

Three-Year Exit Criteria for Schools Placed in Level 4: Guidance and Methodology

Measurable Annual Goals

In accordance with the regulations governing district and school accountability and assistance (603 CMR 2.00), the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) has established the following academic exit criteria¹ for Level 4 schools:

- 1) Increase the Composite Performance Index (CPI) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics in the aggregate and for all high-needs students² over a three-year period.
 - a) Level 4 elementary and middle schools shall increase the CPI comparable to the improvement that the top 30 percent of improving schools made statewide between 2006 and 2009.
 - b) Level 4 high schools shall increase the CPI comparable to the improvement that the top 40 percent of improving schools made statewide between 2006 and 2009.
- 2) Decrease the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on standard MCAS tests in ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for all high-needs students over a three-year period.
 - a) Level 4 elementary and middle schools shall decrease the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on standard MCAS tests comparable to the improvement that the top 30 percent of improving schools made statewide between 2006 and 2009.
 - b) Level 4 high schools shall decrease the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on standard MCAS tests comparable to the improvement that the top 40 percent of improving schools made statewide between 2006 and 2009.
- 3) Achieve and maintain a median student growth percentile (SGP) of 40 or higher in ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for all high-needs students within three years; and
- 4) By the end of the three-year period for which Level 4 high schools have set measurable annual goals, such schools shall meet the Commonwealth's graduation rate target for that year for all student groups required under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

¹The regulations also propose "a measure of postsecondary success, once ESE identifies one that is sufficiently reliable, valid, and timely" as an exit criterion. ESE has not yet determined such a measure.

²A high-needs student is defined as a student belonging to one or more of the following groups: special education, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, limited English proficient (LEP), and students who, according to district SIMS reports from the past two years (going back to October 2006), have progressed to a point where they can perform ordinary classroom work in English ("formerly LEP").

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is a “Level 4” school? How were they identified?

A Level 4 school is an “underperforming” school and is both low performing on MCAS over a four year period (in both ELA and mathematics) and not showing signs of substantial improvement over that time. “Level 4” refers to the placement of those schools in the Commonwealth’s Framework for District Accountability and Assistance.

A school is eligible for placement in Level 4 if it scored in the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide, taking into account multiple measures of school performance, including: MCAS performance, CPI, the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on MCAS, growth, graduation and dropout rates, and other indicators. Additionally, schools designated by the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education as chronically underperforming prior to 2010 are also eligible for placement in Level 4. A total of 35 schools were placed in Level 4 in 2010 based on these criteria.

More information about Level 4 Schools can be found at:

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/framework/level4/>

2. Why were CPI, MCAS, growth, and graduation rates selected as academic exit criteria for Level 4 schools?

State and federal regulations require multiple measures for gauging the performance and improvement of the Commonwealth’s lowest performing schools, including progress in areas of academic underperformance, and progress among historically disadvantaged student groups.

CPI, MCAS, and growth measure school performance on different dimensions: the CPI rewards improvement from one MCAS performance level to the next, with a particular emphasis on all students reaching grade-level proficiency; declines in MCAS failure rates indicate the extent to which a school is supporting its neediest students; growth, a norm-referenced measure, shows how much groups of students in the school grew from one year to the next as compared to students and schools with similar MCAS performance histories; and the high school graduation rate is an important indicator of the degree to which the school is preparing its students for college and beyond. Taken as a whole, progress on these measures is compelling evidence that students have had equitable access to high quality learning opportunities and are being sufficiently prepared for school and post-secondary success.

For details on how the CPI is calculated, refer to the *School Leader’s Guide to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Reports* at www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2009/default.html.

For details on the development of MCAS tests, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/tech/>.

For information on the growth model, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/>.

3. Are these schools expected to show progress on additional indicators in order to exit Level 4 status?

Yes. Level 4 schools are expected to show progress in implementing the conditions for school effectiveness as described in state regulations, and the local school district must also demonstrate that it has the capacity to continue making progress in sustaining school performance.

4. What student groups in Level 4 schools are required to meet the goals?

Each Level 4 school is required to meet three-year goals with respect to CPI, MCAS, and growth for the school's overall population ("the aggregate") and for the school's high-needs students, defined as any student receiving special education services, any student eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, or any student with limited English proficiency (LEP). Goals are calculated in the aggregate if there are at least 20 students, and goals are calculated for high-needs students if the group consists of 40 students or more.

