman and sophomore years. Genres including fiction, nonfiction, poetry, and drama are explored and students analyze the personal and social implications of theme, voice, and point of view. Students demonstrate an understanding through their own writing as well as discussion of how writers use their craft as a means of social critique and empowerment. Students write for a variety of purposes and audiences, and are instructed in a range of techniques to enable them to express ideas with conviction, clarity, and artistry. Students become more proficient at having something to say and discover what they think, feel, and value through writing.

English 12
In this course students read, analyze, and respond to a wide range of literature representing various cultures, genres, styles, time periods, and aesthetic theories. Through careful analysis of literary works and examination of their societal implications, students relate the works to those of other cultures, including their own. Artistic and moral intentions of each text are explored. Focus is placed on establishing the student’s own critical voice. Students develop a
variety of critical lenses and analytic techniques to evaluate the morals, values and choices that authors present in order to formulate their own morals, values, decisions.

History and Social Studies

US History I
Students examine the historical and intellectual origins of the United States during the Revolutionary and Constitutional eras. Consequences of the Revolution, including the writing and key ideas of the US Constitution, are explored. The basic framework of American democracy and the basic concepts of American government such as sovereignty, federalism, separation of powers, and individual rights in addition to America’s westward expansion, the establishment of political parties, and economic and social change are included in the study of this period. Finally, students learn about the growth of sectional conflict, how this led to the Civil War, and the consequences of the Civil War including Reconstruction.

US History II
Causes and consequences of the Industrial Revolution and America’s growing role in diplomatic relations are analyzed. Students study the goals and the accomplishments of the Progressive movement and the New Deal. The various forces that led to America’s entry into World War II as well as the consequences of World War II on American life are presented. Finally, students study the causes and course of the Cold War, important economic and political changes during the Cold War, including the Civil Rights movement, and recent events and trends that have shaped modern-day America.

World History I
Students study the history of the major empires and political entities that emerged after the fall of the Roman Empire, including the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Mogul Empire, the Chinese Dynasties, and the major pre-Columbian civilizations that existed in Central and South America. The important political, economic, and religious developments of this period, including the development of democratic, scientific, and secular thought in Europe are examined.

World History II
Students study the rise of the nation state in Europe, the French Revolution, and the economic and political roots of the modern world. The study the origins and consequences of the Industrial Revolution, 19th century political reform in Western Europe, and imperialism in Africa, Asia, and South America. The causes and consequences of the great military and economic events of the past century, including World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, the Cold War, and the Russian and Chinese revolutions are examined. Finally, students study the rise of nationalism and the continuing persistence of political, ethnic, and religious conflict in many parts of the world.
Mathematics
Pre-Algebra
Pre-Algebra introduces basic Algebra concepts and a review of arithmetic algorithms. While reviewing and building in arithmetic skills, Pre-Algebra furthers math understanding by delving into number theory and integers, and explores negative numbers and algebraic expressions. The variable is introduced as a concept. The course also highlights linear relations and their expression in tables, graphs, and equations. Data, statistics and probability, basic geometry and its connection to algebra, and consumer-related applications of math principles are presented in real-world scenarios.

Algebra I
This course introduces variables, constants, expressions, and equations. Topics covered include: solving equations, simplifying expressions, understanding order or operations, and using properties such as field axioms. This course covers arithmetic operations with positive and negative numbers, polynomials, factoring, graphing (linear and quadratic equations) and work with radicals to expand arithmetic knowledge.

Geometry
This course presents the concepts of lines, rays, and angles and teaches students how to measure and find missing measurements by solving algebraic equations. Students learn the concepts of perimeter, area, and volume, and how to calculate for multiple shapes using algebraic formulas.

Algebra II
Algebra II covers advanced algebraic concepts including: models, functions and permutation, linear relationships and functions, matrices, linear systems, quadratic equations and functions, polynomials and polynomial functions, exponential and logarithmic functions, rational functions, periodic functions and trigonometry, quadratic relations, probability and statistics, and sequences and series. This course may include ALEKS math or Compass Odyssey.

*If a student requires Integrated Math coursework to complement the math program in the home school district, an individualized plan for math instruction will be created in collaboration with the school district.

Science
Biology
This course emphasizes the role Biology plays in the lives of students in today’s society. Topics covered include biochemistry, cell structure and function, and energy (photosynthesis and cellular respiration), cellular life cycles and replication, and structure and function of DNA. The course examines the study of hereditary patterns, general anatomy and physiology with a focus on homeostasis between systems, evolution, biodiversity, natural selection, and ecological relationships. Students explore concepts of Biology using embedded standards for Inquiry, Technology & Engineering, and Mathematics.
Chemistry  
Students investigate the composition of matter and the physical and chemical changes it undergoes. Students use science process skills to study the fundamental structure of atoms, the way atoms combine to form compounds, and the interactions between matter and energy. Additionally, aspects of chemical reactions, including limiting reactants, percent yield, equilibrium, reaction rates, and acids and bases are also explored. Students explore concepts of chemistry using embedded standards for Inquiry, Mathematics, and Technology & engineering. This course may include ALEKS math or Compass Odyssey.

Physics  
In this course students study how the world works. The course introduces and examines the fundamental concepts and laws that govern the universe with focus on Motion & Momentum, Forces, and Heat & Energy. In addition, covered topics include the study of Waves, Electromagnetism, and Electromagnetic Radiation. Math and an ability to perform critical analyses of problems involving physical phenomena are required of the students taking this course. Students explore concepts of physics using embedded standards for Inquiry, Technology & Engineering, and Mathematics. The course may include the use of the Compass Odyssey software program.

Additional Content:

Academic Enrichment  
This course focuses on enhancing literacy, numeracy, organizational and study skills. Depending on their individual needs, students apply a range of strategies to organize, analyze, interpret and evaluate information. Students practice application of these strategies across all content areas and in real-world applications.

The Arts  
Students work on skills in the strands and standards outlined in the Massachusetts Arts Curriculum Frameworks at their access level in the areas of visual arts, music and theatre. The standards covered in each Arts elective are listed in the Academic Report.

Career Development and Life Skills  
In this course, students learn to utilize the MassCIS website to explore careers of interest. In addition to career research, students learn to set short-term, transitional, and long-term goals as well as strategies to overcome obstacles that may impede progress towards goal attainment. Through a series of projects and presentations, students develop the academic, workplace readiness, and personal/social competencies necessary for 21st century employment.
Health and Physical Education
This course focuses on the promotion and maintenance of physical, mental, and social well-being by encouraging students to examine their lifestyles, select goals, and make plans to achieve and maintain a healthy quality of life. Emphasis is placed on increasing students’ awareness of current health issues, nutrition, and on promoting positive decision-making skills that aid in the development of life-long healthy behaviors.

Students also develop an appreciation for the importance of personal fitness and learn skills to improve their own fitness levels. Students participate in multiple modes of training throughout the course that may be incorporated into their personal exercise programs. Activities and topics of discussion include: pre and post-fitness assessments, project adventure activities, cardiovascular endurance exercises, stability and medicine balls, resistance bands, jogging, strength training, and power walking. Students are empowered to make wise choices, meet challenges, and develop positive behaviors in fitness, wellness, and movement activity over a lifetime.

Grading Criteria and Documentation

Quarterly Academic Reports provide updates on each youth’s progress in content area instruction. The revised Academic Report Form references the specific courses described in this Program of Studies. SEIS will use these standard course descriptions, along with consistent teaching resources, across all DMH facilities for high school-aged youth. This will enhance teachers’ ability to collaborate, to plan and implement standards-based instruction and assessment, and to communicate student progress to families and school districts.

The revised Academic Report, on the following page, will further refine communication of student progress. Narrower ranges of numerical values for each grade have been defined, making it easier for school districts to average grades from SEIS with grades from the home school and assign high school credit.
# SPECIAL EDUCATION IN INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS

**ACADEMIC REPORT 2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT: David Student</th>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT: BARNSTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH: 1/1/2000</td>
<td>GRADE: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITY: SEIS LIASON (ETL)</td>
<td>ADDRESS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF ADMISSION:</td>
<td>DATE OF DISCHARGE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period From:</td>
<td>Period From:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Possible:</td>
<td># Days Possible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Attended:</td>
<td># Days Attended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Hrs/Qtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period From:</td>
<td>Period From:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Possible:</td>
<td># Days Possible:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Days Attended:</td>
<td># Days Attended:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Hrs/Qtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Grading Key:**
  - A+ 100-97
  - B+ 89-87
  - C+ 79-77
  - D+ 69-77
  - N Below 60
  - A 96-94
  - B 88-84
  - C 78-74
  - D 68-84
  - A- 93-90
  - B- 83-80
  - C- 73-70
  - D- 63-80
  - INC = Incomplete (may be made up at any time prior to discharge).

**SEIS does not award academic credits for coursework completed in the SEIS program, as this is the responsibility of the student's school district. Please contact the ETL as needed for detail of student coursework and assessments.**
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TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Purpose:

During school years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, CES administrators for the SEIS and DYS education initiatives collaborated in the design and development of a teacher evaluation tool that would align with the state’s Educator Evaluation regulations and new Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching. The Collaborative for Educational Services (CES) established a joint workgroup to develop educator evaluation processes and procedures (for CES educators) and to adapt rubrics that reflect the institutional school settings.

The primary objectives of this workgroup were as follows:

- Design and develop a teacher evaluation tool aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation regulations, Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice
- Develop evaluation processes
- Develop and adapt state rubrics to fit the evaluation of teachers in institutional settings
- Assess and refine implementation of evaluation process and tools

The workgroup developed the CES Teacher Evaluation System (TES) to ensure the quality of educational service delivery. The system was designed in alignment with the following principles:

- Promote growth and development: Educators will have regular and timely feedback and opportunities for development that support continuous growth and improvement.
- Acknowledge excellence: Educators will be recognized for excellence.
- Clarify expectations: Educators will have a clear, explicit set of expectations and implications for performance.
- Differentiate to address individual educator needs: Educators will have support and supervision suited to their strengths and challenges.
- Place student learning at the center: Student learning is central to the evaluation and development of our workforce – and is the core work of our schools.
- Promote professionalism: Exemplary educators regularly reflect on their effectiveness, maintain evidence of their successes, and welcome frequent and constructive feedback about how to be more effective in their craft.
Our expectations are high because we know, and research (Darling-Hammond, 2000) supports, that of all the professionals involved in a student’s schooling, the single most important school-based factor in strengthening students’ educational achievement is the quality and effectiveness of the educators who teach them.

**Key Activities:**

The TES Workgroup reviewed the literature on educator evaluation, as well as the Massachusetts Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching and DESE guidance on educator evaluation. The DESE standards and indicators were adapted to align with the expectations for educators in institutional settings. The workgroup also developed rubrics to assess educator performance on each indicator.

Some aspects of the evaluation system were piloted in 2010-2011, and full implementation occurred in 2011-2012. Further additions and revisions were considered and adopted for school year 2012-2013, along with a pilot in the use of TeachPoint, a web-based tool developed for teacher evaluation and aligned to the Massachusetts evaluation system. Detailed documentation of the CES DYS and SEIS Teacher Evaluation System was disseminated in 2013 and is included in the attachments.

A Leadership Seminar to train the Coordinators in the TES implementation process was developed and delivered beginning in the summer of 2011, and throughout the school year. In the following year, further training for Leadership in Supervision and Evaluation occurred, along with onsite observation and coaching by a consultant.

Supervisors were trained in the use of TeachPoint to document findings using four different observation and evaluation processes:

- Classroom walkthrough
- Informal observation
- Formal observation
- Summative evaluation

During professional development days beginning in 2011-2012, all teachers were introduced to the Standards and Indicators for Effective Teaching. As of 2013-14, teachers are expected to complete self-assessments of their proficiency in the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching as part of their goal-setting process. Teaching Coordinators are also completing training on the TES, as they contribute to evaluations via their walk-through and informal observations of teachers on a day-to-day basis.
Outcomes:

Educators in both SEIS and DYS are beginning to demonstrate a common understanding of the Standards and Indicators for Effective Teaching\(^1\), and to integrate them into their practice, as evidenced by mini-unit plans, lesson plans, and as documented in TeachPoint classroom observation forms.

Teacher feedback indicates they value the alignment between professional development supports for teacher growth and the feedback they receive from supervisors (tied to informal and formal observations). In 2011-2012, 78% of SEIS teachers in DYS and DMH reported that they were getting a consistent message from supervisors, coaches, and professional development events regarding the expectations for effective instruction. In addition, toward the end of the 2012-2013, 87% of SEIS in DYS educators reported that supervisors were an important source of skill development support. Several educators described the benefit of receiving supervisory feedback that is directly tied to the standards and indicators.

Supervisors (Host Agency Coordinators) and Program Administrators are now able to access TES data in TeachPoint to monitor individual teacher needs and growth, and to assess overall trends. For example, the Contract Administrator can access reports that identify strengths and areas for development among all SEIS teachers or by host agency (or other subgroups). These findings are used to adapt supervisory supports and to inform professional development planning.

Next Steps:

- Task a design team from SEIS and DYS with the development of teacher rubrics for the Family and Community Engagement Standard (The addition of this Standard is projected for the 2014-2015 school year.)
- Develop standard training on TES for new supervisors
- Develop mechanisms to promote inter-rater reliability
- Work with DYS and TeachPoint to enhance data reporting tools in TeachPoint
- Explore feasibility of using TES data to monitor teacher growth (in aggregate) and to document common needs for further educator skill development
- As DESE recommends additional tools for other Special Education positions (i.e. teacher aide), convene workgroups to review and adapt the tools as part of the design process

---
\(^1\) These are Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment; Standard 2: Teaching All Students; and Standard 3: Professional Culture.
References and Research Supporting TES Design:
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About Collaborative for Educational Services (CES)

At the Collaborative for Educational Services, we believe that everyone is a learner, and that with the right support every learner can find success. We are committed to reaching and educating all young people and helping them find their pathway to success. We are also experienced in working with educators to help students learn and succeed.

For over 35 years, CES has been working with schools, families, young people and communities in the Pioneer Valley and throughout the Commonwealth to create and improve educational opportunities both in and out of the classroom. We partner with school districts and schools to help them assess their instructional programs and create new ways to improve instruction, student learning and achievement. We train teachers who are seeking licensure in order to gain entry into the teaching field as well as teachers and administrators who want to increase their skills and opportunities by gaining an additional license. We have expertise in assisting schools and educators in providing high quality education for students from diverse backgrounds and who are English language learners. We also are known for effective education services for students with special needs. We work with communities to build their capacity to support learners of all ages through early childhood education and care, after school programs, and academic and vocational opportunities for adolescents and young adults.

Mission

Our mission is to develop and foster educational excellence and opportunity for all learners through collaboration and leadership.

Core Statement

We are a community of innovative and effective professionals dedicated to improving education.

We know that everyone is a learner from the day they are born, and we know how to create classrooms and other environments in which every learner can flourish.

We know how to reach, inspire, support, and educate children, youth and adults, and we help others to do the same.

We value...

Quality and excellence
Innovation, creativity and vision
Inclusiveness, equity and diversity
Collaboration with others

Everyone is a learner
INTRODUCTION

On June 28, 2011 the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education adopted new regulations to guide the evaluation of all educators serving in positions requiring a license—teachers, principals, superintendents, and other administrators. The regulations are designed first and foremost to promote leaders’ and teachers’ growth and development. They place student learning at the center of the process using multiple measures of student learning.

As a result of implementing these regulations, each educator will take a leading role in shaping her/his professional growth and development. Among the practices outlined in the new Massachusetts Model that the Collaborative has already adopted are:

- Every educator is required to assess her/his own performance and propose challenging goals for improving her/his own practice and impact.
- Every educator is provided a rubric that offers a detailed picture of practice at four levels of performance. These system-wide rubrics set the stage for both deep reflection and the rich dialogue about practice that our profession seeks.
- Every educator will consider her/his students’ needs and propose one or more challenging goals for improving student learning.
- Every educator will compile and present evidence and conclusions about her/his performance and progress toward goals, ensuring that the educator voice is critical to the process.

These and other features of the new educator evaluation system hold great promise for improving educator practice, school climate and student learning. To turn this promise into reality, all educators—and the teams they work with—will be supported in a variety of ways to be successful.

The Collaborative for Educational Services Approach

The Collaborative for Educational Services Teacher Evaluation System is closely aligned with the new regulations and Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation. Similar to the Massachusetts Model, our evolving system seeks to establish and define clear expectations for educator performance, promote growth and development, strengthen collaboration, and create mutual accountability for the purpose of improved student outcomes.

At the Collaborative for Educational Services, we understand that effective teachers and educational leaders are the keys to advancing student learning. In fact, no other school-based factor has as great an influence on student achievement as an effective teacher\(^1\). As such, the Collaborative is deeply committed to providing our teachers and educational leaders with clear expectations regarding effective teaching and educational leadership, as well as the professional development and supervisory support needed to insure professional growth and achievement of these expectations.

A hallmark of this commitment is the use of a robust supervisory and evaluation system that promotes excellence in teaching and educational leadership, and demonstrates our shared belief that all students can learn.

The teacher evaluation system that follows reflects our belief that supervision, professional development, and evaluation are ongoing and linked, and should encourage a climate of continuous learning. It is

---

designed to provide the flexibility necessary to adapt to the needs and learning styles of individuals, while also promoting a shared responsibility for educator growth grounded in trust, mutual respect, transparency, and shared purpose. It draws on research for educator evaluation, and conforms to the laws, regulations, and policies to which we adhere. And finally, it values the investment each of us maintains towards realizing the goal of high expectations for learning for all of our students.

**Purposes of Evaluation**

In summary, our evaluation system is designed to:

**Promote Growth and Development:**
Educators will have regular and timely feedback and opportunities for development that support continuous growth and improvement;

**Acknowledge Excellence:**
Educators will be recognized for excellence;

**Clarify Expectations:**
Educators will have a clear, explicit set of expectations and implications for performance;

**Be Differentiated:**
Educators will have support and supervision suited to their strengths and needs;

**Place Student Learning at the Center:**
Student learning is central to the evaluation and development of our workforce—and is the core work of our schools; and

**Promote Professionalism:**
Exemplary educators regularly reflect on their effectiveness, maintain evidence of their successes, and welcome frequent and constructive feedback about how to be more effective in their craft.
THE CES TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Performance
In accordance with Article 15 of the agreement between the Collaborative for Educational Services and SEIU Local 509, teachers will be evaluated using multiple sources of data. Generally speaking, the process will include employee development through collaborative goal setting, formal and informal performance observations, and performance feedback, resulting in a summative evaluation.

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the CES Teacher Evaluation System and our corresponding professional development will aim to support teachers to successfully fulfill the expectations for performance in the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching:

- Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment
- Standard 2: Teaching All Students; and
- Standard 3: Professional Culture

The selected standards and indicators of effectiveness are aligned to the regulations set forth by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for teacher evaluation.

Teachers will be evaluated throughout the year and will receive qualitative performance feedback and performance ratings of:
- 4 = exemplary
- 3 = proficient
- 2 = needs improvement
- 1 = unsatisfactory

These ratings coupled with additional supporting evidence will inform the employee’s educator plan (tier) assignment and employment options for the teacher going forward.
### Educator Standards

2013-2014 Standards and Indicators for CES Teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD I: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment</th>
<th>STANDARD II: Teaching All Students</th>
<th>STANDARD III: Professional Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Backward plan engaging and sequential curriculum units connected to content standards of the relevant curriculum frameworks, develop daily lesson plans that are aligned to unit goals, and create student learning objectives that focus on measurable outcomes and define clearly what students need to \textit{Know}, \textit{Understand} and be able to \textit{Do}.</td>
<td>a) Implement a range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students and communicate learning objectives orally and visually that focus on measurable outcomes of what students need to \textit{Know}, \textit{Understand}, and be able to \textit{Do} (KUDs).</td>
<td>a) Demonstrate the capacity to reflect on and improve their practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful professional goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Plan and design instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs through differentiation, Positive Youth Development (PYD), and Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP).</td>
<td>b) Create a positive, nurturing, safe and collaborative learning community that respects individual differences, enhances social relationships, allows students to comfortably take risks, and models appropriate behavioral expectations for all students, staff, and program personnel.</td>
<td>b) Actively pursue and participate in professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional, team, and leadership roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Demonstrate substantial content knowledge and instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and an in-depth understanding of adolescent development and how students learn.</td>
<td>c) Maximize learning time by effectively managing classroom routines, procedures, space, materials, and instructional resources.</td>
<td>c) Collaborate effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Plan and implement effective teaching strategies that advance student learning by analyzing specific academic data from pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link learning for all students, refine learning objectives, and inform a continuous planning cycle.</td>
<td>d) Differentiate instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs using specific instructional strategies of Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Culturally Responsive Practice (CRP).</td>
<td>d) Share responsibility for the performance of all students within the program and takes an active role in educational program improvement planning efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Maintain high expectations, make information and knowledge accessible for all students, foster student self-efficacy, and implement promising practices that promote student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>e) Perform job and routine responsibilities consistently, demonstrate professional behavior and ethics, and adhere to all program and agency policies, procedures, and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Differentiated Approach

All teachers are placed on one of three tiers. These tiers serve as a guide for both the evaluator and the teacher as to the differentiated nature of evaluative activities and supervisory direction. In some instances, teachers may be moved from either tier one or two to tier three during the year based on their supervisor’s professional judgment that performance improvements are required and additional support and monitoring is necessary.

