Choosing A Theory of Action

THE BIG QUESTION

Incremental Improvements

- More Resources
  - Salaries
  - Facilities
  - Technology
- Effective Management
  - Programs
  - Outside Expertise
  - Command & Control

Fundamental Change

- Managed Instruction
- Performance Empowerment (Portfolio)

Managed Performance Empowerment (MPE)
Managed Performance Empowerment Theory of Action

• The District defines its relationship with each school on the basis of the school’s performance.

• High-performing and/or significantly improving schools are given considerable autonomy and freedom from bureaucratic operating constraints.

• Chronically low-performing schools that fail to improve are subject to District intervention and redesign. (Closure and replacement with higher-performing school models.)
What Do We Mean by Autonomy?

- Personnel Autonomy
- Budget Autonomy
- Programmatic Autonomy
- Operational Autonomy
- School Governance
What Do We Mean by Intervention and Redesign?

• Schools below the “proficient” level on Connecticut State Assessments are placed under the control of a District Intervention Team.

• Schools that do not improve for two consecutive years move to “Redesign” categories.

• Based on prior year’s data, Board of Education takes action to “close” schools in the Redesign category in September of the previous year. Design specifications are approved in December; New leadership starts in February; Staff selected by April; Training, retro-fitting and materials in Spring and Summer; August opening.
What Do We Mean by an “All Choice” System of Schools?

1. Board approval “framework” for development of Choice Schools.

2. Combination of Inter and Intra Choice Schools.

3. Parent Can choose any school according to simple, transparent preference criteria:
   a. ½ Mile Walk Radius
   b. Zone (4)
   c. Outside of Zone
4. All parents of students in “transition” grades must choose in March of the prior year. Parents may choose to change schools at non-transitional grades.

5. Once selected, registration and continued enrollment is conditioned on adherence to a School Compact that outlines specific commitments and requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>2008 TO 2009 RATE OF IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>Baseline Year New &amp; Redesigned Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving &gt;= +4.0</td>
<td>Maintaining +3.9 to -3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Range: OSI 70+</td>
<td>University High Dwight</td>
<td>Hartford Magnet Middle Classical Capital Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient: OSI 50 to 69</td>
<td>Parkville Kinsella Kennelly Wish Fisher Simpson-Waverly M.L. King</td>
<td>Sport &amp; Medical Sciences Webster Breakthrough Pathways Hooker Naylor Rawson West Middle Batchelder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Proficient: OSI Below 50</td>
<td>Clark Quirk Middle</td>
<td>Moylan Burr Sanchez McDonough Bellizzi Middle Betances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools not consisting of a grade that participates in the CMT or CAPT: Bulkeley Upper, HPHS Freshman Academy

New & Redesigned Schools 2009-2010
America's Choice at SAND
Breakthrough II
High School Inc.
Journalism & Media High School
Montessori
OPPortunity High School

Achievement First Hartford
Global Communications/IB

M.D. Fox CommPACT Bulkeley Lower HPHS-Law & Gov't HPHS-Nursing Burns Latino Studies HPHS-Engineering & Green Technology Milner Core Knowledge Culinary Arts

Autonomous

Intervention / Redesign
10 Common Criteria for New and Redesigned Schools

• New Leadership
• New Staff
• Precise design specification
• More instructional time
• Research-based methods and process
• Content or industry focus
• External Partner
• Uniforms and Rituals
• Autonomy for two years; 4% increase per year needed to maintain autonomy
• New School development costs funded by “Ingenuity Fund”
Elementary Schools

National “Proven” Models

Or

Value-added content or experiences

Secondary Schools

Rigor – College-Ready Curriculum

Relevance- Theme or Industry-Based Content

Courses and Capstone

Relationship- Small, independent high schools, approximately 400 students max; time and support as variables
A Portfolio of High-Performing, Distinctive Schools of Choice

7 Essential Elements

1. District Accountability Plan (Measures & Ratings)
2. Board of Education Redesign Policy
3. All-Choice Framework
4. Simple Choice Process / No Defaults
5. Money Follows the Child (Student-Based Budgeting)
6. “Charter-like” Autonomy
7. Central Office organized to support a system of schools rather than a school system
Highlights

• Student achievement significantly increased for the second year in a row.

• Lowest performing schools improved significantly.

• Six of seven achievement gap-closing performance targets were met.

• Every grade level went up in reading for the first time.

• A total of 28 of 42 schools made significant improvements. Thirteen of them raised their overall school index by more than 3 percent.

• Greatest gains on state assessments of any Connecticut City for second consecutive year.

• Eighteen (18) new schools opened.
“Every Organization if Perfectly Designed to Get the Results It is Getting.”

Peter Drucker
ConnCAN’s analysis of the 2007 and 2008 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) results reveals that Connecticut’s three largest districts-Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport- secured bigger gains in the percentage of students within goal range on the CMT than the statewide average, with Connecticut’s capital city leading the way.
Performance Gains on CMT for Five Largest School Districts
(2008 3rd grade to 2009 4th grade, 2008 4th grade to 2009 5th grade, etc.)

Average Change in % of Student Cohorts Meeting State Goals on CMT

- Hartford: 4.2
- New Haven: 3.8
- Stamford: 3.8
- Waterbury: 2.5
- Bridgeport: 2.4

Connecticut Average: 3.6
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