Each Level 4 high school is also required to meet a three-year goal with respect to graduation rates. Goals are calculated for groups of 6 or more students belonging to the following groups: students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, economically disadvantaged students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch), and African American/Black, Hispanic, Asian, White, and Native American students.

For details on how graduation rates are calculated, refer to the *School Leader's Guide to the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress Reports* at www.doe.mass.edu/sda/ayp/2009/default.html.

For information on the graduation rate standard adopted by the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, refer to the December 15, 2009 Board Minutes at www.doe.mass.edu/boe/minutes/09/1215reg.doc.

5. Why aren't the goals for CPI, MCAS, and growth set for specific racial and ethnic groups?

ESE's analyses determined that a high-needs student is more likely to score below proficient on MCAS tests than a non-White student. When a school is making progress with respect to its high-needs students, it benefits all students who are most likely to be below proficient, regardless of race or ethnicity.

The academic progress of a school's high-needs students is a key indicator of the extent to which the school has addressed achievement gaps among different groups of historically disadvantaged students and between high-needs students and all students statewide.

For high school graduation rates, goals are set for all groups required under NCLB, including racial and ethnic groups.

6. How were the goals set for Level 4 schools?

ESE used a statistical analysis technique called linear regression to predict how much a Level 4 school with a given starting point should improve over three years based on the actual improvement of schools statewide in the prior three years. Unlike those schools, however, the performance of Level 4 schools remained flat or declined. Level 4 schools are therefore required to reach goals that have been attained by other schools.

Because the model uses an equation that accounts for the improvement made by hundreds of aggregate and high-needs groups, ESE can set goals for student groups at every performance level with a degree of precision that is not possible using other approaches, even though they may be simpler to understand.

7. In setting goals for Level 4 schools, how many schools statewide were they compared against?

The goals for Level 4 elementary and middle schools are based on the improvement that the aggregate and/or high-needs groups in hundreds of schools statewide made between 2006 and 2009 at the 70th percentile, and the goals for Level 4 high schools are based on

comparison schools at the 60th percentile. In other words, if a school's aggregate or high-needs group were among the top 30 or 40 percent, respectively, of all improving groups statewide between 2006 and 2009, those schools were included in the comparison.

8. Why does each Level 4 school have separate goals for ELA and mathematics? Why not set an absolute goal, such as requiring all Level 4 schools to have a certain percentage of all students scoring Proficient by 2012?

Level 4 schools are required to reach goals that have been attained by other schools, because they were based on the improvement that schools serving groups of students with comparable starting points as the Level 4 schools made in ELA and mathematics, respectively, over three years. Moreover, only the most improved schools were included in the comparison group; as such, the goals Level 4 schools are expected to reach are not just attainable, but ambitious as well.

9. Why were just improving schools included in the comparison group for Level 4 schools? Why not base the improvement that Level 4 schools need to make on all schools in the state?

Level 4 schools are being compared to schools that improved in the past because the expectation is that given increased resources, flexibility, and accountability, Level 4 schools will make gains as much as schools that improved in the absence of those supports.

10. In developing the list of comparison schools, why weren't the Level 4 elementary schools compared to just elementary schools in the comparison group, Level 4 middle schools to other middle schools, and Level 4 high schools to other high schools?

ESE decided against indexing the performance of Level 4 elementary, middle, and high schools to "non-Level 4" elementary, middle, and high schools for three reasons: First, although ESE will often classify schools as elementary, middle, or high for various reporting purposes, there is in fact an enormous diversity of grade configurations, making it difficult to determine what the "cut-off" should be in terms of grades served. Second, because there are fewer high schools in the Commonwealth than other types of schools, the chance for measurement error in setting targets for the Level 4 high schools is increased if they are only being compared to other high schools. Also, because the Commonwealth's high schools tended to be higher performing than other types of schools between 2006 and 2009, there would be very few similarly low performing high schools to serve as a comparison group for the Level 4 high schools, which increases the likelihood of measurement error. Third, including as many aggregate and high-needs groups as possible in the regression model increases the validity of the model because the model is based upon the improvement made by hundreds of groups ELA and mathematics.

11. Are these goals ambitious?

Yes. ESE defines ambitious to mean that Level 4 schools are expected to improve, at a minimum, as much as the top 30 or 40 percent of improving schools, depending on whether they are elementary/middle or high schools.