The three tiers include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tier 1 | Any teacher who:  
• is newly hired  
• is on a waiver  
• was recommended by her/his supervisor to remain at this tier in their summative evaluation  
• was recommended by her/his supervisor that additional support or direction was required  
*Note:*  
Teachers are in Tier 1 from 1-3 years.  
Supervisor can recommend movement to Tier 2 after 1 year or Tier 3 at the supervisor’s discretion. |
| Tier 2 | Any teacher who:  
• has received evaluative ratings in only the proficient and/or exemplary categories as part of her/his overall performance rating  
• was recommended by her/his supervisor to be moved from either Tier 1 or Tier 3 |
| Tier 3 | Any teacher who:  
• is placed on an Improvement plan  
• was recommended by her/his supervisor to be on Tier 3 in her/his summative evaluation  
*Note:*  
Progress in this tier must be attained within one academic year. |
Additional details about the purpose, evaluative activities, and related methods are outlined as follows as they pertain to the teachers’ tier status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To provide data for Tier status and employment</td>
<td>♦ To provide data for Tier status and employment</td>
<td>♦ To provide targeted assistance to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To provide orientation to teaching in our program settings</td>
<td>♦ To support teachers in sustaining skills in all evaluation categories</td>
<td>♦ To provide teachers with support and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To provide orientation to teaching standards</td>
<td>♦ To provide teachers with support and feedback</td>
<td>♦ To ensure professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To provide new teachers and teachers needing some improvement with additional support and feedback</td>
<td>♦ To ensure professional growth</td>
<td>♦ To enhance student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To ensure professional growth</td>
<td>♦ To ensure professional growth</td>
<td>♦ To enhance student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ To enhance student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What:</strong></td>
<td><strong>What:</strong></td>
<td><strong>What:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Evidence of student learning</td>
<td>♦ Evidence of student learning</td>
<td>♦ Completion of Teacher Improvement/Remediation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Informal observations</td>
<td>♦ Informal observations</td>
<td>♦ Evidence of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Formal observation and performance feedback</td>
<td>♦ Formal observation and performance feedback (bi-annual)</td>
<td>♦ Informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Demonstrated progress in Educator Plan goals (Teacher Portfolio)</td>
<td>♦ Demonstrated progress in Educator Plan goals (Teacher Portfolio)</td>
<td>♦ Formal observation and performance feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Reflection on professional growth and evidence of self-evaluation</td>
<td>♦ Reflection on professional growth and evidence of self-evaluation</td>
<td>♦ Reflection on professional growth and evidence of self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Professional culture feedback and adherence to professional responsibilities</td>
<td>♦ Professional culture feedback and adherence to professional responsibilities</td>
<td>♦ Demonstrated progress in Educator Plan goals (Teacher Portfolio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation: culmination of year’s data in a written report.</td>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation: culmination of year’s data in a written report.</td>
<td>♦ Professional culture feedback and adherence to professional responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation: culmination of year’s data in a written report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Review of evidence of student learning jointly with supervisors</td>
<td>♦ Review of evidence of student learning jointly with supervisors</td>
<td>♦ Review of evidence of student learning jointly with supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Ongoing informal observations by supervisors, with feedback</td>
<td>♦ Ongoing informal observations by supervisors, with feedback</td>
<td>♦ Ongoing informal observations by supervisor, with feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>♦ Classroom walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Formal classroom observation by supervisors, including performance feedback</td>
<td>♦ Formal classroom observation(s) by supervisors, including performance feedback</td>
<td>♦ Formal classroom observation by supervisor, including performance feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation and review with supervisor, including performance feedback on Professional Culture Standard</td>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation and review with supervisor, including performance feedback on Professional Culture Standard</td>
<td>♦ Observation and feedback by supervisor, focused specifically on all aspects of the Improvement/Remediation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Summative Evaluation and review with supervisor, including performance feedback on Professional Culture Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Evaluation Process

Teachers/Teaching Coordinators will be provided access to the evaluative tools at the beginning of the year, and a review of the system and related tools within the first month of the start of the academic year. This review will be provided by regional and statewide administrative supervisors.

There are five main phases to the process. These include:

1) self-assessment
2) goal setting and plan development
3) implementation of an Educator Plan (formerly known as IPDP)
4) formative assessments and evaluation including, but not limited to, informal and formal observations, classroom walkthroughs and performance feedback
5) summative evaluation

Every educator participates in this five-step cycle of continuous improvement. The cycle is the centerpiece of the new regulations designed to have all educators play a more active, engaged role in their professional growth and development. For every educator, evaluation begins with self-assessment. The self-assessment leads to establishing three goals in the Educator’s plan for the year. The cycle concludes with the summative evaluation.

Phase 1: Self-assessment

An Educator Plan supports an educator’s efforts to improve student learning, growth, and achievement; and shall be designed to provide teachers with adequate feedback for improvement, professional growth and leadership, and ensure educator effectiveness and overall system accountability.

In the first 8 weeks of school, all teachers and teaching coordinators will review the three Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching and use the self-assessment tool for this purpose. This self-assessment will result in initial goal setting for review/feedback by the evaluator.

Phase 2: Goal Setting and Plan Development

Goal proposal is a key moment for teachers to take ownership of their own evaluations. If proposed goals lack “SMART” qualities (Specific and Strategic, Measurable and Monitored, Action-oriented and Attainable, Rigorous, Realistic and Results-Focused, and Timed and Tracked), they will be difficult to implement and monitor. Therefore, both supervisors and instructional coaches are available to support development and fulfillment of robust SMART goals.

All educator plans shall include one goal for each of the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching for a total of three (3) goals. The goals must include: (1.) Student Learning Goal, (2.) Professional Practice Goal, and (3.) Licensure Related Goal. It is the educator’s responsibility to meet the goals in the plan and to demonstrate her/his progress throughout the year, through the collection of evidence in a portfolio. Additionally, demonstration of progress by the teacher relative to
these goals will be included in the teacher’s summative evaluation. We expect that by October 28th, goals will have been reviewed, revised (if necessary), and endorsed by the appropriate supervisor.

Phase 3: Implementation of an Educator Plan (formerly known as IPDP)
Throughout the year, all teachers and teaching coordinators will maintain a portfolio demonstrating evidence of their progress towards their Educator Plan goals and their teaching performance in relation to the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching. Artifacts/PD products developed during the course of Professional Development may serve as evidence towards meeting ones Educator Plan goals, depending on the nature of the goals that were originally established. Furthermore, we recommend using the TeachPoint system for storing selected artifacts that demonstrate evidence of your progress, in addition to your hard copy portfolio.

Phase 4: Formative Assessments and Evaluations
Supervisor(s) are also responsible for collecting evidence of teacher performance throughout the year. This evidence will include performance observations, the feedback of others, and artifacts of the teacher’s practice, e.g. unit plans, evidence of student learning, learning team logs, classroom walkthrough data, etc. indicating a teacher’s performance relevant to the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching.

Supervisors are expected to conduct multiple mini observations throughout the year. The mini-observation tools include the informal observation (Appendix C-1) and the classroom walkthrough (Appendix C-2). Mini-observations are intended to encourage reflection and dialogue among teachers and supervisors, including performance feedback regarding behaviors and indicators of quality teaching and student learning.

Mini-observations may or may not be announced, will be a minimum of 10 minutes in duration, will result in feedback on teacher performance, and allow for the opportunity for the teacher to provide a written comment about the observation data and supervisors professional judgment. Additionally, the supervisor will be expected to offer the opportunity to discuss the performance observation data with the teacher. Furthermore, supervisors are encouraged to observe different parts of a lesson (beginning, middle, end) using these tools.

Supervisors are expected to share written performance feedback using the TeachPoint evaluation system within a week (5 working days) of an observation being conducted, and debrief sooner if at all possible. Further, all teacher feedback must be submitted within a week (5 working days) of an evaluation being shared. By the end of this period, it is the responsibility of the educator to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation by clicking on the “signature” button at the bottom of the form. The Coordinator will be responsible for reviewing any feedback, responding as appropriate, and signing within another 5 working day period. Altogether this process should take no longer than 15 working days. While there may be exceptions to this rule, we believe this is a reasonable timeframe for completing the process while allowing for reflection to occur by all parties involved.
The Regional Education Coordinator, Assistant Regional Education Coordinator, SEIS Coordinator, or her/his designee will schedule a formal observation during the course of the year for all teachers on Tier 1 or Tier 3, and bi-annually for teachers on Tier 2. At the Coordinator's discretion, an additional formal observation may be scheduled for a teacher on Tier 3 if deemed necessary. Prior to a formal observation, the supervisor will meet with the teacher in the Pre-Observation Conference, and review the lesson and unit plans and any other documentation pertinent to the instruction. During the Post Observation Conference, there will be structured reflection on the formal observation and other areas of teacher performance, such as her/his progress on her/his professional development plan goals. The supervisor will also provide written feedback on the teacher’s performance based on the data collected during the formal observation process. The formal observation tool also provides space for the teachers to reflect and comment.

Last, for Teachers/Teaching Coordinators on Tier II who earned a proficient or exemplary rating in standards 1 and 2 on their formal observation and overall during the 2012-2013 academic year, the Regional Education Coordinator, Assistant Regional Education Coordinator, SEIS Coordinator, or her/his designee may conduct a formative assessment using the Formative Assessment Tool prior to April 1st (Appendix C-6). Based on this assessment, the evaluator may determine to conduct a summative evaluation in the subsequent academic year.

**Phase 5: Summative Evaluation**

The Regional Education Coordinator, Assistant Regional Education Coordinator, SEIS Coordinator, or her/his designee will provide a written summary of the teacher/teaching coordinator and recommend the teacher/teaching coordinator for the appropriate evaluative tier and corresponding educator plan for the next academic year. All of the data collected during the course of the school year relevant to teacher performance will contribute to the summative evaluation. Further, teacher performance relative to **Standard 3: Professional Culture** will be summarized at this time using the Professional Culture Performance Feedback Tool (Appendix C-5). The implications of a teacher/teaching coordinator’s evaluation at this time are outlined in the Implications of Evaluative Ratings Flowchart (Appendix B) and are consistent with the comprehensive evaluation system designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE), pursuant to the new educator evaluation regulations, 603 CMR 35.00.

If at any time in this process the evaluator determines that the teacher/teaching coordinator performance is unsatisfactory, the evaluator is responsible for communicating steps for improvement using the Teacher Improvement Plan (Appendix C-8).

**Note:**
Teachers in two or more programs will be assigned a ‘home base’ where the Teaching Coordinator will be responsible for evaluative activities consistent with the role of a Teaching Coordinator.
CES Teacher Evaluation System: Implementation Phase II

During 2011-2012, the Collaborative for Educational Services implemented Phase I of the comprehensive teacher evaluation system. In 2012-2013, we started the second phase of implementation. We continue with our second phase of implementation in 2013-14 with only slight modifications to our system, including:

2. Introduction of the Formative Assessment Tool (appendix C-6) for Teachers/Teaching Coordinators on Tier II who earned a proficient or exemplary rating in standards 1 and 2 on their formal observation and overall during the 2012-2013 academic year.
4. S.M.A.R.T. goal format adoption that matches the format provided by DESE (Specific and Strategic, Measurable and Monitored, Action-oriented and Attainable, Rigorous, Realistic and Results-Focused, and Timed and Tracked).
5. Alignment of ratings with DESE from emerging to unsatisfactory and beginning to needs improvement.

Teaching Coordinators, who serve as the on-site educational leader and supervisor, will be provided ongoing training and support throughout the year in conducting evidence based observations of faculty working in her/his program.

Additional detail about each evaluator’s Roles and Responsibilities is outlined in Appendix A.

Evalitative Tools

There are multiple tools that are available for evaluators to use. These include:

- Informal Observation Tool
- Formal Observation Tool (Standards 1 and 2)
- Classroom Walkthrough Tool
- Professional Culture Performance Feedback Tool (Standard 3)
- Formative Assessment Tool
- Summative Evaluation Tool
- Self-Assessment Tool
- Improvement Plan

All evaluative tools are in Appendix C.
## Timeline of Evaluation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Timeframe</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>August through October 28</strong></td>
<td>1. Evaluation system provided and reviewed</td>
<td>1. Evaluation system provided and reviewed</td>
<td>1. Evaluation system provided and reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Self-assess and formulate Educator Plan goals</td>
<td>2. Self-assess and formulate Educator Plan goals</td>
<td>2. Improvement plan expectations are set/reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Classroom walkthroughs begin</td>
<td>4. Classroom walkthroughs begin</td>
<td>4. Informal observations begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Maintain evidence of performance in portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 28 through May 15</strong></td>
<td>1. Informal observations continue</td>
<td>1. Informal observations continue</td>
<td>1. Informal observations continue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>2. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>2. Formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Formal observation</td>
<td>3. Formal observation</td>
<td>3. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 15 through June</strong></td>
<td>1. Informal observations</td>
<td>1. Informal observations</td>
<td>1. Informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>2. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>2. Classroom walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Important Definitions

Administrative Supervisor:
Regional Education Coordinators, Assistant Regional Education Coordinators, SEIS Coordinators, and other Supervising Administrators from the Collaborative for Educational Services.

Artifact:
A product that exists as a result of a teacher’s work. An artifact is a natural by-product of a teacher’s work; it is not created for the purpose of satisfying evaluation requirements. A teacher may use an artifact as an exemplar of her/his work.

Data:
Evidence or facts used as the basis for reasoning, discussion, or planning.

Classroom Walkthrough:
A brief informal process focused on documenting classroom observations that encourages reflective dialogue between the observer and the teacher. Classroom walkthroughs are conducted by Regional Education Coordinators, SEIS Coordinators, Teaching Coordinators, and/or CES/SEIS Administrative Leadership.

Educator Plan:
An annual plan comprised of a set of goals and strategies that the educator will address in order to improve performance consistent with the priorities of the organization. The goals of this plan may also align with the educator’s individual professional development plan goals required by the Commonwealth.

Evaluator:
A person responsible for carrying out a component of a teacher’s evaluation, and providing feedback to the educator. This includes Regional Education Coordinators, Assistant Regional Education Coordinators, SEIS Coordinators, Teaching Coordinators, and CES/SEIS Administrative Leadership.

Evidence:
Documents, examples, observations, or artifacts that demonstrate or confirm the work of the person being evaluated, and support the professional judgment rating assigned by the evaluator on the given standard and/or indicator.

Feedback:
The information and recommendations provided to a teacher about her/his performance on the evaluation, designed to recognize effective practice, assist the teacher in improvement efforts, and determine professional development needs.

Formative Assessment:
The process used to assess progress towards attaining goals set forth in educator plans,
performance on performance standards, or both. This process may take place at any time(s) during the cycle of evaluation.

**Goals:**
Goal shall mean a specific, actionable, and measurable area of improvement as set forth in an educator’s plan. They serve as targets for individual growth and development written in S.M.A.R.T. (Specific and Strategic, Measurable and Monitored, Action-oriented and Attainable, Rigorous, Realistic and Results-Focused, and Timed and Tracked) format, collaboratively developed with the educator’s supervisor, aligned with agency goals and approved by the supervisor.

**Improvement Plan:**
A plan developed by a supervisor for the purpose of outlining specific actions and outcomes needed in order to improve the teacher’s performance.

**Observations:**
Observations serve as opportunities for the teacher to receive focused and constructive feedback and to engage in dialogue with the evaluator. Observation shall mean a data gathering process that includes notes and judgments made during one or more classroom or worksite visit(s) of any duration by the evaluator and may include examination of artifacts of practice. An observation may occur in person or through video. Observations are conducted by: Regional Education Coordinators, Assistant Regional Education Coordinators, SEIS Coordinators, Teaching Coordinators, and/or CES/SEIS Administrative Leadership.

1. **Formal Observation**
   A pre-scheduled observation of an entire class period that includes pre and post conferences with the evaluator and teacher. Formal observations include the following characteristics:
   
   a) **Pre-Scheduled**
   Written notification, including email, to the teacher by the evaluator of intent to observe.
   
   b) **Pre-Observation Conference**
   Before the formal observation, the evaluator shall meet with the teacher to discuss the teacher’s lesson to be observed; and the teacher will provide the evaluator with a written lesson and unit plan for the class to be observed. The evaluator may request additional artifacts relative to the formal observation tools that might not be readily observed during the classroom observation.
   
   c) **Post-Observation Conference**
   The teacher and evaluator shall discuss strengths of the teacher’s performance and areas of strength and improvement relative to the formal observation and other relevant data.

2. **Informal Observation**
   An observation of the educator of a minimum of 10 minutes or more, which may be scheduled or unscheduled, that captures a snapshot of evidence of quality teaching and learning during the visit.
3. **Classroom Walkthrough**
   A brief classroom observation of a minimum of 10 minutes or more, which may be scheduled or unscheduled, that captures a snapshot of evidence of quality teaching and learning during the visit.

**Overall Performance Ratings:**
The following rating scale will be used to reflect the evaluator’s professional judgment regarding the educators performance throughout the year and overall.

- **Exemplary (4)**
  Performance consistently and significantly exceeds the requirements of the standards or overall.

- **Proficient (3)**
  Performance fully and consistently meets the requirements of the standards or overall.

- **Needs Improvement (2)**
  Performance on a standard or overall is below the requirements of a standard or overall, but is not considered to be unsatisfactory at this time. Improvement is necessary and expected.

- **Unsatisfactory (1)**
  Performance on a standard or overall has not significantly improved following the rating of needs improvement, or the educator’s performance is consistently below the requirements of a standard or overall is considered inadequate, or both.

**Portfolio:**
A collection of evidence or artifacts demonstrating teacher growth and performance.

- **Must Include:**
  - Demonstration of progress towards Educator Plan goals, including, but not limited to evidence of student learning
  - Professional Development culminating product

- **May include:**
  - Other teacher selected artifacts demonstrating teacher performance relative to the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching

**Reflection:**
The process an educator undertakes to make preliminary judgments about her/his individual practice relative to performance standards.

**Rubric:**
A scoring tool that describes characteristics of practice or artifacts at different levels of performance.

**Self-Assessment:**
The process of judging one’s own teaching performance and outcomes for the purpose of self-improvement and establishing one’s Educator Plan goals.
**Summative Evaluation:**
An evaluation used to arrive at a rating on each standard, an overall rating, and as a basis to make personnel decisions. The summative evaluation includes the evaluator's judgments of the educator's performance against performance standards and the educator's attainment of goals set forth in the educator's plan.

**Summative Evaluation Conference:**
The conference between the teacher and supervisor to discuss, at a minimum, the teacher’s most recent Educator Plan and related progress, summarize the evaluator’s findings over the course of the year, including evidence of the teacher’s performance on Standard 3: Professional Culture, and review artifacts submitted during the evaluation process, such as the educator portfolio.

**Supervisors:**
Regional Education Coordinators, Assistant Regional Education Coordinators, SEIS Coordinators, Teaching Coordinators and other Supervising Administrators from the Collaborative for Educational Services.
## Appendix A

### A-1. Roles and Responsibilities of General Education Teaching Coordinators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Coordinator (Gen Ed)</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough every 2 months&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months&lt;BR&gt;• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records&lt;BR&gt;• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher&lt;BR&gt;• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 3 classroom walkthroughs annually&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months&lt;BR&gt;• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records&lt;BR&gt;• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher&lt;BR&gt;• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough every 2 months unless otherwise directed by supervisor&lt;BR&gt;• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months unless otherwise directed by supervisor&lt;BR&gt;• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records&lt;BR&gt;• Review Improvement Plan with Teacher&lt;BR&gt;• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher&lt;BR&gt;• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor&lt;BR&gt;• Provide written evidence of performance and support as identified in Improvement plan as requested by supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-1. Roles and Responsibilities of General Education Teaching Coordinators (Continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Coordinator (Gen Ed)</td>
<td>SEIS Teacher</td>
<td>SEIS Teacher</td>
<td>SEIS Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 2 classroom walkthroughs annually</td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough</td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 2 classroom walkthroughs unless otherwise requested by SEIS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation</td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation</td>
<td>- Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation, unless otherwise requested by SEIS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. learning team logs, attendance records, unit/lesson plans, as requested by SEIS Coordinator</td>
<td>- Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. learning team logs, attendance records, unit/lesson plans, as requested by SEIS Coordinator</td>
<td>- Review improvement plan with SEIS supervisor and teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. learning team logs, attendance records, unit/lesson plans, as requested by SEIS Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOPE Teacher</th>
<th>HOPE Teacher</th>
<th>HOPE Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Coordinator (Gen Ed)</td>
<td>Conduct minimum of 1 walkthrough as requested by REC/AREC</td>
<td>Conduct minimum of 1 walkthrough as requested by REC/AREC</td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance and support as requested by REC/AREC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct informal observation as requested REC/AREC</td>
<td>Conduct informal observation as requested REC/AREC</td>
<td>Conduct informal observation(s) as requested by REC/AREC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance to REC/AREC as requested</td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance to REC/AREC as requested</td>
<td>Conduct classroom walkthrough as requested by REC/AREC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy Specialist (formerly known as Title I teacher)</th>
<th>Literacy Specialist (formerly known as Title I teacher)</th>
<th>Literacy Specialist (formerly known as Title I teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Coordinator (Gen Ed Only)</td>
<td>Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough as requested by Title I supervisor or designee</td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance to Title I supervisor or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct informal observation as requested by Title I supervisor or designee</td>
<td>Conduct informal observation(s) as requested by Title I supervisor as requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance to Title I supervisor as requested</td>
<td>Provide written evidence of performance to Title I supervisor as requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Teaching Coordinators may only conduct evaluation activities after receiving written authorization to do so by their appropriate supervisor. Further, no Teaching Coordinator who is on an improvement plan may be allowed to conduct mini observations (walkthrough or informal) unless authorized to do so in writing by the appropriate Contract Administrator.
A-2. Roles and Responsibilities of SEIS Teaching Coordinators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Coordinator (SEIS)</strong></td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of evaluation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough every 2 months</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 3 classroom walkthroughs annually</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 classroom walkthrough every 2 months unless otherwise directed by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation every three months after written authorization to do so is provided by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records</td>
<td>• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records</td>
<td>• Maintain sources of evidence of performance, e.g. lesson plans, unit plans, learning team logs, attendance records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher</td>
<td>• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher</td>
<td>• Monthly review of Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor</td>
<td>• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor</td>
<td>• Support and monitor Educator Plan progress with Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide written evidence of performance, e.g. informal observations, as requested by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide written evidence of performance and support as identified in Improvement plan as requested by supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Teaching Coordinators may only conduct evaluation activities after receiving written authorization to do so by their appropriate supervisor. Further, no Teaching Coordinator who is on an improvement plan may be allowed to conduct mini observations (walkthrough or informal) unless authorized to do so in writing by the appropriate Contract Administrator.*
### A-3. Roles and Responsibilities of Regional or Assistant Education Coordinators (A/RECs) or Other Designated CES Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Education Coordinator or Assistant Regional Education Coordinator or other Designated CES Supervisor</td>
<td>Gen Ed Teacher</td>
<td>Gen Ed Teacher</td>
<td>Gen Ed Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation in first 2 months</td>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of one (1) informal observation(s) every month for first three months and ongoing as determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Develop, support, and monitor Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually beginning in 2012-2013 unless tier status change occurs)</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for identified educator</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A-4. Roles and Responsibilities of Assistant or Regional Education Coordinators (A/RECs) or Other Designated CES Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Education Coordinator, Assistant Regional Education Coordinator, or Designated CES Supervisor</td>
<td>Gen Education Teacher (includes Art, Horticulture, Health and Wellness, and Learning Coach)</td>
<td>Gen Ed Teacher (includes Art, Horticulture, Health and Wellness, and Learning Coach)</td>
<td>Gen Ed Teacher (includes Art, Horticulture, Health and Wellness, and Learning Coach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation in first 2 months</td>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Develop, support, and monitor Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually beginning in 2012-2013 unless tier status change occurs)</td>
<td>• Provide direction for IPDP goals and final endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually beginning in 2012-2013 unless tier status change occurs)</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for identified educator</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for identified educator</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and clarify employment status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A-5. Roles and Responsibilities of Regional or Assistant Education Coordinator, SEIS Coordinator, other CES Supervisory Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Education Coordinator, SEIS Coordinator, Assistant Regional Education Coordinator, other CES Supervisory Staff</td>
<td>Teaching Coordinator</td>
<td>Teaching Coordinator</td>
<td>Teaching Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation in first two months</td>
<td>• Conduct informal observation(s)</td>
<td>• Minimum of 1 informal observation each month for first 3 months and ongoing as determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct informal observation(s)</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>• Develop, support, and monitor Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually with first year 2011-12 unless tier status change occurs)</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
<td>• Maintain identified sources of evidence of performance</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain identified sources of evidence of performance</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for identified educator</td>
<td>• Maintain identified sources of evidence of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-6. Roles and Responsibilities of SEIS Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEIS Coordinator</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>• Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation in first 2 months</td>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct minimum of 1 informal observation each month for first 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct informal observations</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>months and ongoing as determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Conduct classroom walkthroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually beginning in</td>
<td>• Develop, support, and monitor Improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
<td>2012-2013 unless tier status change occurs)</td>
<td>• Provide direction for Educator Plan and final endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for</td>
<td>• Complete formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion,</td>
<td>identified educator</td>
<td>• Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion,</td>
<td>• Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A-7. Roles and Responsibilities of Title I Supervisor or Designee(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATOR</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Tier 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I Supervisor or Designee</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>Literacy Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier 1</strong></td>
<td>Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
<td>Review and clarify expectations of TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum of 1 informal observation in first two months</td>
<td>Informal observation(s)</td>
<td>Minimum of 1 informal observation each month for first three months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal observation(s)</td>
<td>Classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>Classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom walkthroughs as determined</td>
<td>Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>Ongoing informal observation(s) as determined by supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
<td>Complete formal observation as scheduled (bi-annually with first year 2012-13)</td>
<td>Develop, support, and monitor Improvement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete formal observation</td>
<td>Maintain identified sources of evidence of performance</td>
<td>Provide direction for Educator Plan goals and final endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain identified sources of evidence of performance</td>
<td>Complete summative evaluation and/or formative assessment for identified educator</td>
<td>Complete formal observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete summative evaluation</td>
<td>Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td>Complete summative evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend continued employment, tier status changes, promotion, and/or dismissal/demotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Implications of Evaluative Ratings Flowchart
Appendix C

Tools

C-1. **Informal Observation Tool**  
This is the informal evaluation tool.  