Level 4 schools are not expected to improve as much as the "average" school; in fact, the standards are higher—Level 4 schools are compared against only those schools statewide that showed improvement over the last three years, not all Massachusetts schools.

Level 4 schools were designated because their performance either declined and/or

remained unacceptably low over the past four years—at a time when many other schools did improve. A Level 4 school that meets its three-year goals will still have work to do. However, in meeting these goals, it helps signify that the district and the school have made demonstrable steps providing a high quality education for all students, particularly its neediest students.

12. Are these goals attainable?

Yes. These goals have been achieved by other schools, many of which serve similar student populations. Specifically, 31 elementary/middle schools and 6 high schools met all of the Level 4 exit criteria between 2006 and 2009; of those, 26 of the elementary schools and 2 of the high schools are located in the Commonwealth’s urban districts. For a list of the 37 schools that met all of the Level 4 exit criteria, please refer to the table entitled, “List of 2006 Schools Meeting Level 4 Exit Criteria in 2009.”

13. Why are the CPI and MCAS goals for Level 4 elementary/middle schools compared against the top 30 percent of improving schools and the goals for Level 4 high schools compared against the top 40 percent of improving schools?

All of the high schools that meet the goals at the 70th percentile or higher were vocational-technical schools. ESE selected the 60th percentile as the criterion for the Level 4 high schools because these goals were met by “traditional” high schools as well. Moreover, unlike the Level 4 elementary and middle schools, Level 4 high schools must also make AYP for the graduation rate standard for all reportable groups under NCLB by the third year.

14. What is the timeline by which Level 4 school will be expected to improve?

Level 4 schools are expected to improve over a three year period. As such, each Level 4 school is assigned a three-year target and interim annual targets. These interim targets will help ESE, educators, and the public to determine whether the school is on track toward meeting their three-year goals and to make adjustments, as needed, if performance in an intermediate year falls below expectations³.

15. Students in Level 4 schools will have already taken the spring 2010 MCAS by the time these goals take effect. Moreover, some of these schools have yet to implement interventions. How will the 2010 performance of these schools affect the goal?

In some cases, local school districts have already taken steps to improve teaching and learning in Level 4 schools. If such a school showed improvement in 2010, then the district may count that improvement toward achieving the school’s three-year goal by the year 2012. If a Level 4 school performed lower in 2010 than in 2009, then the goal may be extended to the year 2013 to allow its reforms to take effect.

16. Why is growth included as an exit criterion for Level 4 schools?

Unlike annual MCAS scores and the CPI figures used in AYP determinations, which compare the performance and improvement of students belonging to separate cohorts, growth measures the extent to which students in a school, grade, or group perform from one year

³ Please note that while the final three-year targets are calculated precisely using the methodology set forth below, interim annual targets are determined by dividing the targets into three annual increments and are rounded to the nearest tenth.

to the next with respect to students with the same or similar “score histories” (scores in previous years). Also unlike MCAS scores and CPI, the Commonwealth’s growth model measures student growth everywhere on the MCAS performance scale, from top to bottom. All schools have the opportunity to show growth, regardless of their students’ academic background or current level of performance.

Although Massachusetts has only two years of growth data, the model used by the Commonwealth is six years old and was devised by teachers’ unions and other stakeholder groups to put all teachers, schools, and districts on the same footing regardless of the students they serve. Regardless of what student walks in the door in September, a school has an equal chance to help a student reach the 1st or the 99th percentile—this would not be the case with CPI, MCAS, or any other current measure of academic performance.

17. How is the growth model, which is norm-referenced, compatible for use with MCAS, a criterion-referenced test?

Because growth scores compare the MCAS scores from one year to another at the student level, it is completely compatible with MCAS, a criterion referenced test, because growth accounts for the fact that MCAS has different criteria at different grades. Assuming the MCAS score for a given student is valid, then the change in MCAS scores at the student level is also valid.

18. With respect to the growth criterion, Level 4 schools are expected to achieve and maintain “only” moderate growth (a median SGP of 40 or higher) each year. Why is that?

Level 4 schools are expected to demonstrate improved performance on a range of metrics, including growth. A school that is meeting its performance expectations with respect to the CPI and MCAS measures that is also demonstrating moderate growth is one that is performing—and improving—at least as well as the typical Massachusetts school, if not more.

19. Will goals be reassigned to a Level 4 school if the school splits, merges with another school, or otherwise undergoes changes to student enrollment or grade configuration?

Yes. If a Level 4 school is reconfigured, to the extent feasible ESE will use existing data to establish baseline performance against which the goals can be measured. For example, if a school serving students in grades 3-8 in 2010 serves students only in grades 3-5 in 2011, ESE will recreate the school’s 2010 baseline performance data to reflect the new grade configuration and thus measure improvement by comparing 2011 grade 3-5 data against 2010 grade 3-5 performance data.

20. Where can I find more information on the Framework for District Accountability and Assistance?

Please visit ESE’s website at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/framework/default.html>.

NOTE: The following questions and answers were compiled in October 2010 in response to questions raised by local school districts charged with completing turnaround plans for their Level 4 schools:

21. In what circumstances might a Level 4 school choose to set 2011-12 (instead of 2012-13) as its ending year for achieving the measurable annual goals in its state turnaround plan?

This should only be done for a Level 4 school in which significant steps had already been implemented during the 2009-10 school year to improve teaching and learning. In such an instance, the district may count the results in 2009-2010 as the first year of three for reaching the Level 4 exit criteria three-year targets by the end of the 2011-12 school year.

Setting a turnaround plan expiration date for the end of the 2011-12 school year would allow the potential for an early exit from Level 4 status, as long as the school and district also made sufficient progress in implementing the conditions for school effectiveness, including effective district systems for school support and intervention. Conversely, this would also create the potential for a school to enter Level 5 status early at the same time if measurable annual goals and insufficient progress was made in implementing the conditions for school effectiveness.

22. Do the Level 4 exit criteria MCAS targets change depending on the ending year of the turnaround plan?

No. For this round of turnaround plans, the final target that must be met in the last year of the turnaround plan will remain the same regardless of which ending year is chosen. These targets are now pre-populated within the *Measurable Annual Goals Template for Submission* once an ending year is selected.

23. If a Level 4 school is receiving federal School Redesign Grant funds, how would exiting from Level 4 status affect the continuation of this funding?

In the case of a school that exits Level 4 status because the school and district have successfully met its measurable annual goals and implement the conditions for school effectiveness, School Redesign Grant funds would continue to flow until the end of the original award period, even if the end date of the grant extends past the date on which the school is removed from Level 4.

In the case of a school that does not make sufficient progress and is placed in Level 5 status, a federal School Redesign Grant award then in effect would not be renewed, and remaining awarded grants funds would be used directly by the external receiver appointed by ESE to implement a Level 5 turnaround plan.

24. Where can we find updated data for the 2009-10 school year?

All spring 2010 MCAS-related data have been provided within a revised *Measurable Annual Goals Baseline Data Tool* and are pre-populated within the *Measurable Annual Goals Template for Submission*. Other rates (e.g., student attendance, dropout, graduation rate) have not yet been calculated or are dependent on the Oct. 1, 2010 SIMS data submission.

25. If we choose to use 2012-13 as our ending year, how do we set targets for future years if 2009-10 data for all rates is not yet available?

ESE cannot provide updated 2009-10 rates for many measures (e.g., student attendance, dropout, graduation rate) until later this school year, since we are dependent on districts to submit this data before it can be analyzed. Districts should refer to the data that they maintain locally (and which are ultimately submitted to ESE) or refer to prior year trends made available in the baseline data tool in order to set future year annual targets.

26. Does a Level 4 school have to use all of the measures recommended by ESE in the Measurable Annual Goal Template for Submission?

The district must have measures for all thirteen areas specified in state law. Only the Level 4 student achievement exit criteria (MCAS measures and graduation rates) are required. The remaining measures are simply recommendations. The district can define its own measures, as long as it ensures that it has covered the thirteen areas specified in state law.

For example, the **truancy rate** is suggested as one way to measure progress on improving student attendance. However, some districts do not report accurate data related to truancy. The development of measurable annual goals is an opportunity for districts to refine their data collection methods for key indicators. Alternatively, it may be more useful for such districts to use other key metrics (e.g., chronic absenteeism) for which they do have better data.

27. What about “dismissal rates”?

The suggested dismissal rate measure is based on data that many districts already submit to the Department of Public Health (DPH) as part of the Essential School Health Services Program (in which all districts with Level 4 schools participate). It should be possible for districts to calculate a school-level dismissal rate based on the data submitted to DPH. However, if your district is having difficulty calculating this data, please contact ESE for assistance. Please note that turnaround plan approval will not be withheld if this rate is not included during the first year.