C-2. **Classroom Walkthrough Tool**  
This is the classroom walkthrough tool.  

C-3. **Formal Observation Tool:**  
*Standard 1—Curriculum, Planning and Assessment*  
This is part one of the formal evaluation tool.  

C-4. **Formal Observation Tool:**  
*Standard 2—Teaching All Students*  
This is part two of the formal evaluation tool.  

C-5. **Professional Culture Performance Feedback Tool:**  
*Standard 3—Professional Culture*  
This performance feedback tool is used during the summative evaluation.  

C-6 **Formative Assessment Tool**  

C-7 **Summative Evaluation Tool**  
This the tool used to reflect the culmination of evaluative evidence regarding teacher performance throughout the year, including their performance on Standard 3: Professional Culture.  

C-8. **Teacher Improvement Plan**  
An improvement plan of no less than 30 days, comprised of a set of goals and strategies that the educator will address in order to improve performance.  

C-9. **Self-Assessment Tool**  

C-10. **General Information**  
Educator Plans, SMART Goals, and timeline details.
C-1. INFORMAL MINI OBSERVATION TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale: 4 = Exemplary</th>
<th>3 = Proficient</th>
<th>2 = Needs Improvement</th>
<th>1 = Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>N/O = Not Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Teacher Name: Program Name: Date:
Evaluator Name: Subject Observed: Start/End Time:
Number of Students:

**CONTENT DEVELOPMENT**

1. Indicator: Plans clearly defined learning objectives (KUDs) aligned to unit goals and makes them clear and accessible to all students throughout the lesson (1.a; 2.a)

   Evidence:

   Evidence:

2. Indicator: Designs Unit/Lesson plans that demonstrate differentiation in instructional planning (1.b)

   Evidence:

3. Indicator: Checks for understanding and adjusts instruction accordingly (1.d; 2.a; 2.e)

   Evidence:

**INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES**

4. Indicator: Integrates and utilizes technology in instruction to maximize learning opportunities and access for all (2.a)

   Evidence:

   Evidence:

5. Indicator: Demonstrates high expectations through a variety of effective teaching techniques, e.g. higher order questioning strategies (2.e)

   Evidence:

   Evidence:

6. Indicator: Differentiates instruction for a diverse group of learners using a positive youth development approach (2.d)

   Evidence:

   Evidence:

7. Indicator: Scaffolds instruction to promote student independence and student voice. (2.d)

   Evidence:

   Evidence:

8. Indicator: Makes learning culturally relevant (2.d)

   Evidence:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale:</th>
<th>4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Needs Improvement 1 = Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>N/O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**INTERACTIONS**

9. Indicator: Promotes and monitors student engagement (2.e)

Evidence:

10. Indicator: Provides appropriate and sufficient academic support, feedback, and encouragement (2.e)

Evidence:

11. Indicator: Maintains appropriate standards of behavior, professional boundaries, and mutual respect (2.b)

Evidence:

**ENVIRONMENT**

12. Indicator: Maximizes learning time by effectively managing routines, procedures, space, and materials (2.c)

Evidence:

13. Indicator: Creates safe and optimal learning environment (2.b)

Evidence:

**PROFESSIONALISM**

14. Indicator: Collaborates effectively with colleagues (3.c)

Evidence:

15. Indicator: Demonstrates responsibility for the learning of all students (3.d)

Evidence:

16. Indicator: Adheres to all program and agency policies, procedures, and guidelines (3.e)

Evidence:

**OVERALL RATING:** (supervisor shall determine the average and provide an overall rating, with professional judgment discretion left to the supervisor when a rating falls between two ratings)

Evaluator Comments:

Teacher Comments:

Teacher Signature: ___________________________ Date: __________________________

Supervisor Signature: ___________________________ Date: __________________________
C-2 CLASSROOM WALKTHROUGH MINI OBSERVATION TOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator Name:</th>
<th>Observer Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Time of Observation: Start________ Finish ____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Present:</th>
<th>Students________ Teachers________ Staff________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT AND TEACHER PREPARATION**

*Check all that apply:*
- Well organized
- Wide range of student work visible
- Lesson is planned and structured to support student learning
- Mini-Unit Plan and/or Lesson Plan available for review
- Class is convened in timely manner and adheres to posted school schedule
- KUDs are posted, accessible, and reinforced throughout the lesson
- KUDs are measurable, clearly stated, and connected/linked to the emphasized standards
- Teacher is positive and professional in presentation and interactions with students and staff

Comments on classroom environment and teacher preparation (if any):

**STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

*Students attending to the instructional activities occurring in class (check ONE):*
- All
- Most
- Some
- Few
- None

**What is the teacher doing to ensure that all students are engaged in meaningful learning activities? Check all that apply:**
- Reviews classroom expectations
- Uses wait-time to promote equitable distribution of questions and responses
- Uses flexible groupings (whole-group, small group, pairing, one-on-one, etc.)
- Circulates throughout the classroom
- Manages instructional pacing and interruptions to lesson
- Provides constructive feedback to students (written and verbal)
- Efficiently addresses challenging behaviors

**PYD / CRP (check all that apply)**
- Asset-based and culturally responsive interactions and strategies observed
- Teacher supports making learning relevant to students
- Appropriate use of praise/affirmation/encouragement
- Other:

Comments on engagement strategies:
## DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

**Check all that apply:**
- Activating background knowledge
- Providing constructive and consistent feedback
- Graphic organizer
- Questioning that promotes higher order thinking
- Use of content and examples relevant to students' lives
- Meaningful practice of skills (content-specific and transferable)
- Skill identification and student goal-setting
- Modeling thinking
- Identifying similarities and differences
- Note-taking strategies
- Nonlinguistic representations: visual cues, manipulatives, thinking maps, graphic organizers, and instructional games
- Hypothesis/Predictions
- Technology integration
- Academic writing for multiple purposes: journaling, personal narrative, persuasive, informational, expository, creative, etc.
- Use of questions, prompts, and cues to scaffold learning
- Inquiry, role-playing, and experiential learning activities
- Summarizing/Review of learning objective/KUDs
- Other:

### Formative Assessment / Frequency of 'Checks for Understanding.' Check ONE:
- Multiple Checks for Understanding Observed
- Few Checks for Understanding Observed
- No Checks for Understanding Observed

### Student Instructional Mode: How are students engaging in instruction? Check all that apply:
- Individually
- Partners
- Small group
- As a whole class
- Self-directed with teacher check-ins

### Teacher Instructional Mode: What is the teacher doing to deliver instruction? Check all that apply:
- Whole Class Direct Instruction
- Small Group Direct Instruction
- Cooperative Learning Group
- Individual Instruction
- Lecture
- Facilitating/Providing Feedback
- Leading Discussion
- At desk/computer
- Both teacher and direct care staff present
- Cooperative Learning Group
- Instructional Video-length

### Comments on differentiated instructional practices:

### General comments for the teacher:

### Teacher reflection (please enter your comments below):

---

**Teacher Signature:** ________________________________ **Date:** ________________

**Supervisor Signature:** ________________________________ **Date:** ________________
### FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator:</td>
<td>Class Observed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Standard:**
The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through designing coherent instruction and authentic and meaningful student assessments, analyzing student performance and growth, and continuously refining learning objectives.

**Teachers will know and be able to:**
- a) Backward plan engaging and sequential curriculum units connected to content standards of the relevant curriculum frameworks, develop daily lesson plans that are aligned to unit goals, and create student learning objectives that focus on measurable outcomes and define clearly what students need to Know, Understand and be able to Do;
- b) Plan and design instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs through differentiation, Positive Youth Development (PYD), and Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP);
- c) Demonstrate substantial content knowledge and instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and an in-depth understanding of adolescent development and how students learn; and
- d) Plan and implement effective teaching strategies that advance student learning by analyzing specific academic data from pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link learning for all students, refine learning objectives, and inform a continuous planning cycle.

**Rating Scale:**
- (4) Exemplary: Performance significantly exceeds requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (3) Proficient: Performance meets the requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (2) Needs Improvement: Performance is below the requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (1) Unsatisfactory: Performance is considered inadequate on an indicator or overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited understanding and/or use of the approved curriculum (i.e., DYS Instructional Guides) and curriculum frameworks to plan backward plan comprehensive curriculum units; and sometimes includes options in unit and/or daily lesson plans for the use of instructional technologies and other instructional materials.</td>
<td>May understand and/or use the content standards of the approved curriculum (i.e., DYS Instructional Guides) and curriculum frameworks to plan backward plan comprehensive curriculum units; and sometimes includes options in unit and/or daily lesson plans for the use of instructional technologies and other instructional materials.</td>
<td>Has a firm understanding of the content standards of the approved curriculum (i.e., DYS Instructional Guides) and curriculum frameworks to plan backward plan comprehensive curriculum units; and sometimes includes options in unit and/or daily lesson plans for the use of instructional technologies and other instructional materials.</td>
<td>Has a deep understanding of the content standards of the approved curriculum (i.e., DYS Instructional Guides) and curriculum frameworks to plan backward plan comprehensive curriculum units; and sometimes includes options in unit and/or daily lesson plans for the use of instructional technologies and other instructional materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."
### FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b. Plan and design instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs through differentiation, Positive Youth Development (PYD), and Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP)</td>
<td>Includes in unit and/or daily lesson plans instructional strategies for students with specialized learning needs.</td>
<td>Demonstrates awareness in unit and/or daily lesson plans of information in the students' records (e.g., IEPs, 504 Plans, Title I, ELL designations) pertinent to their learning and reflects efforts to tailor instruction to specialized learning needs and strengths.</td>
<td>Regularly indicates in unit and/or daily lesson plans curricularly relevant instruction for the full spectrum of student learning needs and includes specific accommodations for the benefit of students with specialized learning needs based upon specific information in the students' records (e.g., IEPs, 504 Plans, Title I, ELL designations).</td>
<td>Consistently indicates in unit and/or daily lesson plans curricularly relevant instruction for the full spectrum of student learning needs and includes specific accommodations for the benefit of all students, including those with specialized learning needs in inclusive classroom settings based upon specific information in the students' records (e.g., IEPs, 504 Plans, Title I, ELL designations).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1c. Demonstrate substantial content knowledge and instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and an in-depth understanding of adolescent development and how students learn | Demonstrates basic content knowledge in the subject area(s) taught. | Demonstrates fundamental content knowledge of the subject area(s) and a basic awareness of instructional pedagogy, adolescent development and student learning. | Demonstrates appropriate content knowledge, effective instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and applies that pedagogy to advance student learning. Based on the pedagogical strategies used, demonstrates an appreciation of student development and how students learn. Assumes responsibility for increasing their knowledge of content, pedagogy and adolescent learning. | Demonstrates exceptional content knowledge, highly effective instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and applies content pedagogy to advance student learning. Based on the pedagogical strategies used, demonstrates a comprehensive grasp of student development and how students learn. Assumes responsibility for increasing their knowledge of content, pedagogy, and adolescent learning and is willing to share with colleagues. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1c. Benchmark Rating</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”
### FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment

| 1d. Plan and implement effective teaching strategies that advance student learning by analyzing specific academic data from pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link learning for all students, refine learning objectives, and inform a continuous planning cycle | Inconsistently considers data from pre-assessments and formative academic assessments when planning instruction. | Occasionally demonstrates in unit and/or daily lesson plans the use of pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments. | Plans and implements effective instruction that advances student learning by regularly analyzing specific academic data from a variety of pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link student learning with specific teaching strategies; refines learning objectives and informs instructional planning and daily decision-making related to student progress. | Consistently plans and implements effective instruction that advances student learning by continuously analyzing specific academic data from a variety of pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link student learning with specific teaching strategies; refines learning objectives and informs instructional planning and daily decision-making related to student progress. Facilitates learning for all students and continuously seeks to learn, share, and use innovative methods to raise student achievement. Is able to model this element. |

| 1d. Benchmark Rating | (1) Unsatisfactory | (2) Needs improvement | (3) Proficient | (4) Exemplary |

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."
FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL - Standard 1: Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator's Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Summary</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Supervisor shall average the employee's rating to arrive at the Benchmark Summary rating. If the employee's rating is split evenly between two ratings, the supervisor shall, based on evidence, use his or her discretion to determine what rating was earned.

Evaluator Signature: ___________________________ Teacher Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

*Note:* At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."
FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 2: Teaching All Students

Teacher Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________ Time: ___________
Evaluator: ___________________________ Class Observed: ___________________________

Description of Standard:
The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through instructional practices that establish high expectations, create a safe and effective classroom environment, and demonstrate cultural proficiency.

Teachers will know and be able to:

a) Implement a range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students and communicate learning objectives orally and visually that focus on measurable outcomes of what students need to Know, Understand, and be able to Do (KUDs);

b) Create a positive, nurturing, safe and collaborative learning community that respects individual differences, enhances social relationships, allows students to comfortably take risks, and models appropriate behavioral expectations for all students, staff, and program personnel;

c) Maximize learning time by effectively managing classroom routines, procedures, space, materials, and instructional resources;

d) Differentiate instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs using specific instructional strategies of Positive Youth Development (PYD) and Culturally Responsive Practice (CRP);

e) Maintain high expectations, make information and knowledge accessible for all students, foster student self-efficacy, and implement promising practices that promote student achievement.

Rating Scale:
(4) Exemplary: Performance significantly exceeds requirements on an indicator or overall.
(3) Proficient: Performance meets the requirements on an indicator or overall.
(2) Needs Improvement: Performance is below the requirements on an indicator or overall.
(1) Beginning: Performance is considered inadequate on an indicator or overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Implement a range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students and communicate learning objectives orally and visually that focus on measurable outcomes of what students need to Know, Understand, and be able to Do (KUDs)</td>
<td>Sometimes posts and/or orally reviews KUDs when introducing the lesson. Occasionally tries new instructional strategies. Rarely tailors instructional strategies to the varied learning needs and strengths of all students.</td>
<td>Frequently posts KUDs for the lesson. Orally reviews them with students when introducing the lesson, and implements moderately effective instructional strategies tailored to engage all students in learning.</td>
<td>Regularly incorporates the review of KUDs at the beginning, during and when evaluating the effectiveness of the lesson. Develops student learning objectives with clear, measurable outcomes that are always accessible for all students to see and reference throughout the lesson. Delivers effective instruction by implementing a range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students through engagement, differentiation, and clarity of lesson objectives. Engages students so that they are able to communicate the expectations for learning and are actively engaged in daily learning experiences. Regularly uses instructional technologies and other instructional materials to maximize learning opportunities and create access for all.</td>
<td>Consistently incorporates the review of KUDs at the beginning, during, and when evaluating the effectiveness of the lesson. Develops student learning objectives with clear, measurable outcomes that are consistently accessible for all students to see and reference throughout the lesson. Delivers highly effective instruction by implementing an extensive range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students through engagement, differentiation, and clarity of lesson objectives. Engages students so that they are able to communicate the expectations for learning, are actively engaged in daily learning experiences, and are aware of their performance and progress. Consistently uses instructional technologies and other instructional materials to maximize learning opportunities and create access for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator’s level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”
## FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 2: Teaching All Students

### 2a. Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sets behavioral expectations for students and implements appropriate procedures for their safety and security.</td>
<td>Creates a positive learning environment, sets behavioral expectations for students, and implements appropriate procedures for safety and security.</td>
<td>Creates a positive, safe, and collaborative learning community that respects individual differences, enhances social relationships, and allows students to comfortably take risks. Shapes the learning environment to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of all students. Models appropriate behavioral expectations for all students, staff, and program personnel.</td>
<td>Creates an optimal safe and collaborative learning community that respects individual differences, enhances social relationships, and allows students to comfortably take risks. Shapes the learning environment to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of all students. Consistently models appropriate behavioral expectations for all students, staff, and program personnel. Is able to model this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2b. Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistently reinforces classroom routines, procedures, and materials for students.</td>
<td>Occasionally reinforces established classroom routines, procedures, and materials for students. Has a procedure for familiarizing new students with classroom norms, routines, and expectations.</td>
<td>Maximizes instructional time by regularly managing daily classroom routines, procedures, space, materials and learning resources, including technology to reduce or eliminate unproductive student time. Executes smooth transitions throughout the lesson. Efficiently pieces instruction so that students move from one task to the next with minimal prompting.</td>
<td>Consistently maximizes instructional time by effectively managing daily classroom routines, procedures, space, materials and learning resources, including technology to reduce or eliminate unproductive student time. Uniformly executes smooth transitions throughout the lesson. Efficiently pieces instruction so that students independently move from one task to the next. Is able to model this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2c. Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges different student learning styles when implementing instruction.</td>
<td>Differentiates instruction based on general information about different student learning styles in the classroom and shows sensitivity to the students’ cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Differentiates instruction by content, process, and product to allow for multiple entry points, learning tasks and outcomes that are tailored to the students’ interests, abilities and learning styles. Uses PYD/CRP instructional strategies to ensure that all students have equal access to the established curriculum. Employs instructional strategies that promote student independence and student voice.</td>
<td>Consistently differentiates instruction by content, process, and product to allow for multiple entry points, learning tasks and outcomes that are tailored to the students’ interests, abilities and learning styles. Uses and shares specific PYD/CRP instructional strategies to ensure all students have equal access to the established curriculum. Scaffolds and implements instructional strategies that promote student independence, self-advocacy, and student voice. Is able to model this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2d. Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges different student learning styles when implementing instruction.</td>
<td>Differentiates instruction based on general information about different student learning styles in the classroom and shows sensitivity to the students’ cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>Differentiates instruction by content, process, and product to allow for multiple entry points, learning tasks and outcomes that are tailored to the students’ interests, abilities and learning styles. Uses PYD/CRP instructional strategies to ensure that all students have equal access to the established curriculum. Employs instructional strategies that promote student independence and student voice.</td>
<td>Consistently differentiates instruction by content, process, and product to allow for multiple entry points, learning tasks and outcomes that are tailored to the students’ interests, abilities and learning styles. Uses and shares specific PYD/CRP instructional strategies to ensure all students have equal access to the established curriculum. Scaffolds and implements instructional strategies that promote student independence, self-advocacy, and student voice. Is able to model this indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator’s level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating, in this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”
### FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 2: Teaching All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2e.</td>
<td>Maintain high expectations, make information and knowledge accessible for all students, foster student self-efficacy, and implement promising practices that promote student achievement.</td>
<td>Sets high expectations for all students and holds them accountable for meeting the expectations.</td>
<td>Consistently sets high and realistic expectations for all students and works with each student in the classroom to develop specific learning goals. Makes information and knowledge accessible for all students through differentiation, matching strategies with specific students, activating prior knowledge, and re-teaching key concepts and skills. Uses formative assessment to check for understanding and adjust instruction. Uses a variety of effective teaching techniques, such as the use of higher order questioning strategies, that demonstrate a belief in student self-efficacy and that students are capable of high achievement. Provides students with appropriate and sufficient academic support, feedback, and encouragement. Demonstrates classroom instruction that is more student-centered and less teacher-directed.</td>
<td>Consistently sets high and realistic expectations for all students and works with each student in the classroom to develop specific learning goals. Makes information and knowledge accessible for all students through highly effective differentiation, matching strategies with specific students, activating prior knowledge, and re-teaching key concepts and skills. Uses a variety of effective methods to check for understanding and immediately adjusts instruction to address misconceptions and clarifies. Consistently uses a variety of effective teaching techniques such as the use of higher order questioning strategies, that demonstrate a belief in student self-efficacy and that all students are capable of high achievement. Provides students with appropriate and sufficient academic support, feedback, and encouragement. Demonstrates classroom instruction that is characteristically student-centered and promotes self-directed learning wherein the teacher functions primarily as facilitator of learning. Is able to model this indicator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2e. Benchmark Rating</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "is able to model."
FORMAL OBSERVATION TOOL – Standard 2: Teaching All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator’s Comments</th>
<th>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Comments</th>
<th>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark Summary</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisor shall average the employee’s rating to arrive at the Benchmark Summary rating. If the employee’s rating is split evenly between two ratings, the supervisor shall, based on evidence, use his or her discretion to determine what rating was earned.

Evaluator Signature: ___________________________ Teacher Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

*Note: At the Exemplary level, an educator’s level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”*
PROFESSIONAL CULTURE FEEDBACK TOOL – Standard 3: Professional Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Name:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Standard:**
The teacher promotes the learning and growth of all students through ethical, culturally proficient, skilled, and collaborative practice.

**Teachers will know and be able to:**
- a) Demonstrate the capacity to reflect on and improve their practice, using informal means as well as meetings with teams and work groups to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful professional goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning;
- b) Actively pursue and participate in professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional, team, and leadership roles;
- c) Collaborate effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks;
- d) Share responsibility for the performance of all students within the program and take an active role in educational program improvement/planning efforts; and
- e) Perform job and routine responsibilities consistently, demonstrate professional behavior and ethics, and adhere to all program and agency policies, procedures, and guidelines.

**Rating Scale:**
- (4) Exemplary: Performance significantly exceeds requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (3) Proficient: Performance meets the requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (2) Needs Improvement: Performance is below the requirements on an indicator or overall.
- (1) Unsatisfactory: Performance is considered inadequate on an indicator or overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Demonstrate the capacity to reflect on and improve their practice to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful professional goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning</td>
<td>Demonstrates limited reflection on practice and/or use of insights gained to improve practice. Generally, participates passively in the goal-setting process and/or proposes goals that are vague or easy to reach.</td>
<td>May reflect on the effectiveness of lessons, mini-units, and interactions with students but not with colleagues and/or rarely uses insights to improve practice. Proposes goals that are sometimes vague or easy to achieve and/or bases goals on limited self-assessment, supervisor input, and/or consideration of the student population.</td>
<td>Consistently reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, mini-units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues, and uses insights gained to improve practice and student learning. Proposes challenging, measurable professional learning goals that are consistent with the priorities of the organization and based on thorough self-assessment, supervisor input, and the strengths and needs of the student population. Consistently reflects on the effectiveness of lessons, mini-units, and interactions with students, both individually and with colleagues; and uses and shares with colleagues insights gained to improve practice and student learning. Individually and with colleagues proposes and makes demonstrated progress towards attaining challenging, measurable goals based on thorough self-assessment, supervisor and collegial input, the strengths and needs of the student population, and the goals of the organization.</td>
<td>Is able to model this element:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a. Benchmark Rating</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."
### PROFESSIONAL CULTURE FEEDBACK TOOL – Standard 3: Professional Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3b. Actively pursue and participate in professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional, team, and leadership roles</td>
<td>Participates only in required professional development and learning opportunities to improve practice and/or applies little new learning to practice.</td>
<td>The teacher occasionally seeks out new learning and/or inconsistently or inappropriately applies new learning to improve practice.</td>
<td>Consistently seeks out and applies, when appropriate, ideas for improving practice from supervisors, colleagues, instructional coaches, professional development activities, and other resources to gain expertise and/or assume different instruction, team, and leadership responsibilities.</td>
<td>Consistently seeks out professional development and learning opportunities above and beyond what the organization provides that improve practice and build expertise of self and other educators in instruction, teamwork, and leadership. Is able to model this element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Benchmark Rating</td>
<td>(1) Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>(2) Needs Improvement</td>
<td>(3) Proficient</td>
<td>(4) Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Collaborate effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks, including, but not limited to learning teams, co-planning, and co-teaching</td>
<td>Rarely and/or ineffective collaborates with colleagues; conversations often lack focus on improving student learning.</td>
<td>Does not consistently collaborate with colleagues in ways that support productive team effort.</td>
<td>Consistently and effectively collaborates with colleagues in such work as developing standards-based units, co-teaching, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate intervention.</td>
<td>Supports colleagues to collaborate in areas such as developing standards-based units, co-teaching, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate intervention. Is able to model this element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Benchmark Rating</td>
<td>(1) Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>(2) Needs Improvement</td>
<td>(3) Proficient</td>
<td>(4) Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."
## Professional Culture Feedback Tool – Standard 3: Professional Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3d. Share responsibility for the performance of all students within the program and take an active role in educational program improvement planning efforts</td>
<td>Participates in planning and decision making at the school, but only when asked and rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise.</td>
<td>May participate in planning and decision making at the school, but rarely contributes relevant ideas or expertise.</td>
<td>Consistently contributes relevant ideas and expertise to planning and decision making at the school.</td>
<td>Consistently participates in planning and decision-making at the school. Consistently contributes ideas and expertise that are critical to school improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely reinforces school-wide behavior and learning expectations for all students and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by rarely sharing responsibility for meeting their needs.</td>
<td>Within and beyond the classroom, inconsistently reinforces school-wide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and/or makes a limited contribution to their learning by inconsistently sharing responsibility for meeting their needs.</td>
<td>Within and beyond the classroom, consistently reinforces school-wide behavior and learning expectations for all students, and contributes to their learning by sharing responsibility for meeting their needs.</td>
<td>Individually and with colleagues develops strategies and actions that contribute to the learning and productive behavior of all students at the school. The teacher always contributes ideas and expertise in program-based meetings for the purpose of educational program improvement planning. The teacher consistently takes responsibility for the learning of all students, including those identified with IEPs, ELLs, or those with behavior challenges, and collaborates effectively with supervisors and coaches to plan, design, implement, and assess teaching and learning. Is able to model this element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates minimal responsibility for ensuring learning growth for all students, including those identified with IEPs, ELLs, or those with behavior challenges.</td>
<td>The teacher sometimes takes responsibility for the learning growth of all students, including those identified with IEPs, ELLs, or those with behavior challenges, and collaborates with supervisors and coaches to plan, design, implement, and assess teaching and learning.</td>
<td>The teacher consistently takes responsibility for the learning growth of all students, including those identified with IEPs, ELLs, or those with behavior challenges, and collaborates effectively with supervisors and coaches to plan, design, implement, and assess teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Consistently participates in planning and decision-making at the school. Consistently contributes ideas and expertise that are critical to school improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a. Perform job and routine responsibilities consistently, demonstrate professional behavior and ethics, and adhere to all program and agency policies, procedures, and guidelines</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates poor judgment and/or discloses confidential student information inappropriately. Frequently misses or is late to work classes, meetings, makes errors in records, and/or misses paper work deadlines, frequently late or absent. Is frequently cited for not adhering to program and/or agency policies, procedures, and guidelines.</td>
<td>Sometimes demonstrates questionable judgment and/or inappropriately shares confidential information. Occasionally misses or is late to work classes, meetings, completes work late, and/or makes errors in records, is occasionally cited for not adhering to program and/or agency policies, procedures, and guidelines.</td>
<td>Demonstrates sound judgment reflecting honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness. Appropriately protects student confidentiality.</td>
<td>Consistently fulfills professional responsibilities; is consistently punctual and reliable with paperwork, duties, and classes; and is rarely late or absent from school. Regularly adheres to program and/or agency policies, procedures, and guidelines. Consistently demonstrates a positive attitude, professional conversations, and professional attire.</td>
<td>Demonstrates sound judgment reflecting honesty, fairness, and trustworthiness, and acts appropriately to protect student confidentiality, rights and safety. Consistently fulfills all professional responsibilities to high standards. Consistently adheres to program and/or agency policies, procedures, and guidelines. Consistently demonstrates a positive attitude, professional discourse among colleagues, and professional attire. Effectively redirects discourse that is counterproductive. Is able to model this element.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3b. Benchmark Rating</th>
<th>(1) Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>(2) Needs Improvement</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Note
At the Exemplary level, an educator's level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by "Is able to model."
### PROFESSIONAL CULTURE FEEDBACK TOOL – Standard 3: Professional Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator’s Comments</th>
<th>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Comments</th>
<th>Evidence, Feedback, Reflections...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Supervisor shall average the employee's rating to arrive at the Benchmark Summary rating. If the employee's rating is split evenly between two ratings, the supervisor shall, based on evidence, use his or her discretion to determine what rating was earned.

Evaluator Signature: ___________________________ Teacher Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

**Note:** At the Exemplary level, an educator’s level of expertise is such that he or she is able to model this element through training, teaching, coaching, assisting, and/or demonstrating. In this rubric, this level of expertise is denoted by “is able to model.”
C-6. FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT TOOL (1)

This tool is for educators on tier 2 who earned a proficient or exemplary rating in Standards 1 and 2 on their formal observation and overall in 2012-13. Based on the evaluator's professional judgment about the educator's performance following use of this tool, a summative evaluation may be deferred to the following academic year.

Educator Name/Title: _______________________________________________________________

Supervisor Name/Title: ____________________________________________________________

School(s): _____________________________________________________________________

Assessing2:

☐ Progress toward attaining educator goals    ☐ Performance on Standard    ☐ Both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Toward Student Learning Goal(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe current level of progress and feedback for improvement. Attach additional pages as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Toward Professional Practice Goal(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe current level of progress. Attach additional pages as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress Toward Licensure Goal(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe current level of progress. Attach additional pages as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 As per 603 CMR 35.02 and 603 CMR 35.06(5), formative assessment shall mean the process used to assess progress toward attaining goals set forth in Educator Plans, performance on Performance Standards, or both.
C-6. FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT TOOL (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance on Each Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Describe performance and feedback for improvement. Attach additional pages as needed.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I: Curriculum, Planning &amp; Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II: Teaching All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III: Professional Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Evaluator __________________________ Date Completed: __________

Signature of Educator* __________________________ Date Received: __________

* Signature of the educator indicates acknowledgement of this report; it does not necessarily denote agreement with the contents of the report. Educators have the opportunity to respond to this report in writing and may do so below.

Based on the professional judgment of the Evaluator regarding educator progress on their Educator Plan, performance on Standards 1 or 2, or both, a summative evaluation may be conducted.

Evaluator Recommendation: Summative Evaluation Required Yes ___ No ___

Educator Comments:
C-7. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION TOOL (1)

CURRENT TIER: ___ Tier 1 ___ Tier 2 ___ Tier 3

EMPLOYEE INFORMATION:
Name ___________________________________________ Job Title ___________________________________________
Name of Program(s) _____________________________________________________________________________
Location of Program(s) __________________________________________________________________________
Period covered ___________________________ to ___________________________
Date(s) of Informal Observation Visits _______________________________________________________________
Date of Formal Post-Observation Conference __________________________________________________________
Date of Formative Assessment (if applicable) __________________________________________________________
Date of Summative Evaluation Conference ____________________________________________________________
Date(s) of Educator Plan Progress Review _____________________________________________________________
Name of Immediate Supervisor ________________________________________________________________
Name of Assistant/Regional Education Coordinator/Host Agency Coordinator: ___________________________

Name of Reviewer: ____________________________________________________________

OVERALL INFORMAL OBSERVATION RATINGS AVERAGE
___ (1) Unsatisfactory ___ (2) Needs Improvement ___ (3) Proficient ___ (4) Exemplary

OVERALL FORMAL OBSERVATION RATINGS AVERAGE
  Standard 1 ___ (1) Unsatisfactory ___ (2) Needs Improvement ___ (3) Proficient ___ (4) Exemplary
  Standard 2 ___ (1) Unsatisfactory ___ (2) Needs Improvement ___ (3) Proficient ___ (4) Exemplary

OVERALL PROFESSIONAL CULTURE RATING
  Standard 3 ___ (1) Unsatisfactory ___ (2) Needs Improvement ___ (3) Proficient ___ (4) Exemplary

EDUCATOR GOALS PROGRESS
Goal 1 ___(0) Did not meet ___(1) Some Progress ___(2) Significant Progress ___(3) Met ___(4) Exceeded
Evidence:

Goal 2 ___(0) Did not meet ___(1) Some Progress ___(2) Significant Progress ___(3) Met ___(4) Exceeded
Evidence:

Goal 3 ___(0) Did not meet ___(1) Some Progress ___(2) Significant Progress ___(3) Met ___(4) Exceeded
Evidence:
C-7. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION TOOL (2)

Calculation of the Overall Performance Rating:
The overall rating will be comprised of 4 or 3 components depending on whether or not the teacher is scheduled for a formal observation. The formula for determining an overall performance rating is described below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The 4-Component Weighting Formula</th>
<th>Use this formula as follows to calculate the Overall Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(40%) Informal Observation Rating</td>
<td>(Average of Informal Observations x .40) + (Professional Culture Rating x .20) + (Formal Observation x .20) + (Average of Educator Plan Progress x .20) = Overall Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%) Professional Culture Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%) Formal Observation Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20%) Educator Plan Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:** Teacher has Informal Observation Rating of 3; Professional Culture Rating of 3; Formal Observation Rating of 3; and EP Progress Rating of 4.
Calculate: \( (3 \times 0.40) + (3 \times 0.20) + (3 \times 0.20) + (4 \times 0.20) = 3.2 \) rounded to 3 Proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The 3-Component Weighting Formula</th>
<th>Use this formula as follows to calculate the Overall Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(50%) Informal Observation Rating</td>
<td>(Average of Informal Observations x .50) + (Average of Educator Plan Progress x .25) + (Professional Responsibilities Rating x .25) = Overall Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25%) Professional Culture Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25%) Educator Plan Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXAMPLE:** Teacher has Informal Observation Rating of 4; Educator Plan Progress Rating of 3; and Professional Culture Rating of 4.
Calculate: \( (4 \times 0.50) + (3 \times 0.25) + (4 \times 0.25) = 3.75 \) rounded to 4 Exemplary

OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING:

___ (1) Unsatisfactory  ___ (2) Needs Improvement  ___ (3) Proficient  ___ (4) Exemplary

**4) Exemplary:** Performance consistently and significantly exceeds the requirements of the standards or overall.

**3) Proficient:** Performance fully and consistently meets the requirements of the standards or overall.

**2) Needs Improvement:** Performance on a standard or overall is below the requirements of a standard or overall, but is not considered to be unsatisfactory at this time. Improvement is necessary and expected.

**1) Unsatisfactory:** Performance on a standard or overall has not significantly improved following the rating of needs improvement or unsatisfactory, or the educator’s performance is consistently below the requirements of a standard or overall is considered inadequate, or both.

TIER RECOMMENDATION FOR NEXT YEAR*:

___ Tier 1  ___ Tier 2  ___ Tier 3

*Teachers/Teaching Coordinators may not be recommended to remain on tier 3 for more than one academic year.
C-7. SUMMATIVE EVALUATION TOOL (3)

COMMENTS:
Reflections/Questions/Specific Concerns (please use dates to record notes over time) and include summative written statement. Supervisors are specifically asked to address the teacher’s performance with regards to meeting professional responsibilities, including their reliability, fulfillment of routine responsibilities, and adherence to ethical standards.
Please attach separate sheet(s) or use the form for Supervisor and Employee comments provided.

SUPERVISOR
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

EMPLOYEE
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Signature of Administrator ___________________________ Date _______________________
Signature of Teacher _________________________________ Date _______________________

Personnel File
C-8. TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Teacher Name ______________________________________  Date _________________________
Assignment ______________________________________ Subject(s) ____________________
Evaluator ______________________________________ Subject(s) ____________________

The following plan is based on formal and informal observation, documentation, attendance records, staff and individual meetings and discussion.

Areas of Improvement:

Supervisor is to select and complete the area(s) required for performance improvement.

1. Curriculum, Planning, and Assessment
   - Evidence:
   - Recommendation for Improvement:
   - Support / Assistance offered:
   - Timeline:
   - Follow-up:

2. Teaching All Students
   - Evidence:
   - Recommendation for Improvement:
   - Support / Assistance offered:
   - Timeline:
   - Follow-up:

3. Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities
   - Evidence:
   - Recommendation for Improvement:
   - Support / Assistance offered:
   - Timeline:
   - Follow-up:

4. Other
   - Evidence:
   - Recommendation for Improvement:
   - Support / Assistance offered:
   - Timeline:
   - Follow-up:

Signature of Administrator ______________________________  Date _________________________
Signature of Teacher ______________________________  Date _________________________

Personnel File
## PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE SELF-ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator's Name</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Supervisor's Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching

#### STANDARD 1: CURRICULUM, PLANNING, ASSESSMENT

1a. Backward plan engaging and sequential curriculum units connected to content standards of the relevant curriculum frameworks, develop daily lesson plans that are aligned to unit goals, and create student learning objectives that focus on measurable outcomes and define clearly what students need to Know, Understand, and be able to Do (KUDs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice Area</th>
<th>Assessment of Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a1. Backward planning sequential curriculum units using DYS Instructional Guides and/or EYF curricula</td>
<td>(Please rate your professional practice areas by placing an X in the appropriate boxes below.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2. Creating daily instruction from mini-unit and/or lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a3. Developing clearly defined and measurable KUDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. Plan and design instruction for a diverse group, including students with specialized learning needs through differentiation, Positive Youth Development (PYD), and Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice Area</th>
<th>Assessment of Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b1. Designing and planning instruction for specialized learning through differentiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b2. Designing and planning specialized instruction that is culturally responsive and relevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b3. Designing and planning instruction that fosters student voice, efficacy, and advocacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1c. Demonstrate substantial content knowledge and instructional pedagogy related to subject area(s), and an in-depth understanding of adolescent development and how students learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice Area</th>
<th>Assessment of Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c1. Demonstrating content area knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c2. Demonstrating content area pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c3. Demonstrating specific knowledge of how students learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1d. Plan and implement effective teaching strategies that advance student learning by analyzing specific academic data from pre-assessments, formative and summative assessments to link learning for all students, refine learning objectives, and inform a continuous planning cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice Area</th>
<th>Assessment of Professional Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1d1. Using pre-assessment data to plan effective instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d2. Using formative assessment data to inform instructional planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d3. Using summative assessment data to monitor student progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C-9. Self-Assessment Tool (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice Area</th>
<th>Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching All Students</td>
<td>24. Implement a range of instructional strategies that support the varied learning needs of all students and encourage learning environments that focus on the outcomes of what students need to know, understand, and be able to do (KiDS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Create a positive, nurturing safe and collaborative learning community that respects individual differences, enhances social relationships, allows students to comfortably take risks, and models appropriate behavioral expectations for all students, staff, and program personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Maximize learning time by effectively managing classroom routines, procedures, space, materials, and instructional resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Differentiate instruction for diverse groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. Maintain high and realistic expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29. Reinforcing effort and providing recognition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Setting objectives and providing feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching</td>
<td>Professional Practice Area</td>
<td>Assessment of Professional Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD 3: PROFESSIONAL CULTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Please rate your professional practice areas by placing an X in the appropriate boxes below.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Demonstrate the capacity to reflect on and improve their practice to gather information, analyze data, examine issues, set meaningful professional goals, and develop new approaches in order to improve teaching and learning</td>
<td>3a1. Engaging in reflective practices</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a2. Analyzing student work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a3. Setting meaningful IPDP goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Actively pursue and participate in professional development and learning opportunities to improve quality of practice or build the expertise and experience to assume different instructional, team, and leadership roles</td>
<td>3b1. Active participation with PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b2. Exploring outside learning opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b3. Assuming varied co-planning, co-teaching, learning team and leadership roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Collaborate effectively with colleagues on a wide range of tasks, including, but not limited to learning teams, co-planning and co-teaching</td>
<td>3c1. Collaborating with learning team colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3c2. Collaborating with colleagues on co-planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3c3. Collaborating with colleagues on co-teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Share responsibility for the performance of all students within the program and take an active role in educational program improvement planning efforts</td>
<td>3d1. Seeking student performance data from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d2. Sharing student performance data with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d3. Active participation in program improvement planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Perform job and routine responsibilities consistently, demonstrate professional behavior and ethics, and adhere to all program and agency policies, procedures, and guidelines</td>
<td>3e1. Performing job and routine responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3e2. Demonstrating professional behavior and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3e3. Adhering to program and agency policies, procedures and guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C-10. GENERAL INFORMATION: Educator Goal Setting and Planning Form

Possession of an Educator Plan is a requirement of the Departments of Youth Services and Elementary and Secondary Education, including SEIS. These plans define the growth or the improvement actions an educator seeks to accomplish in accordance with the priorities of an organization, district, or school. In our system, they also serve as a tool for focusing conversations between educators, coaches, and/or supervisors.

Use this worksheet to create three educator goals: a student learning goal, a professional practice goal, and a licensure related goal. As in previous years, educator goals must be submitted to and endorsed by your supervisor via TeachPoint and available for review upon request. Work with your instructional coach to develop and refine your proposed and final goals. Use the SMART goal format to support the development and assessment of quality goals. The criteria for crafting S.M.A.R.T. goals are as follows:

S = Specific and Strategic
M = Measurable and Monitored
A = Attainable and Action-Oriented
R = Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused
T = Timed and Tracked

EDUCATOR GOAL SETTING and PLANNING FORM 2013-2014

Educator Name: ________________________________________________________________
Program Supervisor Name: _______________________________________________________
Administrative Supervisor Name: _________________________________________________
Program/School Name(s) ________________________________________________________
Check the appropriate box: □ Proposed Goals □ Final Goals
(Final goals must be endorsed by supervisor by October 28)

STUDENT LEARNING S.M.A.R.T. GOAL

State the professional growth goal
(Use the S.M.A.R.T. goal format to craft a student learning goal.)

Identify the action steps, including supports/resources and timeline needed to achieve this goal
(Describe specific actions you plan to take, including supports/resources from others needed to attain this goal.)

Describe the evidence that will be collected
(What evidence will you collect to demonstrate mastery of this goal in your professional practice?)
## PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE S.M.A.R.T. GOAL

**State the professional growth goal**
(Use the **S.M.A.R.T.** goal format to craft a professional practice goal.)

**Identify the action steps including supports/resources and timeline needed to achieve this goal**
(Describe specific actions you plan to take, including supports/resources from others needed to attain this goal.)

**Describe the evidence that will be collected**
(What evidence will you collect to demonstrate mastery of this goal in your professional practice?)

## LICENSURE RELATED S.M.A.R.T. GOAL

**State the professional growth goal**
(Use the **S.M.A.R.T.** goal format to craft a licensure related goal.)

**Identify the action steps including supports/resources and timeline needed to achieve this goal**
(Describe specific actions you plan to take, including supports/resources from others needed to attain this goal.)