28. My district does not have all of the baseline data necessary to inform the setting of measurable annual goals in certain areas, but may have more data gathered and analyzed this fall. Will we be able to make adjustments to our measurable annual goals after our state turnaround plan is submitted?

Districts and schools can make adjustments to their measurable annual goals until the deadline for the January round of School Redesign Grants. After this point, the targets must be set and changes will not be permitted, except for metrics which are dependent on further guidance from ESE as noted within the *Measurable Annual Goals Template for Submission*. Progress against these set targets will be monitored throughout the duration of the turnaround plans.

29. What about the suggested measures in the Measurable Annual Goals Template for Submission that indicate “TBD by ESE”?

ESE will provide additional information about these suggested measures as it becomes available and assist schools in making adjustments to their finalized Measurable Annual Goals as appropriate.

30. Can I set “change” goals instead of an “absolute” goal?

Yes. Goals may be set to reflect an increase or decrease of a certain amount or percentage from a baseline, though this baseline must be established by the deadline described in question 27 above.

31. If my district/school chooses to set measurable annual goals for the Level 4 exit criteria MCAS measures that are higher than the targets specified by ESE, will we be penalized for not reaching these higher targets?

No. When ESE makes determinations regarding exiting from Level 4, a school that meets the minimum targets set by ESE but does not meet its own higher targets will not be penalized. Districts and schools may choose to set higher targets to motivate their faculty and students, and are strongly encouraged to do so.

Detailed Methodology for Establishing CPI and MCAS Goals

Step 1: Create a “high-needs” student group for each Massachusetts school

1. In the 2006 and 2009 student-level Megafiles, ESE identified students belonging to one or more of the following groups: special education, eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch, and limited English proficient (LEP).⁴
2. ESE created a “high-needs” group for each school with 40 or more students belonging to the above categories who were enrolled in the school for the full academic year in 2006 or 2009 and who were assessed on standard MCAS tests.

Step 2: Calculate the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing and a CPI for each school’s aggregate and high-needs group

3. At the school level, ESE calculated the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing in 2006 and 2009 on standard MCAS tests for each school’s aggregate and high-needs group. ESE performed this calculation separately for ELA and mathematics, and excluded the scores of students taking the MCAS Alternate Assessment. ESE performed this analysis for all schools in the Commonwealth, including Level 4 schools.
4. ESE calculated the CPI for each school’s aggregate and high-needs group. ESE performed this calculation separately for ELA and mathematics, and included the CPI points generated by students taking the MCAS Alternate Assessment. ESE performed this analysis for all schools in the Commonwealth, including Level 4 schools.

Step 3: Generate a list of comparison schools

5. ESE generated a list of schools meeting the following criteria: The school had to be open from 2006 to 2009; carry the same school code from 2006 to 2009; receive an AYP determination for at least one subject from 2006 to 2009; and not be an Early Childhood Center (ECC) in 2009.
6. ESE merged in the aggregated data from Step 2 above. Each school had two lines of data: aggregate and high-needs.
7. ESE removed four schools that were reconfigured in 2006 or 2009 [Cobbet Elementary (01630035), Station Avenue Elementary (06450025), Benjamin Banneker Charter School (04200205), and Media and Technology Charter School (04690505)].
8. ESE filtered out schools that did not assess at least 20 students in the aggregate and filtered out any high-needs group with less than 40 students assessed.
9. ESE calculated the change in the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on MCAS for the aggregate and high-needs groups and the change in CPI from 2006 to 2009.

Step 4: Calculate Measurable Annual Goals for CPI

10. Using the list of comparison schools generated in Step 3, ESE identified aggregate and

⁴ In addition to LEP students, the LEP group includes students who, according to district SIMS reports from the past two years (going back to October 2006), have progressed to a point where they can perform ordinary classroom work in English (“formerly LEP”).

high-needs groups in those schools that showed improvement in the CPI between 2006 and 2009.