**Describe the evidence that will be collected**
(What evidence will you collect to demonstrate mastery of this goal in your professional practice?)
GOAL 3

Ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students
GOAL 3

SECTION 1

Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Youth Services

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
COLLABORATIVE VISIONING AND PLANNING
WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH SERVICES

Purpose:

A workgroup composed of the key leadership from SEIS, DYS, CommCorp, and CES convened to foster a common vision for SEIS and DYS, and to identify critical challenges to effective collaboration and opportunities to strengthen coordination and collaboration. This work focused on the work of General Education and SEIS in DYS settings; this did not include SEIS in other settings.

The primary goals of this workgroup were as follows:

- Develop a shared vision for the SEIS / DYS education initiatives
- Define what is working well in the SEIS / DYS collaboration, what can be improved upon, and how to build on the strengths and make needed improvements to move us towards the shared vision
- Agree on the messaging of common vision, common language, and common expectations
- Examine and discuss infrastructures, staffing, and initiatives against the shared vision and goals, and identify gaps and solutions

Activities:

The workgroup met for three 2-hour sessions. The workgroup meetings were facilitated by a senior administrator from CES who used generally accepted facilitation methods. The method used to launch the discussions was a SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats). SWOT was developed in the 1970s at the Stanford Research Institute (now SRI). The technique has been used extensively, although the research on it is relatively sparse.

A comprehensive review of 142 studies about the effectiveness of SWOT was published in 2010 (Helms & Nixon, 2010). The authors concluded that the research supports the efficacy of SWOT as a tool for planning purposes, and is especially useful in helping groups reach consensus on key elements in each of the four quadrants and then develop a shared vision and set of strategic goals. The authors also note that SWOT “is used in virtually every published case study” used in graduate business programs. Other facilitation methods were drawn from multiple sources, notably trainings by Interaction Associates.
At the first meeting, the workgroup spent time reviewing and agreeing on the goals for the DYS / SEIS vision and strategy work. This included an exercise in reaching consensus on “What is our preferred future? (We see…” and “What is our impact? (As a result…”). The workgroup then completed and discussed a SWOT analysis (see pages 3-4) and began work on a shared vision statement.

At the second meeting, the workgroup further developed the shared vision statement and then compared that statement to the DYS Strategic Goals and the SEIS goals to ensure alignment. The workgroup listed what the agencies have done and are doing consistent with the shared vision and each organization’s goals, and areas where more work was needed (e.g. eliminate some duplication in roles / functions; improve transition planning).

At the third meeting, the workgroup fleshed out the shared vision and collaboration by identifying specific examples of what the organizations already do and what they can do to promote the shared vision and goals. This was followed by a discussion about philosophical assumptions/generalizations/policies and practices that help the organizations achieve, and those that stand in the way of achieving, this student-centered mission.

**Outcomes:**

This workgroup had four major accomplishments:

- Formed a consensus on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats around the SEIS / DYS education work
- Developed a shared vision
- Had frank discussions about the progress and the barriers towards achieving that vision and specific action steps to move forward
- Developed shared messaging and goals both for the current work and for the next stages of work (e.g. to include in the upcoming proposals)

**Vision statements (two variations were adopted):**

1. Students served collaboratively by DYS and SEIS benefit from all staff sharing responsibility to support the success of all DYS youth through services that pursue positive youth development and utilize a personalized approach.
2. All DYS and SEIS staff share responsibility to support the success of all DYS youth through services that pursue positive youth development and utilize a personalized approach.
**SWOT Analysis:**

**Strengths and Weaknesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise and knowledge across shared group</td>
<td>Need for shared messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-organizational relationships in place</td>
<td>Adequate capacity for transition planning and support for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sharing with between DESE and DYS</td>
<td>Improved communications internally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel, not identical goals</td>
<td>Competing priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good structure, vision for PD</td>
<td>Legal and contractual obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All programs under one vendor</td>
<td>Joint plan to share knowledge and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships at regional levels, including</td>
<td>Capacity for supervision, management, and oversight in SEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some integration of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration at leadership level</td>
<td>Inefficiencies in education liaison and evaluation team liaison job duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP/PYD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EYF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Opportunities and Threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More focus from feds/state on youth at risk</td>
<td>Time shared for all that needs to get done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFR Process</td>
<td>Legal/regulatory, election, fragmented state govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory/curriculum changes from DESE re: College and Career readiness</td>
<td>Lack of public support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for discrete needs</td>
<td>Decreased resources, funding opportunities, stability of funding and budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of philosophies across HHS agencies to make our case persuasively and align practices between SEIS/DYS</td>
<td>Changing student numbers and demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low numbers of students</td>
<td>Legal advocates-service delivery to youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress with technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Steps:

This work was short-term and focused on four key goals (listed on the first page) which were, for the most part, accomplished. This process and the findings generated will inform future collaborative efforts between DYS and SEIS.

### References and research supporting this approach:

SECTION 1 – ATTACHMENTS

Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Youth Services

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
ATTACHMENTS

Goal 3 | Section 1: Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Youth Services

No attachments for this section
Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Mental Health

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
COLLABORATIVE VISIONING AND PLANNING
WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

Purpose:

From the outset of the SEIS contract with the Collaborative for Educational Services (CES), one of the primary goals of the work was to “ensure collaborative agency relations that promote coordinated and appropriate program services to SEIS students.” (SEIS Work Plan 2008-2011).

Over the first five years of the contract, CES and DESE leadership worked closely together to meet the following goals:

- Engage host agency leadership in discussions regarding enhanced collaboration, joint vision development, and coordination of services
- Develop structures to foster communication and coordination at all levels

These efforts were designed to ensure that SEIS and host agency staff coordinate their efforts to promote positive outcomes for youth.

Activities:

In the first year of the contract CES and DESE agreed to conduct a baseline assessment and develop recommendations for building collaborative structures between SEIS and DMH. CES contracted with an evaluation team led by Professor Sharon Rallis of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts/Amherst to conduct an initial assessment of current practices and make recommendations for improving collaboration and coordination efforts.

This assessment work continued over two years. The first year focused on SEIS and DMH leadership perspectives, policy, and practices (see attachments). In the second year, work included dissemination of the preliminary findings to all DMH programs and further field work to look at collaborative practices and structures at the service delivery level.

While the Rallis team was collecting baseline data and developing recommendations for enhanced collaboration, the DESE SEIS Director initiated a joint visioning process with DMH Leadership (Janice Lebel). They initiated the DMH-SEIS Advisory Group, which included SEIS and DMH
program directors, the DESE Principal for DMH programs, the CES SEIS Contract Administrator, the CES DMH Host Agency Coordinator, and the CES Director of Evaluation. The group met monthly over a two year period and developed collaborative processes and structures, including the following:

- A joint vision statement for SEIS and DMH collaboration (see attachments)
- Outreach with DMH program managers to identify shared training opportunities to build a consistent knowledge base among DMH and SEIS staff
- Systems to collect and share data to shed light on youth participation and outcomes (e.g., attendance data reports were presented monthly to DMH leadership to help engage DMH and SEIS staff in efforts to increase student participation at school)

Beginning in the fall of 2010, DMH leadership became deeply involved in the EOHHS procurement process for residential programs, and monthly SEIS-DMH meetings at the leadership level were no longer possible. While these meeting became less frequent, SEIS continued work on several fronts, with CES staff working with the DESE Principal to sustain and build new program level structures for improved collaboration. SEIS staff regularly met with program directors to build site-level communication practices and to share information about resources or trainings that would have a common benefit. During 2012-13, the CES SEIS Coordinator also began meeting with program staff and the Worcester Recovery Center and Hospital’s parent liaison, to collaborate on educational opportunities for youth in the WRCH DMH programs.

Outcomes:

As a result of targeted collaborative planning work since 2008, DESE, CES, and DMH have achieved several positive outcomes producing greater coordination in support of the youth served.

The DMH-SEIS Advisory Group developed the SEIS-DMH Joint Vision statement, which clearly articulates the shared values, goals, and structures for collaborative work between SEIS and DMH (see attachments). The group also established expectation that the SEIS DMH Host Agency Coordinator would meet quarterly with DMH Program Directors to identify and address issues that arise and to enhance communication. Plans to include parent advocates in collaboration-building were also initiated.

The “SEIS Education Overview” presentation was developed and presented to staff in all DMH programs (see attachments). DMH program staff gained greater understanding of SEIS practices and policies.
As a result of the Rallis assessments and the Host Agency Coordinator’s outreach to programs, SEIS administrators identified effective practices and program-specific tools to foster communication between education and clinical staff (e.g., Bindex, morning meeting).

In the follow-up assessment, the Rallis team found considerable improvements in collaboration at the program level (see attachments). These included the following:

- A common recognition that all staff need to work together to meet the needs of the children
- DMH vendor/contractor understanding of the DMH-SEIS vision for enhanced collaboration
- More program-based meetings across agencies
- More sites open to expanding collaborative practices
- Less adversarial or territorial behavior reported at programs

The evaluation work also yielded recommendations for ongoing monitoring of collaboration between SEIS and host agencies.

**Next Steps:**

- The CES Contract Administrator and SEIS Coordinator will continue to work with the Host Agency Coordinator and DMH Program Directors to share training and resources that support social and emotional learning. This includes both SEIS teachers participating in host agency trainings and CES sharing instructional resources that can be useful for program staff and/or families.
- Transition Planning: Professional development will continue to focus on how to center IEP development around youths' vision for their futures and post-secondary goals. Specifically, the work will emphasize measurable action steps and progress monitoring for those goals.
- The CES Contract Administrator and SEIS Coordinator will continue to work with the Parent Liaison at Worcester Recovery Center and Hospital (WRCH) to identify ways to engage students in activities that prepare them for successful transitions back to their homes and communities.
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SEIS-DMH Collaborative Vision Statement

Vision
SEIS and DMH will work collaboratively to support the health and wellness of the youth we serve so that they may achieve the academic, social-emotional and life skills necessary to lead productive lives in their community.

Goals
SEIS and DMH will work together to provide clinical and educational programming in DMH statewide programs that will support youth to:

1. achieve academic success, aligned with individualized educational goals, to support college or career-readiness
2. develop social-emotional skills to support healthy relationships and participation in community activities of his/her choice
3. develop vocational and life skills that promote independent functioning and the ability to contribute to his/her community

Guiding Principles
SEIS and DMH are committed to working as one unified team to support each youth’s optimal functioning within their community. In order to achieve this, SEIS and DMH:

1. are committed to sharing responsibility for youth outcomes
2. integrate education into all aspects of the treatment program
3. recognize that youth, family, educators, and program staff (residential and clinical) are all critical members of the treatment team
4. are committed to creating a learning environment in which all members of the treatment team work collaboratively to support each youth and family’s goals
5. share their respective areas of expertise to promote positive youth outcomes

Essential Structures to Promote Collaboration

1. A continuous quality improvement structure that includes regular review of youth outcome data
2. Policies and procedures within each agency that facilitate and encourage consistent and complementary practice
3. Organizational structure and staff expectations are designed to facilitate communication and effective working relationships between both agencies to support youth needs
4. Shared professional development and training opportunities for SEIS and DMH providers
5. Partnering with local school systems, community agencies, and families to insure:
   a. effective communication about each youth’s strengths and needs
   b. advocacy and support for effective programming within the community
SEIS
Education Overview
U Mass Adolescent Units
October, 2009
Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS)

• SEIS provides specially designed instructional services to the extent possible consistent with IEP and with as much emphasis on providing services inclusively as possible.

• In most cases the state agency provides related services, medical, residential and clinical services.

• Public schools remain responsible for IEPs. SEIS cooperates with the public schools.
A major aspect of special education: Access to the General Curriculum

- The term general curriculum refers to the curriculum that is used with nondisabled children.
- An IEP must include measurable annual goals related to meeting the child’s needs that result from the disability to enable the child to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum.
- Students must be able to access the general curriculum in all placements, however,

*The general curriculum is not a place.*
The Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks
Competency Determination
Graduation Requirement

• ELA and Mathematics MCAS score:
  -240 on the grade 10 tests

  OR

  - between 220 - 238 on these test
  & fulfill the requirements of an EPP

  \[EPP = \text{Educational Proficiency Plan}\]

AND

• MCAS Science and Tech/Engineering (STE)
  -220 on a high school level science test
  Biology, Chemistry, Introductory Physics, or
  Technology/Engineering

Starting with the class of 2010
MCAS

• Grade 10 exams typically administered in the Spring of 10th grade year

• Retests for those who’ve taken Grade 10 & have not reached a score of 220 in Math & ELA typically administered in November & March

• Very specific guidelines for Grade 10 administration re: dates & testing conditions
SEIS Basic Schedule

• 5 hours/week of ELA
• 5 hours/week of Math
• 5 hours/week of Science
• 5 hours/week of Social Studies
• 3.75 hours/week of Comprehensive Health
• 3.75 hours/week of The Arts

27.5 hours/week
Instructional Guides

• *Guide* to curriculum
• (meaning what is taught).
• Scope & sequence of each of the main content areas and driven by Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.
• Provides links to resources that have started to be distributed.
Massachusetts Special Education Regulations
603 CMR 28.00

• 28.01 Authority, Scope and Purpose
• 28.02 Definitions
• 28.03 Administration and Personnel
• 28.04 Referral & Evaluation
• 28.05 The Team Process & Development of the IEP
• 28.06 Placement Types & Service Options
• 28.07 Parent Involvement
• 28.08 Continuum of Options for Dispute Resolutions
• 28.09 Approval of Public or Private Day and Residential Special Education School Programs
• 28.10 School District Responsibility
(a) Public school districts are not relieved of their obligations to students in {SEIS}…Although admission and discharge decisions in such facilities are not within the jurisdiction of the public school district, students…remain the responsibility of the school district where the father, mother or legal guardian resides and have the same rights for referral, evaluation, and the provision of special education…as students in public schools.
The IEP Team & Process is managed by the school district

- In SEIS settings the ETL can help to set it up, but it is essentially a district function.
- Alternatives to “physical meetings” are explicitly allowed, including video-conferencing, telephone conferencing, or virtual meetings.
The IEP includes:

- specially designed instruction to meet the needs of the individual student
- related services that are necessary to allow the student to benefit from the specially designed instruction
- and/or related services that are necessary to allow the student to access the general curriculum.
The IEP in SEIS/DMH settings

- Some identified services/activities may not be available or may take a different form in the SEIS/DMH setting.
- Some IEPs are out-of-date
- Some IEPs are not well-written
- Some IEPs seem to include everything but the kitchen sink
- Teacher’s job is to understand how the student learns and to do the best they can to assist that learning.
• Receiving special education in institutional settings requires accommodating to
  - DMH setting
  - Sending school district requirements
  - Specific student circumstances.

• The goal is to make it as successful and seamless for the students as we can, providing access to the general curriculum and aiming for independence in acquired skills.
Questions?
SEIS/DMH Collaboration and Coordination

Performance Documentation

The Center for Educational Policy
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
August 2009
Background

• Terminology
  • Education
  • Youth
  • Collaboration and Coordination

• Conceptualization of the Project
  • The RFR
  • HEC’s Response
  • SEIS Contract
Collaboration: What and Why?

Many Definitions, Multiple Models
(Himmelman; Stroul; Baker & Martin; Friend; Bardach)

- Academic Outcomes and Mental Health Closely Related for Youth (NASP 2006)

- Collaboration between Agencies Essential to Support Academic and Mental Health Outcomes (Adelman and Taylor 2006)
Theory of Action

If both SEIS educators and DMH program staff work together collaboratively in their efforts to address the youth’s needs, then teachers will be better able to facilitate appropriate educational goals and the DMH treatment team will be better able to provide service, resulting in positive outcomes for the whole youth.

1. Does consensus exist on educational goals and youths’ needs?
2. Do all parties agree on what working together means?
3. Do personnel in both agencies share mutual understanding of what constitutes positive outcomes?
4. Where do mandates and policies mapping out expectations around collaboration and coordination come from?
Challenges

- What are our common goals?
- Why should we work together?
- Who are members of our collaborative team?
- What strengths do team members bring?
- What resources do we bring and are willing to share?
- How will we know if we are successful?
Levels of Collaboration

Three levels for reform and outcome measurement (Stroul): State Policy, Local Systems, and Service Delivery

**Upper level administration/policy**
- State Director of AMH
- State Director of SEIS

**Middle level administration**
- Program Directors
- Principals
- Program Coordinators

**Lower level administration**
- Teachers
- Clinicians
- Teacher Aides
Roles and Responsibilities

DMH: Surrogate Home
Wellness for youth
Desire for full range of educ. services

SEIS School as Normative Experience
Time on task
Academic outcomes

Access to Gen Ed Curriculum vs. Functioning in Society
Education as Custodial vs. Education as Effective Treatment
Current Mechanisms for Collaboration

Meetings
- Site, service delivery level – frequent, as needed
- Middle level - monthly or quarterly
- State policy level – annual

Behavioral Plans
- Jointly developed
- Between education and clinical staff

Staff Development/Training
- On the job training
- Crisis de-briefs
- Formal does not currently occur collaboratively, but potential exists
## Challenges to Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do all the meetings happen?</td>
<td>Vision to practice</td>
<td>Personality Driven Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they appropriate?</td>
<td>Lack of formal policy</td>
<td>Leadership expectations vary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of shared definitions</td>
<td>Role Definitions vary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of articulated common goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Good Practice

- Morning “Pass-Ons”
  - Some are oral communication/some written

- Joint Problem Solving
  - Eg: Tewksbury “after lunch crises” becomes “after lunch nature walk”

- Leadership recognizes the need for education and clinical staff to work together
Recommendations

- **Develop** a jointly agreed upon definition of *collaboration* and *coordination*,

- **Formalize** policies, protocols and procedures.

- **Build Capacity** and provide professional development around practices of collaboration and coordination.

- **Share** relevant professional development, including plans, materials, and objectives.

- **Integrate** collaboration and coordination objectives into *job descriptions* and *performance review* plans of staff.

- **Disseminate** findings broadly to all actors as a basis for discussion.
Thank you

From Dr. Sharon Rallis, Rachael Lawrence, Nina Papadopoulos, and Jason Schweid
BACKGROUND

Terminology

For the purpose of clarity, throughout this report we will use the following terminology:

*Education* – referring to the school related activities that students encounter within the institutional setting and the actors associated with these activities, including DESE and HEC.

*Youth* – broadly defining children and youth that make up the student population within institutional settings included in the study.

*Collaboration and coordination* – two terms that, while carrying somewhat different meanings, are used to represent the recursive process where two or more organizations work together at the intersection of common, shared goals toward learning, improvement, and effective results.

The Conceptualization of this Project

The collaboration and coordination between the Hampshire Educational Collaborative (HEC) and the Department of Mental Health (DMH) began with the issuance of a request for response (RFR) from Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Anticipating the conclusion of the EdCo contract to provide Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) services for DESE, a new RFR was issued for services starting in the 2007 school year. Central to this RFR were key desired changes in the way SEIS services were provided. Working together with leaders from the various state agencies, DESE Director of SEIS, Jan Avallone, included specific language within the RFR to seek out an SEIS provider that would meet the demand for improved collaboration and coordination between the education service provider and the host agency service provider, and facilitate a shift toward an integrated service delivery model, in order to improve the quality of education services for youth in DMH settings. An agency that was especially interested in extending collaboration and coordination efforts was the Department of Mental Health, as expressed by Dr. Janice LeBel.
From the potential service providers who responded to the RFR, Hampshire Educational Collaborative (HEC) was selected. The selection of HEC was largely due to a strong articulation of interest and intent in strengthening collaborative and coordinative efforts. HEC specified an additional two hours of non-instructional time in the contract day with the intent of allowing critical time and space, both needed to meet with service providers from the other agency and each other, as well as plan instruction. HEC is seeking to integrate additional ways of promoting and providing improved mechanisms for collaboration and coordination.

After the contract for SEIS services was awarded, HEC developed a ToR with a team of researchers at the University of Massachusetts to research and document current practices in collaboration and coordination and make recommendations for improving these efforts. In June and July 2009, a team of four, lead by Dr. Sharon Rallis conducted a review of program documents and literature, made site visits, facilitated focus group discussions and individual interviews with appropriate staff in an effort to shed light on current efforts and experiences.

In a review of relevant documents provided by HEC and DMH, the RFR and the HEC response is the only document in which collaboration and coordination is implied as a goal. The DMH and vendor manuals are extensive, and do not clearly spell out how collaboration or coordination between the school/education services and residential/clinical services should occur. In addition, HEC leadership takes the position that the teachers are “guests in the host agency facility”, as indicated by interviews. Overcoming the sense of “being guests” to becoming equal partners and an integrated part of the collaboration may be one of the challenges facing HEC as it seeks to fulfill the call of the RFR.

The following theory of action maps out with words the processes and possible outcomes relating to the vision for improved coordination and collaboration between SEIS and DMH as observed and documented by the evaluation team.

**Theory of Action:** If both SEIS educators and DMH program staff work together collaboratively in their efforts to address the youth’s needs, then teachers will be better able to facilitate appropriate educational goals and the DMH treatment team will be better able to provide service, resulting in positive outcomes for the whole youth.

Implicit to this theory of action is a belief that a coordinated approach will allow for more predictable leadership, a heightened understanding of the changing needs of the youth, and in turn will allow for a more flexible, responsive and appropriate approach based on the needs and experiences of the youth/student.

This theory of action leads to the following questions:

1. Does consensus exist on educational goals and youths’ needs?

2. Do all parties agree on what working together means?
3. Do personnel in both agencies share mutual understanding of what constitutes a positive outcome?

4. Where do mandates and policies mapping out expectations around collaboration and coordination come from?

**What is Collaboration? Why is it important in the context of education and mental health?**

*Collaboration* is a commonly used term in both education and mental health literature. Public schools are seeking collaborative relationships to ensure that all student needs are being met “around” the school, and mental health agencies are recognizing that the students have needs beyond their diagnosis. The interagency collaboration necessary to provide education to the youth patients of DMH, living in institutions run by contracted vendors, intersects both of these bodies of literature.

According to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) position statement (2006), interagency collaboration occurs through partnerships in the educational and mental health systems. These partnerships form to meet the needs of students with mental illness, because academic outcomes and mental health are closely related. Citing Fantuzzo, McWayne and Bulotsky (2003) and the U. S. Public Health Service (2000), the NASP asserts that students with mental health issues are often encounter barriers to service because of restricted resources and the lack of coordination between agencies. They conclude, “Collaboration among agencies is essential in order to support the academic achievement and healthy social-emotional development of children (Adelman & Taylor, 2006a, 2006b).”

A current approach to reform underway in Children’s Mental Health Care in the United States is the *system of care* approach, which emphasizes service integration with coordination of services at both system and service delivery levels (Stroul, 2002). *Systems of care* is a multi-level, multi-faceted approach to service delivery for students with mental health challenges, providing an individualized set of services to the patients. Collaboration and coordination is critical to its effectiveness. In fact, the system of care approach in mental health organizations illustrates interagency collaboration as “a process in which organizations exchange information, alter activities, share resources, and enhance each other’s capacity for mutual benefit and a common purpose by sharing risks, responsibilities, and rewards” (Himmelman, 2004, p.3).

While school-linked integrated services and interagency collaboration are frequently stated as necessary to coordinate fragmented and segmented delivery systems, few working models can be found (Baker & Martin, 2008). Collaboration is seen as a “willingness” by agencies to work together to develop and define common goals, sharing responsibility to the actualization of these goals, and working together toward that end (Bruner,1991). Systems must be in place for the sharing of information and resources, and there must be a sense of a common purpose.

Bardach (1998) defines collaboration as joint activity between two or more agencies that aims to increase public value by working together rather than working separately. He hypothesizes that public policy commonly encourages differentiation and separation of services and thus thwarts collaborative efforts because of political and institutional pressures. Because of the fragmentation of public services that results from these political pressures, the value of the
services to the public is decreased. Interagency collaboration, therefore, is not only good for the youth, but may increase the public value of the host agency.

**At what levels might collaboration occur?**

Stroul (2002) specifies three levels for reform and outcome measurement: State Policy, Local Systems, and Service Delivery. Policies need to be enacted at the state level to support an interagency “system of care”; local systems need to be aligned with each other for efficient provision of services; and the local service delivery systems must be in sync with each other. Each level’s intervention strategies will differ, with the end goal being a system that is supportive of the “whole child”.

At the policy level, Bardach (1998) explains that *politics* can often stand in the way of collaboration. One way in which politics can obstruct collaboration is through funding. Another obstacle may occur from the rules, regulations, and protocols set in place for an agency by legislators. To ensure that collaboration will happen, funding streams and rules need to be written in ways that streamline or provide an incentive to streamline interagency interaction.

Baker and Martin (2008) focus on the roles of *organization structure* and *leadership* in their study of collaboration. In their findings, flexibility of roles and expectations between people within agencies was essential to the ability of the *Missouri Communities that Care* (MCC) to function within and around schools. In terms of leadership, parity of status between leaders was crucial to collaboration. The MCC collaboration evolved from the ability of the sites within the organization to “self-organize” and from the leaders of each agency utilizing “shared leadership”. At the upper and middle level of collaboration, *distributed leadership* theory may provide a framework for interaction and strategic planning.

At the site level, Friend (1996) lists several ways in which collaboration may occur in a school setting with the provision of special education services. One form is in consultative relationships for behavioral, clinical, or mental health matters. School personnel also may collaborate through professional teams, to create and work for student-oriented goals. Participants in a school-based collaboration extend beyond teachers and administrative staff, to parents, public and private agencies, and professionals from other disciplines. Friend presents strategies to enhance what she terms “interpersonal collaboration”, which she defines as “a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal” (p. 6).

**What is a “good” collaboration model?**

The agency in the Baker and Martin study may have successful because of the willingness of stakeholders to participate in shared leadership and self-organization activities. This collaboration appears to have been personality-driven since many participants refer to the “leader’s personalities” as the driving force behind the agencies success. Collaboration may occur naturally through the “right” combination of personalities; however, built in systems that support formal collaboration must be in place to support continuity and stability within the collaborative effort.
Friend (1996) lists several defining characteristics a collaborative system. First, collaboration is voluntary, especially at the level of personal interaction. Stakeholders who work in a collaborative effort must first have the desire to interact in this way. Secondly, parity in terms of decision-making power among participants is essential in collaboration; thus, agencies recognize that each contributes value to the work. If one individual holds more decision-making power, collaboration will occur. Third, any collaboration forms around mutual goals, and any team that meets for the purpose of collaboration must have at least one common goal. Fourth, all stakeholders within an organization must share responsibility regarding decision making and participation. To that end, people who collaborate must be willing to share resources, as well as accountability for positive and negative outcomes.

In summary, three key levels of interaction are essential to a “good” interagency collaboration. Policies must be in place to facilitate interagency interaction and communication and funding should be done in a way that encourages shared activities between agencies. Leadership, across the collaborating agencies, must have parity, access to the same knowledge, and be able to share decision making. At the site level, communication between staff, teachers, leadership, families, and other professionals is essential to an effective collaboration. Centralization of the collaboration is probably not necessary for success, provided that frequent and productive interactions between agencies occur at the variety of levels. Finally, collaboration must occur around a common, understood goal or mission, in which the collaborating parties have parity and a willingness to share responsibility.

For HEC and DMH, the challenge then becomes: first, to **articulate the goals around which they will collaborate**; next to **define what collaboration means to them in this context for their purposes**. Some questions, drawn from the resource above, to guide interaction include:

1. What are our common goals?
2. Who is a member of our collaborative team? Why are we meeting as a team?
3. What strengths do the team members bring? Why do we need to work with them?
4. What resources do we have to bring, and what are we willing to share?
5. How will we know when we are successful in our goals?

**CONTEXT**

**Levels of Collaboration/Coordination:** Collaboration and coordination occurs at multiple levels within the SEIS/DMH context. For the purposes of this project, we have identified three levels.
Some communication occurs between and across levels. For example, the SEIS Principals meet with the Upper level administration, as well as the site level personnel. To facilitate collaboration and coordination, one top level administrator suggested that “by demonstrating collaboration at the upper level, the collaborative effort will ‘trickle down’ to the lower levels” (6/9/09).

Roles and Responsibilities: The DMH program takes on the role of care-giver and family for the youth in their care, and provides a temporary space where the focus is healing and recovery. School, in this setting approximates a normative experience. There is acknowledged difference between this temporary school and home space and community home and school space – both approximate typical ‘in the world’ experiences, but they are in no way typical. In many respects, the goals, practices, and outcomes of these services will need to be adjusted accordingly. Just as the DMH program is not ‘business as usual’ neither should the education program be considered in this way.

The relationship on site between the DMH staff and SEIS staff can be seen as analogous to that which exists between most parents and their child’s school. Therefore, DMH and SEIS site staff take on the roles of parent and school accordingly. For example, DMH Program Managers are concerned that the school does not run in the summer – as most parents or caregivers would be. Conversely, educators are concerned that too much time away from the classroom will negatively impact learning and time on task, even when the absence is based on care or clinical needs.

This tension extends to potentially conflicting goals: the educators’ aim is for students to access the general education program; the clinical goal is get youth well and functioning in society.
**Education is one element on the Continuum of Care:** The *continuum of care* is a term used by health providers to describe the complementary services that serve as part of an individuals’ treatment approach. The Educational Services provided by SEIS are as much a part of this continuum as the direct treatment, occupational or physical therapy, or dental health providers. A Range of Approaches, including a variety of delivery methods, is used on the Continuum of Care. How education is viewed in each setting should be considered. For example, a continuum of the purposes/roles for education appears in practice:

Education as custodial ←---------------------------→ Education as effective treatment

A joint exploration of the healing and life-saving elements of education would be useful to better articulate the intersection between the education and clinical goals. To do so, both agencies need a clearer understanding of the role of education within the clinical setting.

**Current Mechanisms to Promote Collaboration and Coordination**

Mapping and defining existing mechanisms, beliefs and behaviors of collaboration and coordination with the DESE, DMH partnership is the first step in understanding how to improve them. The following activities and policies were observed or referred to by participants during our interviews:

- A range of mutually agreed upon and attended meetings.
  - Multiple meetings at the site level, ranging from rounds to pass-ons, and casual debriefings.
  - Number, frequency, and topic of meetings vary from site to site.
- Yearly meeting between state dept. level management and SEIS principals/coordinators.
  - Is the purpose to the meetings clear?
  - What outcomes/actions results from these meetings?
- Jointly developed or articulating behavior plans for individual youth have been created at some DMH sites.
  - This approach could be useful at all sites
  - An example of “resource sharing”
- Shared training/staff development is possible and has been proposed.
  - General joint training has not occurred across all settings. Some programs have job site-orientations, while others do not. An example of an area around which educators and mental health service providers would benefit from joint training is trauma informed instruction, offered by DMH. DMH program staff could be trained on what a standards-based curriculum means for their population.

Very few formalized mechanisms to encourage collaboration and coordination are in place at this time—in most instances where collaboration occurs, it is based in the relationship and good will of the participants. However, for long-term effect, HEC and DMH efforts in SEIS will require more than a loose informal collaboration that exists in many settings. A more supported, built-in formalized system is called for.
PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

The following bullets highlight challenges to collaboration and coordination which surfaced through the interviews and focus group:

➢ MECHANISMS
  - Not all meetings occur on a regular scheduled basis
  - In some meetings, agenda and purpose are not clear or shared.

➢ POLICY
  - No formal written policy about collaboration and coordination exists between or across agencies to define, guide and monitor collaborative efforts.
  - Top-level leadership of both DMH and DESE (Jan and Janice) is dedicated to a compelling vision. However, how it is translated and is practiced below them is variable. The messages are general, and as result, interpreted situationally.
  - Whether jointly developed and currently shared goals have been articulated and accepted across agencies is not clear. Collaboration must have common goals to work around.
  - Lack of shared definitions regarding collaboration at both policy and practice levels. Example: some participants/staff see collaboration as “sharing information,” while others view it as “cohesion to host policy rules”. Yet, others see it as joint planning and decision-making.

➢ PRACTICE
  - Personality Driven Collaboration. Current practices in collaboration depend on relationships and individuals. Existing collaborative structures are negatively affected by high turnover especially in leadership, and change of service provider.
  - Need for shared understandings of collaborative activities as well as formal structures and supports for effective collaborative and coordination (What can we do together? When? How?).
  - Inconsistent Leadership Expectations from site to site. Many discrepancies occur in what meetings should be mutually attended, what a “good collaboration” is in practice, and what protocols should exist around collaborative efforts.
  - Inconsistent role definitions. This includes job titles, descriptions and expectations, agency-to-agency and vendor-to-vendor. An example is the terminology for the “direct care” workers, called “residential workers”, “line-staff”, “counselors”, etc, depending on site or agency.
  - Espoused theory vs. theory in use. A lot of rhetoric supports joint decision-making and strategic planning, but little or varying degrees of collaborative action occurs at the site level.
  - Lack of coordinated sharing of information and resources. For example, some sites share behavior plans, reward room, paying for field trips. Others do not.

EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICES
1. **Joint problem solving** – For example, at the Merrimack Center in Tewksbury, both director and lead teacher explored re-definitions a perceived problem, and developed a solution that has had positive impacts educationally and clinically.

2. **Morning “pass-ons” and meetings** – Some sites do this through a meeting of DMH and Educational staff (Merrimack). Others do this through written communication, via a log book (UMass 1 and 2).

3. **Leaderships explicitly recognizes the need for educators and clinical staff to work together** – Education is consistently viewed as essential to youth, as related by DMH Program Directors and SEIS Principals and Coordinators.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Develop** a jointly agreed upon definition of *collaboration* and *coordination*, that is realistic and practical, as well as its purposes and specific practices. (What will people actually do, and what will it look like, when they are collaborating?)

2. **Formalize** policies, protocols and procedures. Make leadership and processes more predictable. The description and application should be documented, and then consistently applied. Top leadership should be clear about what to except in terms of support for collaboration and coordination efforts and processes.

3. **Build Capacity** and provide professional development around practices of collaboration and coordination, its benefits, definitions, roles and responsibilities. Some staff may need professional development.

4. **Share** relevant professional development, including plans, materials, and objectives. This is not only a good practice for collaboration and coordination, but may be a good use of financial resources in order to avoid duplication.

5. **Integrate** collaboration and coordination objectives into *job descriptions* and *performance review* plans of staff.

### PLAN FOR MEASUREMENT

Before you can measure how successful an organization is a meeting its goals, clarity about definitions, goals and benchmarks needs to be reached. As sites within DMH share neither a common set of goals or a common definition of what is “successful collaboration”, the first step in measuring is for all stakeholders to agree on the goals and definitions. Further, criteria and markers of “successful collaboration” should be agreed upon by the staff themselves. Once this critical first step is completed, then progress toward realization of the definition can occur, and it then becomes measurable.

We recommend the following steps toward measuring collaborative and coordination efforts:

1. **Identify and define COLLABORATION**. To this end, SEIS/DMH leadership can develop a cross-agency task team that is empowered to do the following:
   
a. Develop framework of shared goals and related mechanisms to achieve goals (definition around what is collaboration and coordination)
b. Designate collaborative activities at each level; some are already occurring others will be generated.

c. Develop tools/rubrics to measure performance (how well was a critical incident handled) particularly for use in de-briefing.

2. **Formalize goals, mechanisms and activities through the creation of a policy or mandate on collaboration.** Once established, the framework can be used to track implementation of mechanisms and ultimately goal achievement.

3. **Standardize tools, policies, and resources where appropriate.** Map existing resources, tools, and trainings to better understand how to integrate collaboration priorities into agency related documents. (I think this is important) This includes policy guidelines, performance appraisals, job descriptions, etc.

4. **Create relevant tools for measurement.** For example, if collaboration means joint decision-making then you could track the decisions and whether or not the decisions are carried out. Kohler’s *Taxonomy for Transition Programming* (1996) could serve as another template for identifying collaboration. The taxonomy specifies key areas in which collaboration is essential to the transition of a student receiving special education services. Creating a checklist that identifies key points of collaboration would be a way of documenting that or when collaboration occurs. Baker and Martin used a single-case study methodology to identify activities surrounding collaboration. Using observations, open ended interviews, and document analysis, they were able to identify what collaborative activities were key to the stakeholders in their collaborative effort. Friend provides ways of collaboration and communication and suggests several ways of documenting interaction at the site level. Other data collection strategies include: logs of collaborative activities for review using rubric/identified criteria; Q sorts to access participants’ attitudes towards collaborative process and its actual implementation.

5. **Utilize the information to inform practice**

**REFERENCES AND RESOURCES**


BUBBLING UP:
What we can learn from the sites about collaboration
June 2010
Communicating the vision from here:

Leadership desire that staff at sites work together collaboratively

Little shared understanding of collaboration at and across sites

The vision for collaboration had not trickled down to the sites.
This Year

What are sites thinking and doing about collaboration this year?

Visited:
Centerpoint, Merrimack, UMass Adolescent Units 1 and 2, Three Rivers, and UMass Connections
# State of Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Commitment to collaboration at DMH and DESE central office</td>
<td>- Vision has been communicated to all contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HEC “willingness”</td>
<td>- More meetings across agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some sites very collaborative</td>
<td>- More sites open to expanding collaborative practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some sites more territorial</td>
<td>- Less adversarial or territorial behavior reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some sites more adversarial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE BIG CHANGE

Visited sites recognize that all staff need to work together to meet the needs of the children.
“CAMPS” OF CARE

- **Treatment**
  - Psychiatrists, Medical Personnel, Therapists

- **Residential**
  - “direct care” or “line staff” (sometimes called Mental Health Counselors)

- **Educational Staff**
  - Teachers, Teacher Assistants, Principals
THE CHALLENGE

Person-Centered Care
Education as Treatment
Treatment as Education
ALL CAMPS FUNCTION TOGETHER
**Positive Examples**

- **Centerpoint:** Literally and figuratively, “no walls” between treatment, residential, and school.

- **Merrimack:** Mental Health Counselors able to make suggestions to teachers for classroom seating and hallway attendance.

- **UMass 1 and 2:** Charge Nurse navigates between school and residential floors—can also speak to treatment. Mental Health Counselors seem welcome in classrooms.
WHAT MAKES THIS HAPPEN?

- **Policies/Leadership**
  - Top down: sending right messages (*education is not negotiable*)
  - Bottom up: collaborative practices (originated at sites)
  - Distributed leadership

- **Structure**
  - Shared goals
  - Role definition and clarity
  - Collaborative practices and tools (site originated/adapted)
  - Use/design of physical space
  - Communication

- **Human Resources**
  - Hiring
  - Developing (PD)
  - Job-supportive infrastructure (internet and email)

- **Symbolic Aspects**
  - Culture of collaboration
  - Efficacy and agency – *We can do it! v. I don’t know how they expect me to do this.*
  - Mutual respect
POLICY AND LEADERSHIP SUPPORTS

- Messages and policies from the top (DMH and SEIS offices) are clear
  - School is required
  - Collaborative student focus every day
  - Description of three staff roles and how they support each other
  - Multi-site meetings as one vehicle for dissemination
Structural Aspects

- Promising tools for site-wide communication
  - Bindex
  - Morning meeting
  - Program director-lead teacher as team
  - Play active role in IEP (may draft appropriate IEP for district, which may not know youth well)

- Challenges
  - At one site, the treatment staff are located in another building, and the education staff rarely see or communicate with them. Teachers asked for “a consulting psychologist”.
  - At another, some roles have been “too blurred” or confused: thus, tasks seem impossible, and staff is overwhelmed. (eg—lead teacher does not see her job as attending meetings with therapeutic staff)
HUMAN RESOURCE SUPPORTS

- Hire for good fit/able to manage, collaborate (does program director have input on hiring lead teacher, and vice versa?)

- Orientation to site/work/collaboration (see model orientation checklist and quiz)

- PD seen as better by some this year, now that it's not DYS-focused
  - Prefer training that is half-days, site-level, job-embedded

- Margaret and Debbie are helping with site-level collaboration by explaining educator role to other site staff
Symbolic Aspects

- Culture of “we’re handling things” versus culture of “ongoing crises.”

- Belongingness: teacher as member of the family, versus teacher as guest in the house

- “No Walls”: not just a structural aspect
**THE MODEL: EACH SITE FUNCTIONS AS A COHERENT CAMP**

None can do it alone

Each has a defined role, but supports each other

- Parents/Home
- Residential
- Treatment
- Home School District
- Education
- Youth
Next Steps:
Recommendations for moving forward
SHORT TERM AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Centerpoint as exemplar for construction of new facility if possible (clinicians on one side of hall, classrooms on other; facilitates collaboration almost by default)

- Acknowledge and get over bad start with HEC contract: Important to recognize that EDCO was a positive experience for many veteran teachers

- Sites want HEC Leadership to visit and see successes and needs

- Provide critical tools for success (eg: professional internet and email access)

- Cross-pollination on PD
CREATING A LONG-TERM MEASUREMENT TOOL

- Participatory development

- Meaningful indicators
  - Build indicators from identified existing promising practices

- Capable of becoming SOP

- Provides useful information for improvement of practice

- Tool needs to support shared accountability
**Potential Indicators of Collaboration**

- Evidence of shared goals
- Use of specific identified collaborative practices and tools
  - Program director-lead teacher as team
  - Clear job descriptions that include collaboration activities
  - Cross-role involvement in hiring
  - Site-specific collaboration-focused orientation
  - Cross-role meetings (morning meeting)
  - Bindex
- Job satisfaction – lack of turnover
- Joint PD (as appropriate to meet needs of site staff)
- For more, refer to *What Makes This Happen?* slide
THANK YOU!
Bubbling Up: What We Can Learn from the Sites about Collaboration

In June and July of 2009, a team from the UMass Amherst Center for Education Policy led by Dr. Sharon Rallis researched and documented current practices in collaboration and coordination between agency service providers in the Department of Mental Health’s youth settings and the Hampshire Educational Collaborative’s SEIS education service providers in those settings. Findings included the following recommendations: (1) develop a jointly agreed upon definition of collaboration and coordination; (2) formalize policies, protocols, and procedures; (3) build capacity and provide professional development around practices of collaboration and coordination; (4) share relevant professional development, including plans, materials, and objectives; (5) integrate collaboration and coordination objectives into job descriptions and performance review plans of staff; and (6) disseminate findings broadly to all actors.

HEC asked UMass to continue this work in 2009-2010. Based on a discussion with the SEIS-DMH leadership team on November 6, 2009, the scope of work for December 2009-June 2010 was to (1) disseminate findings from the Spring 2009 UMass assessment to mid-level managers with responsibility for site-based activities; (2) collect feedback from the site-level perspective on specific, sustainable, collaborative actions DMH and SEIS staff can adopt as standard operating procedures; and (3) bring the site-level feedback on collaboration and coordination to the SEIS-DMH leadership team for discussion. To jumpstart implementation work planned for FY2011, UMass was also asked to suggest some potential indicators for monitoring progress in collaboration going forward.

The UMass team presented and discussed the 2009 findings at a joint meeting of approximately 25 DMH and SEIS site managers on January 21 in Westborough. The team subsequently conducted site visits and interviews with DMH and SEIS staff at the following sites: Centerpoint, Merrimack, UMass Adolescent Units 1 and 2, Three Rivers, and UMass Connections. The findings from this work are below.

Improved recognition of need for collaboration. Compared to the previous year, the team found that a big change had taken place: the visited site staff showed much greater recognition of the need for all staff to work together to meet the needs of children. Related findings included: more meetings across agencies; more sites open to expanding collaborative practices; and less adversarial or territorial behavior reported.

The challenge: get 3 “camps” of care to function as one, to provide person-centered care, in which education is seen as part of treatment and treatment is integral to education. Youth at each site are served by staff playing three different roles:

- Treatment (psychiatrists, medical personnel, therapists)
- Residential (“direct care” or “line staff” – sometimes called mental health counselors)
- Educational Staff (teachers, teacher assistants, principals)

The team saw a number of positive examples of this kind of collaboration at the sites:

- Centerpoint: Literally and figuratively, “no walls” between treatment, residential, and school.
- Merrimack: Mental health counselors (residential staff) able to make suggestions to
teachers for classroom seating and hallway attendance.

- UMass 1 and 2: Charge nurse navigates between school and residential floors—can also speak to treatment staff; mental health counselors seem welcome in classrooms.

**What makes this happen?** Based on the literature, collaborative work is driven by four factors:

- **Policies/Leadership.** This includes (1) top-down, sending the right messages (e.g., education is not negotiable); (2) bottom-up, originating collaborative practices at sites; and (3) distributed leadership.
- **Structure.** This includes (1) shared goals; (2) role definition and clarity; (3) collaborative practices and tools (site-originated or adapted); (4) the use/design of physical space; and (5) communication.
- **Human resources.** This includes (1) hiring; (2) professional development; and (3) job-supportive infrastructure (e.g., internet and email access).
- **Symbolic aspects.** This includes (1) a culture of collaboration; (2) efficacy and agency (we can do it! vs. I don’t know how they expect me to do this); and (3) mutual respect for different roles.