11. Among all of the groups that improved between 2006 and 2009, ESE identified only those groups whose improvement placed them at the 60th percentile or higher (for high schools) and at the 70th percentile or higher (for elementary/middle schools).
12. ESE used a linear regression model where the independent variable was each group's 2006 CPI and the dependent variable was the 2006 to 2009 CPI change figure.⁵

ESE used the regression equations generated from the 60th and 70th percentile analyses to calculate the three-year CPI achievement goal for Level 4 high schools and elementary/middle schools, respectively. This calculation was performed separately for ELA and mathematics.

Step 5: Calculate Measurable Annual Goals for MCAS

13. Using the list of comparison schools generated in Step 3, ESE identified aggregate and high-needs groups in those schools that decreased the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing between 2006 and 2009.
14. Among all of the groups that decreased the percentage of scoring Warning/Failing between 2006 and 2009, ESE identified only those groups whose percentage point decrease placed them at the 60th percentile or higher (for high schools) and at the 70th percentile or higher (for elementary/middle schools).
15. ESE used a linear regression model where the independent variable was each group's 2006 percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing and the dependent variable was the 2006 to 2009 change in percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing.

ESE used the regression equations generated from the 60th and 70th percentile analyses to calculate the three-year MCAS goal for Level 4 high schools and elementary/middle schools, respectively. This calculation was performed separately for ELA and mathematics.

⁵Regression analysis generates a line that establishes a relationship between a dependent variable and an independent variable. A straight line is drawn through the set of points in such a way that makes the sum of squared residuals of the model (the vertical distances between the points of the data set and the fitted line) as small as possible. The resulting equation for the slope of the line allows one to calculate the observed amount of improvement for any given unit of performance.

In this case, ESE wanted to understand the relationship between a school's performance in 2006 and the change in performance between 2006 and 2009. Because ESE selected for the sample only those student groups that improved between 2006 and 2009, for every unit of performance P , there is a corresponding and positive unit of improvement I . It can also be deduced that, most of the time, schools with lower performance in 2006 tended to improve more between 2006 and 2009 than schools with comparatively higher performance in 2006.

List of 2006 Schools Meeting Level 4 Exit Criteria in 2009

<i>District</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Type¹</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>2009 ELA SGP²</i>	<i>2009 Math SGP</i>	<i>06-09 ELA CPI Percentile³</i>	<i>06-09 Math CPI Percentile</i>	<i>06-09 ELA MCAS W/F Percentile⁴</i>	<i>06-09 Math MCAS W/F Percentile</i>
Agawam	Clifford M Granger	ESMS	All Students	58.5	58	73	94	82	77
			High-Needs	62	51	93	98	98	98
Atlantis Charter	Atlantis Charter School	ESMS	All Students	56	60	85	87	84	82
			High-Needs	57	56	89	85	80	88
Boston	Clarence R Edwards Middle	ESMS	All Students	70	67.5	97	99	97	98
			High-Needs	70	68	97	99	97	98
Boston	David A Ellis	ESMS	All Students	59	77	92	96	96	97
			High-Needs	56.5	76	92	97	95	97
Boston	Eliot Elementary	ESMS	All Students	70	64	100	96	100	95
			High-Needs	69.5	68.5	100	94	100	93
Boston	Fenway High	HS	All Students	45	69	95	88	62	74
			High-Needs	42.5	65	99	96	77	89
Boston	John Winthrop	ESMS	All Students	54	56	90	71	96	87
			High-Needs	52.5	56.5	93	80	97	89
Boston	Lilla G. Frederick Middle	ESMS	All Students	48	54	79	80	89	95
			High-Needs	49	54	78	76	90	92
Boston	Thomas Gardner	ESMS	All Students	48	49	81	86	85	73
			High-Needs	48	50.5	79	86	81	71
Brockton	South Junior High	ESMS	All Students	63	46	97	93	94	92
			High-Needs	63	46	98	95	96	94
Chelsea	Clark Avenue	ESMS	All Students	46	43	90	96	90	97
			High-Needs	46	43	93	96	92	97
Chicopee	Bowie	ESMS	All Students	44	54.5	81	87	86	85
			High-Needs	45	55	87	90	97	91
Chicopee	Selser	ESMS	All Students	50	55	84	97	72	95
			High-Needs	48	58	89	98	83	98
Fall River	Edmond P Talbot Middle	ESMS	All Students	50	47	89	75	84	74
			High-Needs	49.5	45	92	71	86	73