The implications of each of these for DMH-SEIS collaboration are indicated below.

**Policy and Leadership Supports.** Messages from top DMH and SEIS leaders need to be clear:

- Schooling is non-negotiable - senior DMH reinforcement of this message has been very important
- Collaborative student focus every day
- Description of the three staff roles and how they support each other
Multi-site meetings are one vehicle for disseminating these messages.

**Structural Aspects.** We witnessed a number of promising site-driven tools and practices for facilitating site-wide communication. These include:

- The “Bindex” – a centralized binder of standard reporting that is reviewed by each employee at the beginning of his/her shift and annotated at the end of his/her shift.
- Morning meeting – cross-function team meeting to bring everyone up to speed on events during the night, areas of concern, etc.
- Program Director-Lead Teacher as Team – strong, mutually supporting co-leadership.
- Active role in shaping student’s IEP – although responsibility for the IEP rests with the sending district, in many cases the sending district doesn’t know the student well; site staff may go so far as to (re)draft an appropriate IEP for district

We also witnessed some structural challenges:

- At one site, the treatment staff are located in another building, and the education staff rarely see or communicate with them. Teachers asked for “a consulting psychologist”.  
- At another, some roles have been “too blurred” or confused: thus, tasks seem impossible, and staff is overwhelmed. (E.g., lead teacher so classroom focused that she does not see her job as attending meetings with therapeutic staff.)
Human Resource Supports. Several implications affecting human resource practices were noted:

- Hire for good fit – need to hire site leaders who are positively disposed toward collaborative management (e.g., does program director have input on hiring lead teacher, and vice versa?).
- Orientation to site/work/collaboration – build role clarity and teamwork expectations into orientation (see model orientation checklist and quiz)
- Targeted Professional Development – PD seen as better by some this year, now that it's not DYS-focused. Interviewees prefer training that is half-days, site-level, and job-embedded.
- Margaret and Debbie are helping with site-level collaboration by visiting sites and explaining the educator role to other site staff

Symbolic Aspects. Some sites seemed to have built some important symbolic capital, which supported their success more generally:

- Culture of “we’re handling things” versus culture of “ongoing crises.”
- Belongingness: teacher as member of the family, versus teacher as guest in the house
- “No Walls” – not just a structural aspect

As a result, these sites appeared to function more as one unified camp than three separate camps.

Next Steps: Recommendations for moving forward

Short Term Areas for Improvement

- Centerpoint as exemplar for construction of new facility if possible (clinicians on one side of hall, classrooms on other; facilitates collaboration almost by default)
- Acknowledge, get over bad start with HEC contract. It is important to recognize that EDCO was a positive experience for many veteran teachers and site directors.
- Sites want HEC leaders to visit and see successes and needs.
- Provide critical tools for success (e.g., professional internet and email access).

Creating a Useful Long-Term Measurement Tool

- Requires participatory development
- Meaningful indicators – build indicators from identified existing promising practices
- Capable of becoming SOP
- Provides useful information for improvement of practice
- Tool needs to support shared accountability

Potential Indicators of Collaboration

- Evidence of shared goals
- Use of specific identified collaborative practices and tools: program director and lead teacher as a team; clear job descriptions that include collaboration activities; cross-role involvement in hiring; site-specific collaboration-focused orientation; cross-role meetings (e.g., morning meeting); Bindex
- Job satisfaction – low turnover rates
- Joint PD (as appropriate to meet needs of site staff)
Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Public Health

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
COLLABORATIVE VISIONING AND PLANNING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Purpose:

This project was designed to enhance coordination and collaboration between DESE/SEIS and the Department of Public Health (DPH) leadership and staff at the Massachusetts Hospital School (MHS). The primary goals of this project were as follows:

• Create a joint vision
• Identify opportunities to enhance collaboration
• Jointly develop an action plan to build collaborative policies, structures, and practices

Activities:

Building on a collaborative framework developed within the Department of Mental Health (DMH), the Director of SEIS invited DPH leadership to engage in a collaborative planning process. This effort was initiated during the 2011-2012 school year. A change in leadership at the MHS that year delayed the joint planning process until a new CEO at MHS was in place. The process was re-initiated at the start of the 2012-2013 school year.

SEIS and DPH leadership created a collaborative planning team, which included key leaders from both agencies.

• SEIS was represented by the SEIS Director and Assistant Directors, MHS Principal, and the CES SEIS Contract Administrator.
• DPH representatives included the MHS CEO; COO; and Directors of Clinical Services, Occupational and Physical Therapy, Speech, Nursing, and Recreation.

Kate Lytton, Director of Program Evaluation at CES, facilitated the meetings and helped to guide the process.

To support this collaborative planning process, CES contracted with Professor Sharon Rallis, a consultant from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, School of Education/Center for Education
Policy (CEP), who had previously supported the collaborative efforts between SEIS and DMH. The primary objectives of the CEP work were to:

- provide a baseline assessment of collaboration and coordination between SEIS and MHS staff at various levels;
- identify current collaborative processes that could be strengthened; and
- identify priority areas in which it is important to improve collaboration to enhance student outcomes.

The CEP team conducted extensive fieldwork between January and April 2013, and presented their findings at an SEIS-DPH Collaboration meeting in June.

**Outcomes:**

The initial outcomes from this SEIS-MHS collaborative planning process included:

- A draft joint vision statement (see attachments)
- Identification of two priority areas for enhanced collaboration: transition planning and information sharing between SEIS and DPH staff
- Development and implementation of new information sharing policies and practices
- Identification of opportunities to coordinate across transition planning structures/processes

The CEP findings identified current strengths in the collaboration between educational and clinical staff and structures that support effective communication. The study also indicated gaps in communication and information sharing, as well as regulatory and administrative barriers that would need to be addressed to improve coordination. The research team also provided guidance as to next steps for a collaborative planning process. See the Executive Summary (“MHS Vision Project: Unified Policies Toward Collaborative Practices”) and recommended group exercise (“Exit Upon Entry”), attached.

**Next Steps:**

The SEIS and DPH leadership will take up these findings and continue the process in the 2013-2014 school year. In addition, leadership staff in SEIS and DPH are continuing the work started on information sharing policies and practices, and on adapting transition planning processes to enhance coordination between the two agencies.
SECTION 3 – ATTACHMENTS

Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Public Health

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
Report on the Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) Education Initiative
ATTACHMENTS

Goal 3 | Section 3: Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the Department of Public Health


2. MHS-SEIS Collaborative Planning Map (Draft, 2013)


4. MHS Vision Project (Rallis Executive Summary, 2013)

5. Exit Upon Entry Theory of Action Activity, Massachusetts Hospital School (CEP, 2013)
Essential Structures to Promote Collaboration: These might include:

- Coordinated transition planning process to establish shared approach and greater integration of school curriculum and discharge planning (e.g., coordinated Annual POC/IEP meetings)
- Service coordination to develop, reinforce, and generalize skills across settings: school, residential, vocational, and community settings
- Structured interagency communication to ensure policies and procedures are complementary and consistent (e.g., regarding occurrences, abuse/neglect reporting)
- Information sharing protocols (in compliance with all state and federal regulations) to guide staff in both agencies in effectively communicating about youth strengths, needs, abilities, and opportunities
- Shared professional development and training opportunities for SEIS and DPH staff
- Transition policy and procedures to support youth self-advocacy and social-emotional skills
- Quality improvement system with outcome measures to monitor effectiveness of collaboration
- Partnering with families, community agencies, and local school systems to insure:
  - effective communication about each youth’s strengths and needs
  - advocacy and support for effective programming within the community
SEIS-DPH Collaborative Vision Statement: DRAFT (February 2013)

Vision
The Department of Public Health and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Special Education in Institutional Settings collaborate to support the youth we serve at the Massachusetts Hospital School so that they may achieve the health, educational, vocational, and life skills to maximize their ability to live safe and independent lives in the community.

Goals
DPH and SEIS staff will develop policies and practices that promote coordinated assessment, planning, and service delivery for youth at the Massachusetts Hospital to support health, skill development, and successful transitions to community settings. By coordinating service delivery, DPH and SEIS strive to enable youth to:

1. develop behavioral, health management, and advocacy skills that allow maximum independence and active engagement in community settings;

2. achieve academic and vocational goals, aligned with individualized educational and transition plans; and

3. develop social-emotional skills to support healthy and safe relationships and participation in community activities.

Guiding Principles
SEIS and DPH are committed to working collaboratively and to engaging family members and community-based organizations to support youth goal attainment. This collaborative approach is guided by a consistent commitment to:

1. shared responsibility for supporting youth in developing essential skills needed to transition effectively into community settings;

2. coordination of therapeutic, medical, and educational supports in the school and residential settings;

3. coordination of transition planning among therapeutic and educational staff and family members;

4. sharing areas of expertise to promote positive youth outcomes.

5. engaging youth, family, educators, health and residential program staff, and community-based support providers as critical members of the treatment team.
DPH and SEIS Collaboration to support Youth Self-Advocacy Exit Upon Entry

Essential System Components
- Shared responsibility and accountability
- Policy-making/Joint agreements
- Team approach includes youth, family, schools, community supports
- Clear roles and responsibilities
- Sharing of information
- Shared expertise
- Coordinated planning and supports
- Reflection/Continuous Quality Improvement

What we do
- Assessment and Progress Monitoring
- Health Management
- Assistive Technology
- Hiring and supporting PCAs
- Community Opportunities
- Landing Plan
- Services/Supports for Academic and Vocational Skill Development
- Behavioral Health Supports
- Family Supports/Parent Education
- Team Building/Communication
- Therapies

Goals for Youth
- Vocational Skills
- Academic Skills
- Social Emotional Skills
- Healthy and safe relationships
- Decision-making skills
- Health management skills

What we strive to achieve
- Families and youth have essential supports
- Life Skills, Self-Advocacy, Daily Activities
- Connections to Community Resources
- Youth Self-Advocacy: Maximum Independence and active engagement in community settings
MHS Vision Project: From Unified Policies toward Collaborative Practices

Presented by
The Center for Education Policy, UMass Amherst
June, 2013

Questions for this Evaluation

- In what ways do personnel from both agencies already work together?
- What do personnel in both agencies identify as needed for working together?
- What capacity building for collaboration do personnel need to achieve joint visions and goals?
Evaluation Activities

- December-April 2013
- Interviews: 22 interviews, encompassing 36 personnel, including:
  - Senior and Middle Level Leadership
  - Site Staff
  - Encompassed the Multiple Departments and Agencies
- Attended 3 Leadership Team Meetings
- Observed in 2 classrooms; spent time in school
- Reviewed website and those documents that were provided
- Literature Review

The Challenge: Collaboration
Where and Why?

- MHS is known for serving its Student-Patients: Status quo is good—could it be better?
- Personnel (teachers, teacher aides, medical, clinical, psych, and administrative/management staff) are skilled, highly trained, and dedicated
- Ground-level collaboration is essential to getting the job done*
- Why collaboration? BECAUSE student-patient is better served when agencies at all levels and people work together.
- Shared vision demonstrates committed to improving quality of care through collaboration.

*Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass
Key Findings

- Policy: A clear theory of action – with emphasis on action – is needed.
- Structure: Role clarity and transparency regarding decision authority at the middle management level is lacking in two key departments.
- Symbolic: Expressed need exists for MHS to feel as a single unit with one common goal: serving the needs of the youth.

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass

Cycle of the Day

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass
What IS Collaboration?

- Himmelman (2004): “shared resources, information, risks and rewards, enhance capacity”
- Bardach (1998): “increase public value”
- Merriam Webster
  - “work jointly with others”
  - “cooperate or willingly assist with the enemy”
  - “cooperate with an agency or instrumentality with which one is not immediately connected”
Essential Elements for Collaboration

- Individual **agency** of personnel
- Structural supports
  - **Clear Roles, Shared Goals and Language, Cooperative Strategies**
- Mutual respect for **professional knowledge**
- **Taking action** (beyond talking)
- **Reflecting together** on actions
- Mutual **accountability**

**Which elements are in place at MHS?**

---

SEIS Collaborative Vision Statement Jan 2013

- **Vision**
  DPH and DESE’s SEIS collaborate to support the youth we serve at the Massachusetts Hospital School so that they may achieve the health, educational, vocational, and life skills to maximize their ability to live safe and independent lives in the community.

- **Goals**
  Policies and practices that promote coordinated assessment, planning, and service delivery for youth at the Massachusetts Hospital to support health, skill development, and successful transitions to community settings.
Vision and Goals (con’t.)

Youth will:

1. develop behavioral, health management, and advocacy skills that allow maximum independence and active engagement in community settings;

2. achieve academic and vocational goals, aligned with individualized educational and transition plans; and

3. develop social-emotional skills to support healthy (safe?) relationships and participation in community activities.

If these outcomes are to be realized, what must SEIS and DPH **DO** at MHS?

Guiding Principles

SEIS and DPH are committed to:

1. shared responsibility for supporting youth in developing essential skills needed to transition effectively into community settings;

2. coordination of therapeutic, medical, and educational supports in the school and residential settings;

3. coordination of transition planning among therapeutic and educational staff and family members;

4. sharing areas of expertise to promote positive youth outcomes.

5. engaging youth, family, educators, health and residential program staff, and community-based support providers as critical members of the treatment team.

Collaboration within levels and across levels: vertical and horizontal communication

Policy (senior leadership):
Vision, Policy, and Program

Middle Administration:
Manages vision, policy, and program; leads practices and procedures

Ground Level (service delivery):
Daily Action practices and procedures

Supports & Barriers for Collaboration in MHS

- **Policies & Leadership**
  - Clearly Articulated Theory of Action
  - Clear Joint Policies: Shared Understandings
  - Commitment to and modeling of Action

- **Structure**
  - Shared goals and definitions
  - Clarity of Role Definitions and Authority
  - Infrastructural supports necessary to support human resources
    - Job embedded collaborative strategies and tools
    - Transparent communication channels; Shared Language
  - Joint Professional Development
  - Mutual Respect for Professional Knowledge and Actions

- **Symbolic**
  - Unifying events: Community Rituals and Ceremonies
  - Evidence of Beliefs & Values
Policy & Leadership

Critical Elements

• Clearly Articulated Theory of Action
• Clear and Shared Policies
• Commitment to and modeling of Action

Observed Promising Practices

- Regular DPH & SEIS Leadership Team Meetings
  - Ongoing brainstorming re: how to do things better at the school
  - Periodic review of policies
    - e.g., HIPAA/FERPA waiver process underway
- Executive Staff (DPH & Cheryl) meet 2x/month
- Open and easy communication channel between Jan & Brian and between Jay & Cheryl

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass

---

Policy & Leadership: Problem

- Theory of Action: **Exit upon Entry**
  - Connections between goals and outcomes are undeveloped;
  - Actions are unclear
  - Heard at policy level but not prevalent at ground level
  - Do you mean this:

    **IF we want our students to be able to commence successfully to the community, then we need to DO...**

Theory of Action is a back-ward mapping: Planning with end goal in sight: Exit upon entry

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass
Goals for Youth

Commencement to Community

Goals for

Plan of Care

Plan of Care

Where does IEP fit?

Collaboration Goals for

Exit upon Entry

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass

Exit Upon Entry

Massachusetts Hospital School

Collaboration Goals between

Goals for Youth

Goals for Youth

Exit from Community

Health and Self-Relationship

Health and Self-Relationship

Academic Skills

Academic Skills

Vocational Skills

Vocational Skills

Plan of Care

Plan of Care

Career Planning

Career Planning

Therapy

Therapy

Lifestyle Skills

Lifestyle Skills

Communication

Communication

Healthcare

Healthcare

Social Skills

Social Skills

Communication

Communication
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Policy level questions or concerns

- “Need to Know”: a policy or an action?
- Existing policies may cause structural barriers: e.g., HIPAA and FERPA
- Are all levels and or agencies represented in policy discussions and review?
- Is Education Program adequately represented in decision-making or information meetings?

Structure

Critical elements

- Shared goals and definitions
- Clarity of Role Definitions and Authority
- Infrastructural supports necessary to support human resources
  - Job embedded collaborative strategies and tools
  - Transparent communication channels; Shared Language
  - Joint Professional Development
- Mutual Respect for Professional Knowledge and Actions
Structure

Observed Promising Practices

- Daily Report generated and shared at 9am
- Teams or collaborations within units: e.g.,
  - Rounds
  - Plan of Care Meetings,
  - Campus Satisfaction Team,
  - Classroom and Cluster Meetings,
  - Other groups forming
- Daily Shared Priority Goal: **Getting the job done safely**
  - E.g., Individuals willing to take on a task not in their job descriptions to help get students safely to another points.

Structure: More Promising Practices

- “Bridge” Roles navigate and negotiate between School and Hospital
  - Therapists: “They pass info between the hospital and school”
  - Patient Advocate: “He’s an Ombudsman, problem solver, communicator, role model”
  - Activities Director: “He helps ‘normalize’ the day of the youth
- Professional Development:
  - E.g., SMART trainings across all agencies (initiated and ongoing)

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass
Structure: Problem Area

Confusion at Middle Management level:

- Lack of role clarity and lines of authority
  - “I think there’s too many heads over there [school]—too many higher ups. Too big of a team, too many layers... I mean I don’t even really know who to call over there.”

- Lack of transparency regarding decision-making:
  - “Who is responsible for contacting whom?”
  - Eg: Nursing schedules with blacked out information
  - Information comes through informal channels
    - “We found out from the students that we were having a snow day.”
    - “We got an email saying that the senior trip was changed to April vacation.”

Communication channels are poor or missing - horizontally AND vertically

- “We have to go through lateral and vertical movement of communication up the chain and back down again to receive simple answers.”
- “Mid-level needs to build protocols and structures for communication.”
- “All-staff meetings used to happen once a month.”
- “We haven’t approached each other yet. We need to strengthen communication with these folks (teachers).”
- “All levels of communication need tightening.”
- “Students get caught in the crossfire...when communication breaks down.”

Personnel across units do not always share a common language

- Are the youth “patients” or “students”? Many in all units refer to “kids” or “our kids”; e.g., nurses talking about how they feel like proud parents when they get all their “kids” off to school successfully.
- Acronyms (e.g., IEP, PoC . . .)
- Medical terms
Structural Supports Necessary to Support Human Resources are Weak or Missing

- Cooperative strategies to support common procedures are missing or do not include all agencies:
  - Information exchange between medical and education: Calendar? Daily schedule?
    - "I think we have five school calendars. We need one school calendar."
  - Workload and PD support:
    - "I have 86 kids that I am in charge of. There used to be six of us over here."
    - "Last year we had an assessment person for professional development and asked to have them again because they were very helpful. We were told we could not have that person again."

- Opportunities for joint strategizing and learning (across agencies - across levels)
  - "When Sandy Hook happened, we had no guidance as to how to deal with the students. We could have had some communication about how to deal with this. We are not trained to handle these things."
  - "We need some common planning time."
  - "It would be nice to have some time to coordinate with therapists in June."

Staff Needs

- Respect for Professional Knowledge: may not be a two way street
  - "My skills as a [xx] could have helped that student prepare emotionally for the upcoming event—if I'd known, I could have helped them prepare."
  - "It cuts both ways. It goes back to role definitions and back to respect in the workplace and to what is needed to do your job."
  - "We are treated like outsiders by medical staff."

- More formal opportunities for individuals and units to offer and receive feedback (double-loop learning)
  - "I wish for more meetings with classroom people."

- Dedicated time to get to know each other as human beings, apart from their job roles
  - "We need some days for renewal and interaction as people."
Suggestions:

- Several useful informal collaborative practices exist; can they be formalized, codified?
  - "[Cheryl and Jay] work closely together to figure out where communication needs to happen. So far it is mostly to put out fires. Need to make it official that we meet regularly."
  - "Therapists often serve in bridge roles, but it depends on the person. It is informal. We need to codify this as part of the role."

- Both “houses” need to be in order to support meaningful and effective collaborative interaction
  - Clarify roles at middle management level

- Establish Strategies to pass general information across units; some personnel suggested:
  - Implement a version of med-tech for educators; that is, a personal profile of each student in classrooms (to alert for allergies, conditions, etc. that anyone working with the student can access.
  - Re-establish all-staff meetings (in addition to cluster meetings)
  - Clarify paths of communication between units and school, between DPH senior staff and school.

Organizations Map
Symbolic Aspects:

Critical elements
- Unifying community events: Rituals and Ceremonies
- Evidence of Beliefs & Values

Observed Promising Practices
- Campus Celebrations (e.g., Christmas, graduation, Prom)
- Unique-ness: “This may be the only one of these types of institutions that does this”
- Sense of unity rooted in the name and tradition of the place
- Pride in what the youth do; work displayed in buildings.
- Culture of care: People are more important than procedures

Symbolic Aspects: Questions or Concerns
- Naming may cause artificial division: “This is a Hospital First” or “This is the Hospital School”
  - “We work in the same facility. Aren’t we all part of the same team?”
  - “The parents wanted more from your program—the education side of things.”
- Some rituals are noticeably missed by the school staff:
  - “We used to have bagel breakfasts once a month where the whole staff gathers for breakfast.”
  - “We used to have all-staff meetings once a month.”
- Lack of regular, periodic, inclusive events
  - “We could use the large auditorium with everyone there for Hospital-wide events.”
  - “We have lost our sense of community.”
Capacity Building: Recommendations

- Backward Mapping Exercise (Exit Upon Entry activity): Collaborative articulation of a Theory of Action with emphasis on action.

- Specify how Policies, Protocols, Procedures, AND Practices are related; Consider effects of these P’s:
  - Which create barriers?
  - Which supports student success?
  - What can be changed when it does not work?
  - In especially difficult situations, what legal supports are needed?
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Capacity Building Recommendations (con’t.)

- Streamline and clarify roles and codify agreements (MOU?) to support and empower middle management on both sides of the aisle. This may take legal and upper level department support.

- Establish regular meetings for sharing relevant plans and information when appropriate.

- Create and Embrace Rituals that emphasize that the hospital and school comprise ONE entity. Use opportunities to get to know each other as human beings, not just as workers...
  - Such as Breakfasts, Staff meetings, Holiday Celebrations, Prom Planning

- Standardize scheduling when possible; use a common calendar.

- Social Network Analysis: Systematic inquiry into the organizational maps and nodes of interaction.

Center for Ed Policy, SOE, UMass
Thank you!
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Introduction

Drawing on previous Special Education in Institutional Settings (SEIS) work with other state agencies (e.g., the Department of Mental Health), SEIS leaders began a conversation with the Department of Public Health (DPH). The goal of this effort was to develop a collaborative vision, as well as policies, and practices that will benefit Massachusetts Hospital School (MHS) patients/students in achieving high quality outcomes and addressing transition goals. An initial step has been to identify how SEIS and DPH can develop and enact an appropriate joint vision and goals for their working relationship at MHS, located in Canton, MA.

The Center for Education Policy (CEP) was contracted by CES-SEIS to gather information from stakeholders and staff to inform the following questions:

1) In what ways do personnel from both agencies already work together?
2) What needs for improved collaboration do personnel in both agencies identify?
3) What capacity building efforts would support personnel in actuating joint visions and goals?

Given our experience with the SEIS/DMH collaboration, CEP explored the perspectives of three levels of inter-agency collaboration: Policy Making, Middle Administration, and Ground Level/Service Delivery Employees. To inform future decision-making, we present key findings in the following areas:

• Baseline data regarding current state of collaboration
• Areas of strengths and concern within the collaborative effort
• Recommendations for avenues of joint vision development

Evaluation Activities

To investigate the above questions, the research team employed a compressed ethnographic approach, between December 2012 and April 2013. Key activities included:

• 22 interviews, encompassing 36 personnel across multiple agencies and departments, including Senior and Middle Level Leadership and Service Delivery Personnel;
- Attending 3 Leadership Team Meetings;
- Observing in 2 classrooms; spent time in classes and other school activities;
- Reviewing website and documents that were provided;
- Literature review.

Guiding questions for the interviews were:
1. With whom do you collaborate? Who do you work with and why? How would you describe this working relationship?
2. With whom do you need more contact/communication? What is your preferred mode of communication and does the current system fit it? What happens when communication breaks down (concrete examples)?
3. What support do you need in order to work more collaboratively? Are there policies or procedures that you think are needed? Is there specific information that you need in order to better perform your tasks?

All findings are drawn from the data. They are our interpretations of the words or actions of participants. The quotations we offer illustrate what we believe are representative of larger issues—not single occurrences or specific instances of issues.

**The Challenge**
MHS seeks to ensure that the vision of collaboration becomes a unified guide that is used to develop and implement integrative programs and collaborative practices. To facilitate collaboration, structures and channels need to be developed and supported to ensure that information, planning, and services are communicated and/or coordinated smoothly both horizontally and vertically between the Policy, Middle Administration, and Service Delivery levels and across all agencies involved.

**Key Findings**
All personnel share a common priority goal of serving the youth and “getting the job done” safely. For example, individuals are willing to perform tasks that are not in their job descriptions to help transport patient/students safely from one point to another. As a result, MHS currently works well to provide excellent service to their patient/students. However, the emergent policy of collaboration that aims to improve service delivery is not consistently evident in practice across the various agencies. Minimal or moderate collaboration means that service delivery is *satisficing—not maximizing*. Specific areas of concern include the following:

- **Policy:** A clear theory of action – with emphasis on action – is needed.
- **Structure:** Role clarity and transparency regarding decision-making authority at the middle management level is lacking in two key departments.
- **Symbolic:** Expressed need exists for MHS to feel as a single unit with one common goal: serving the needs of the youth.
Specific areas for collaboration that demonstrate no to minimal development at this time include the following:

- Formal channels of communication both within levels and between levels (current structures are parallel and hierarchical);
- Cooperative strategies (e.g., hand-off infrastructures for information sharing);
- Confusion regarding roles at the middle level (e.g., “I don’t know who to call at the school);
- Lack of transparency regarding lines of authority (e.g., redacting of names of who is in charge on schedules in nursing).

These areas of weakness reflect problems in both policy and procedures.

A tension between education and medical programs at MHS is highlighted in these varying quotations from interviews: “This is a hospital first, and it happens to have an education program in it” vs. “We are one building, one system working together to improve the service of the youth.” The tension illustrates the need for the articulated vision of collaboration to be communicated throughout the institution, across agencies and to the service delivery/ground level employees.

Meeting the Challenge at Mass Hospital School

To frame our findings, we have selected three broad categories from the organizational change literature that are apropos to collaboration at MHS: Policy and Leadership, Structure, and Symbolic Aspects. The following summarizes promising practices observed and areas for improvement are noted in each category.

**Policy & Leadership**

Policy and leadership applies directly to the upper level visioning process. No clear Theory of Action exists that translates policies into practice. Such an articulated *If . . . , then . . .* statement would assist organizational leaders to specify policies to be enacted jointly and to promulgate shared understanding of those policies. Finally, modeling of collaborative action and demonstrated commitment to interagency collaboration is not consistent among those who are responsible for policy and leadership decisions.

Promising Policy and Leadership Practices observed at MHS include:

- Regular DPH & SEIS Leadership Team Meetings
  - On-going brainstorming re: how to do things better at the school
- Periodic review of policies
  - e.g., HIPAA/FERPA waiver process underway
- Executive Staff Meetings, which include DPH staff and Cheryl Nicholson (twice monthly)
Open and easy communication channel between key leadership personnel: e.g. Jan Avallone and Brian Devin and Jay Jones and Cheryl Nicholson

**Key Problem**
The current Theory of Action, *Exit upon Entry*, needs further development. Currently, connections between goals and outcomes are undeveloped, the actions are unclear, and it is heard at policy level but not prevalent at ground level. One way to begin to develop a Theory of Action would be to complete this sentence:

- **If we want our patient/students to be able to commence successfully to the community, then we need to DO...**

Developing a *Theory of Action* is a backward mapping activity, or planning with end goal in sight. To this point, we provided a tool at the presentation that may be useful in developing a theory of action that is focused on activity and articulating program logic.

Other *questions or concerns* at the policy level include:

- Is “Need to Know” a policy or an action? This guideline is often interpreted as a way of privileging professional knowledge. How does one person decide what another needs in order to do their job effectively?

- Existing policies may cause structural barriers. An example is HIPAA and FERPA, a policy that the leadership is addressing. What other policies are in place that may interfere with collaboration?

- Are all levels and or agencies represented in policy discussions and review? For example, is the education program adequately represented in DPH-MHS decision-making or information meetings? Do DPH-MHS staff contribute to SEIS decision-making?

- Finally, where do the IEP and other contributions of the Educational Program fit in the vision? In many of the documents, education aspects are missing or not clearly identified.

**Structure**
Clearly articulated visions and clarified policies contribute to an effectively functioning organizational structure; that is, goals, roles, and coordinating mechanisms exist and are understood by all. In addition, an effective organizational structure meets the needs of those who must do the work of the organization (its human resources). Critical components of an effective collaborative structure include:

- Shared goals and definitions;
- Clarity of role definitions and authority;
- Infrastructural supports necessary to support human resources:
  - Job embedded collaborative strategies and tools
  - Transparent communication channels; shared language
  - Joint professional development
- Mutual respect for professional knowledge and actions.
Promising Practices at MHS include:

- Daily report generated and shared at 9am

- Teams or collaborations within units, for example:
  - Rounds,
  - Plan of Care Meetings,
  - Campus Satisfaction Team,
  - Classroom and Cluster Meetings,
  - Other groups forming.

- Daily shared priority goal: Getting the job done safely
  - E.g., Individuals are willing to take on a task not in their own job descriptions to help get patients/students safely to another point on campus

- “Bridge” roles navigate and negotiate between school and hospital
  - Therapists: “They pass info between the hospital and school”
  - Patient Advocate: “an Ombudsman, problem solver, communicator, role model”
  - Activities Director: “helps ‘normalize’ the day of the youth”

- Professional Development:
  - SMART trainings across all agencies (initiated and ongoing)

Currently, some of these practices (teams, daily report) appear to be used for within department collaboration; others demonstrate the potential for system-wide sharing.

**Key Problem**

**Confusion at Middle Management level.** This issue surfaced among multiple participants regarding two key services—education and nursing—along the following themes:

- Lack of role clarity and lines of authority
  - “I think there’s too many heads over there [school]—too many higher ups. Too big of a team, too many layers... I mean I don’t even really know who to call over there.”

- Lack of transparency regarding decision-making:
  - “Who is responsible for contacting whom?”
    - “I never know who I’ll be calling on the unit because that information is blacked out.”
  - Information comes through informal channels
    - “We found out from the students that we were having a snow day.”
    - “We got an email saying that the senior trip was changed to April vacation.”

Additional structural problems at MHS include:

- Communication channels are poor or missing - horizontally AND vertically.
  - “We have to go through lateral and vertical movement of communication up
the chain and back down again to receive simple answers."
- “Mid-level needs to build protocols and structures for communication.”
- “All-staff meetings used to happen once a month.”
- “We haven’t approached each other yet. We need to strengthen communication with these folks (teachers).”
- “All levels of communication need tightening.”

Personnel across units do not always share a common language.
- Are the youth “patients” or “students”? Many in all units refer to “kids” or “our kids”; e.g., nurses talking about how they feel like proud parents when they get all their ‘kids” off to school successfully.
- Acronyms (e.g., IEP; PoC): Are all personnel aware of what acronyms commonly used on each side of service delivery mean?
- Medical/Educational terminology

Cooperative strategies and tools are needed to support human resource needs.
- Mechanisms to facilitate common procedures are missing or do not include all agencies: information exchange between medical and education, calendar, daily schedule.
  - “I think we have five school calendars. We need one school calendar.”
- Workload and Professional development support:
  - “I have 86 kids that I am in charge of. There used to be six of us over here.”
  - “Last year we had an assessment person for professional development and asked to have them again because they were very helpful. We were told we could not have that person again.”
- Opportunities for joint strategizing and learning (across agencies and levels):
  - “When Sandy Hook happened, we had no guidance as to how to deal with the [youth]. We could have had some communication about how to deal with this. We are not trained to handle these things.”
  - “We need some common planning time.”
  - “It would be nice to have some time to coordinate with therapists in June.”

- Presently, respect for professional knowledge may not be mutual. For example, consider the following quotations:
  - “My skills as a [xx] could have helped that [youth] prepare emotionally for the upcoming event—if I’d known, I could have helped them prepare.”
  - “It cuts both ways. It goes back to role definitions and back to respect in the workplace and to what is needed to do your job.”
  - “We are treated like outsiders by medical staff.”

In general, staff expressed need for more dedicated time and formal opportunities for individuals and units to get to know each other as human beings, apart from their job roles, for the purpose of building mutual respect. Such opportunities could allow routine offering
and receiving of feedback that can lead to double-loop learning (a re-examination of underlying assumptions that drive policies and actions).

- “I wish for more meetings with classroom people.”
- “We need some days for renewal and interaction as people.”

**We offer the following suggestions** for improving collaborative structures at MHS:

- Several useful informal collaborative practices exist; can they be formalized or codified?
  - “We work closely together to figure out where communication needs to happen. So far it is mostly to put out fires. Need to make it official that we meet regularly.”
  - “Therapists often serve in bridge roles, but it depends on the person. It is informal. We need to codify this as part of the role.”

- Clarify roles at middle management level; for example: Who is the principal? Who in management is responsible to communicate with charge nurses? Both “houses” need to be in order to support meaningful and effective collaborative interaction.

- Establish strategies to pass general information across units; some personnel suggested the following:
  - Implement a version of medi-tech for educators; that is, a personal profile of each patient/student in classrooms (to alert for allergies, conditions, etc. that anyone working with the youth can access);
  - Re-establish all-staff meetings (in addition to cluster meetings);
  - Clarify paths of communication between units and school, between DPH senior staff and school.

Improving key structural supports at MHS will ensure that the collaborative vision developed at the policy and leadership level of the organization will result in meaningful improvement in programs and procedures at the service delivery level.

**Symbolic Aspects**
Symbolic aspects illustrate an organization’s culture and encompass its belief and value systems. Strong and positive symbols indicate a strong and positive culture. Symbols, which often take the shape of rituals and ceremonies or other visual displays of what is important to members of the organization, include events that create a sense of unity. We observe the following promising symbolic aspects present on the MHS campus:

- Campus celebrations are valued by staff in both agencies (e.g., Christmas, Graduation, Prom);
- Sense of unity rooted in the name and tradition of the place and its uniqueness: “This may be the only one of these types of institutions that does this”;
- Pride in what the youth do; patient/student is work displayed throughout buildings;
- Culture of care: People are more important than procedures.
Key Problem

“This is a Hospital First” or “This is the Hospital School” highlights the reality that for funding and accreditation purposes MHS is, indeed, a hospital first. The patient/students would not be there if it were not for the care they receive for very serious medical conditions. However, they are also enrolled in this institution because of the education program provided, as exemplified in this quote: “The parents wanted more from your program—the education side of things.” The emphasis on “Hospital first” may create a symbolic tension as some staff internalize that their role is perceived as secondary or less important than the medical or therapeutic services at the hospital.

Cited examples of the need for increased attention to symbolic supports for a collaborative culture include:

- Some rituals are noticeably missed by the staff:
  - “We used to have bagel breakfasts once a month where the whole staff gathers for breakfast.”
  - “We used to have all-staff meetings once a month.”
  - “I asked for a list of teachers celebrating milestones so we could recognize it at the holiday celebration—I didn’t get it so I wasn’t able to get that done for them.”

- Lack of regular, periodic, inclusive events:
  - “We could use the large auditorium with everyone there for hospital-wide events.”
  - “We have lost our sense of community.”

Recognizing, embracing, and improving symbolic aspects within the organization can be as essential to the implementation of a collaborative vision as effective policy and structure.

Summary

Many positive and effective practices are in place and provide opportunity to build a productive, coordinated model that is founded in the collaborative vision at Massachusetts Hospital School. Most important, the youth are cared for safely on a daily basis. However, some key opportunities for improvement exist. Among the most pressing needs in each category are:

- **Policy:** A need for clear theory of action with the emphasis on action.

- **Structure:** Lack of clarity or transparency regarding role and authority at the middle management level in two key departments.

- **Symbolic:** Expressed need to feel as if the hospital is one unit with one common goal—serving the needs of the youth.

Many of the other questions or concerns within the three areas are rooted in these three key problems. The next section offers recommendations for building capacity within these areas.
Capacity Building Recommendations

- **Backward Mapping Exercise**: Collaborative articulation of a Theory of Action with emphasis on action (see the handout activity sheets).

- Specify how Policies, Protocols, Procedures, AND Practices are related; Consider effects of these P’s:
  - Which create barriers?
  - Which support youth success?
  - What can be changed when a policy, procedure, or practice does not work?
  - In especially difficult situations, what legal supports (re: HIPPA; FERPA; union regulations) are needed?

- **Streamline and clarify roles and codify agreements** (for example, Memoranda of Understanding) to support and empower middle management on both sides of the aisle. This may take legal and upper level department support.

- **Establish regular meetings for sharing** relevant plans and information when appropriate.

- **Create and embrace ritual** that emphasize that the hospital and school comprise ONE entity. Use opportunities to get to know each other as human beings, not just as workers (such as community breakfasts, all-staff meetings, holiday celebrations, prom planning).

- **Standardize scheduling** when possible; use a common calendar.

- Consider conducting a Social Network Analysis (SNA): Systematic inquiry into the organizational maps and nodes of interaction. Social Network Analysis is grounded in the assumption that relationships between interacting units are important. Network models look for lasting patterns of relations among actors (individuals) within the interacting units. Thus, the focus of an SNA is not on an individual’s attributes but on investigating relations between individuals, groups, or social institutions. For example, an SNA could provide insight into the flow of communications within an organization at specified time intervals in order to understand possible effects of an intervention on the actors. Identifying networks can suggest possible areas for improvement.¹²

[CAUTION: SNA is a research procedure that has become trendy due to the emergence of some plug ‘n play software. However, to conduct and interpret a thorough and credible SNA, you will need more than the software – you will need a strong statistical background. Conducting SNA takes time and a lot of cooperation from all levels and all staff in order to carry out. Furthermore, if not conducted expertly, the results can be harmful to members of the network. Still, if done properly SNA can show an organization all aspects of the interactions taking place and can highlight gaps and successes.]

Exit Upon Entry
Theory of Action Activity
Massachusetts Hospital School
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Directions:
There are four components of the “Exit Upon Entry” process including:
• “Collaboration Goals” between DPH & SEIS
• “Plan of Action” that includes services and what you do for each student/patient
• “Goals for Youth” which are opportunities for student/patient to accomplish while at MHS
• “Commencement to Community” which is the outcome of a successful “Exit Upon Entry” process where the student/patient leaves MHS and transitions into the community at his or her maximum level of independence.

Using the “Exit Upon Entry” process in its entirety and in each component, think about:
• WHAT you are/will doing?
• WHO are/will be doing it?
• HOW are/will you be doing it?
• For the “Plan of Action,” “Goals for Youth,” and “Commencement to Community” components: Think about what “Collaboration Goals” are in use or need to be in use.
Exit Upon Entry

Massachusetts Hospital School

Plan of Care
- Community Opportunities
- Landing Plan
- Therapies
- Behavioral Health Supports
- Health Management

Collaboration Goals between DPH & SEIS
- Shared responsibility and accountability
- Team approach to identify strengths, challenges & opportunities
- Confirmed plans and support
- Sharing of information
- Shared expertise

Goals for Youth
- Health Management Skills
- Healthy and Safe Relationships
- Academic Skills
- Social Emotional Skills
- Vocational Skills

Commencement to Community
- Life Skills
- Essential Supports
- Community Connections & Resources

Exit Upon Entry Activity	
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PREZI
## Collaboration Goals between DPH & SEIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared responsibilities and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated planning and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team approach including youth, family, and school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLAN OF CARE

- Landing Plan
- Assessment and Progress Monitoring
- Services/Supports for Academic and Vocational Skill Development
- Therapies
- Health Supports
- Behavioral Health Supports
- Health Management
- Team Building/Communication
- Community Opportunities

Exit Upon Entry Activity
# Plan of Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Program Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services/Supports for Academic and Vocational Skill Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building/Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Goals for Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy and Safe Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Management Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Emotional Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commencement to Community

- Essential Supports
- Life Skills
- Community Connections & Resources

Youth: Maximum independence & active engagement in community settings
# Commencement to Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Community Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4

Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the County Houses of Correction

Supporting Teachers, Strengthening Educational Services

2008-2013

Collaborative for Educational Services
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COLLABORATIVE VISIONING AND PLANNING WITH THE COUNTY HOUSES OF CORRECTION

Purpose:

In the fall of 2012, the SEIS-CHC Advisory Group began to develop a joint proposal for the implementation of an integrated service delivery model in the County Houses of Correction (CHC). The Advisory Group included the DESE SEIS Director and Assistant Director, the CES SEIS Contract Administrator, and representative leaders from a subgroup of the CHC. The purpose of developing this model was to:

- ensure efficient identification of students eligible for special education services;
- enhance access to educational services; and
- improve collaboration between SEIS special educators and CHC general education staff.

As part of the process, it was agreed that the first step would be to establish a shared vision and understanding of what we intended to accomplish (See “Pilot Proposal for SEIS and CHC Integrated Service Delivery,” attached).

Activities:

- Monthly meetings in 2012-2013 with SEIS leadership and CHC Advisory Group Education Directors
- PowerPoint Presentation of “What is SEIS?” to CHC Education Directors
- Development of a shared collaborative vision
- Design and implementation of a pilot project using Independent Study software at Bristol CHC
- Development of Moodle and other shared technological resources to support the delivery of special and general education services
- Program level coordination of educational service delivery between SEIS Host Agency Coordinators and CHC education staff
Outcomes:

- Agreement on shared vision, collaborative principles, and a pilot proposal
- Availability of common instructional resources for shared use by SEIS and general educators
- Integration of special education services into writing and art projects
- Site-based collaboration between SEIS CHC Coordinator, the SEIS teacher and CHC education staff

Next steps:

- September 2013: Training will be conducted on integration of Common Core standards, to support college and career readiness (accomplished September 2013).
- October 2013: ISD Pilot Project teachers will refine their proposal, aligning with Common Core and curriculum standards. They will clarify roles of CHC and SEIS teacher in the project, and how to integrate specialized instruction, accommodations and modifications (accomplished October 2013).
- Common Core training materials and instructional resources will be provided for CHC teachers on Moodle (in process, to be accomplished by December 2013).
- Implement, review, and evaluate pilot activities (by February 2014).
- Continue to explore the potential of Integrated Service Delivery in CHCs, and provide training and resources to expand ISD opportunities and evaluate their effectiveness.
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Goal 3 | Section 4: Collaborative Visioning and Planning with the County Houses of Correction

1. CHC Integrated Service Delivery Proposal (2013)
Pilot Proposal for SEIS and CHC Integrated Service Delivery

Presented by
The Collaborative for Educational Services

To the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and CHC Advisory Group

March 2013
Introduction
The SEIS-CHC Advisory Group has been meeting since the fall of 2012 to develop a joint proposal for the implementation of an integrated service delivery model in the County Houses of Correction. As part of the process, it was agreed that the first step would be to establish a shared vision and understanding of what we intended to accomplish.

Vision
SEIS and the County Houses of Correction will work collaboratively to support the success of the youth they serve so that they may achieve the skills to become productive members of the community.

Core Values
Professional Collaboration
Respect for Diversity of Individual Needs and Differences
Student Centered and Strengths-Based
Successful Transition to the Community
Self-Determination and Self-Advocacy
Efficiency and Expediency
Quality Teaching and Learning

Essential Structures to Promote Collaboration
- Policies and procedures within each facility that facilitate and encourage consistent and complementary practice
- Staff expectations are designed to facilitate communication and effective working relationships between both agencies to support youth needs
- Shared professional development and training opportunities for SEIS and CHC educators

Pilot Goal
To develop a model for collaboration at the facility level for working together in support of improving academic, social-emotional and career outcomes for the special education students; and providing resource tools to CHC Educators.
**Pilot Activities**

- Develop a model that is transferable.
- Determine where the process needs refinement.
- Determine any barriers that may exist.
- Identify strategies: forms, processes, technical assistance, communication protocols.

**Time Lines**

- April-June 2013: pre-planning and model design
- September-October 2013: training
- November-January 2014: first phase of implementation
- Midterm review, assessment and evaluation

**Site Selection**

**Decision Criteria**

- Full time SEIS teacher
- Consistently more than 6 students
- Receptive program and educators

**Potential Sites for Consideration**

- Essex
- Hampden
- Plymouth
- Suffolk

**Pilot Evaluation**

**Potential Questions**

- Is the collaboration working?
- Are there process or practice issues to refine?
- What additional resources are needed?
- What barriers exist, and how can they be overcome?
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