Three-Year Measurable Annual Goals for Schools Placed in Level 4

<i>District</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Type¹</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>2009 ELA SGP²</i>	<i>2009 Math SGP</i>	<i>06-09 ELA CPI Percentile³</i>	<i>06-09 Math CPI Percentile</i>	<i>06-09 ELA MCAS W/F Percentile⁴</i>	<i>06-09 Math MCAS W/F Percentile</i>
Fall River	North End Elementary	ESMS	All Students	61	64	86	90	88	80
			High-Needs	48	59	84	79	90	73
Greater Lowell Voc Tec	Gr Lowell Reg Voc Tech	HS	All Students	44	47	92	92	76	86
			High-Needs	47	51	91	94	79	93
Holyoke Community Charter	Holyoke Community Charter	ESMS	All Students	55	62.5	99	100	100	100
			High-Needs	54	64	99	100	100	100
Lawrence	Emily G Wetherbee	ESMS	All Students	52	45	90	95	93	98
			High-Needs	52	45	92	96	95	98
Lawrence	John K Tarbox	ESMS	All Students	56	51	93	84	96	91
			High-Needs	61.5	54	93	87	97	91
Lawrence	South Lawrence East Elem.	ESMS	All Students	65	76	81	96	95	92
			High-Needs	64	76	81	96	96	93
Lowell	Dr An Wang School	ESMS	All Students	63	72	75	92	75	90
			High-Needs	61.5	72	75	90	81	87
Lowell	Kathryn P. Stoklosa Middle	ESMS	All Students	53	68	93	98	95	98
			High-Needs	52	68	92	98	95	97
Lowell	Moody Elem	ESMS	All Students	81	81	96	93	98	86
			High-Needs	82	77	98	94	98	89
Pittsfield	John T Reid Middle	ESMS	All Students	51	63	84	96	84	96
			High-Needs	52	67	94	97	95	99
Randolph	Randolph High	HS	All Students	64	57	70	63	65	67
			High-Needs	66.5	55	87	65	89	74
Revere	Beachmont Elementary	ESMS	All Students	61	83	97	99	97	92
			High-Needs	61	83	99	100	99	97
So Middlesex Voc Tech Reg	Joseph P Keefe Tech	HS	All Students	43	55	84	93	75	81
			High-Needs	42	53	87	93	78	87
South Shore Charter	South Shore Charter	ESMS	All Students	70	66	72	83	72	83
			High-Needs	54.5	62.5	81	77	84	91
Southeastern Reg Voc Tech	Southeastern Reg Voc Tech	HS	All Students	51	55	99	92	87	87
			High-Needs	51.5	54	99	96	92	95

Three-Year Measurable Annual Goals for Schools Placed in Level 4

<i>District</i>	<i>School</i>	<i>Type¹</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>2009 ELA SGP²</i>	<i>2009 Math SGP</i>	<i>06-09 ELA CPI Percentile³</i>	<i>06-09 Math CPI Percentile</i>	<i>06-09 ELA MCAS W/F Percentile⁴</i>	<i>06-09 Math MCAS W/F Percentile</i>
Springfield	Daniel Brunton	ESMS	All Students	54	57	85	93	96	94
Springfield	Daniel Brunton	ESMS	High-Needs	58	57	87	92	98	97
Springfield	Kensington Avenue	ESMS	All Students	54.5	47	93	97	87	99
Springfield	Kensington Avenue	ESMS	High-Needs	56	50	94	96	87	99
Waltham	Douglas MacArthur Elem.	ESMS	All Students	64.5	58	76	97	82	93
Waltham	Douglas MacArthur Elem.	ESMS	High-Needs	61	47	98	100	99	100
Worcester	Belmont Street Community	ESMS	All Students	58	53	76	94	97	95
Worcester	Belmont Street Community	ESMS	High-Needs	61	56	80	93	98	94
Worcester	Burncoat Middle School	ESMS	All Students	53	43	95	85	94	82
Worcester	Burncoat Middle School	ESMS	High-Needs	53	41	98	86	98	88
Worcester	Forest Grove Middle	ESMS	All Students	60	57	84	82	79	73
Worcester	Forest Grove Middle	ESMS	High-Needs	58	56	93	85	91	80
Worcester	Worcester East Middle	ESMS	All Students	68	56	96	75	95	81
Worcester	Worcester East Middle	ESMS	High-Needs	68.5	56.5	98	72	97	82
Worcester	Worcester Voc	HS	All Students	64	62	100	98	94	87
Worcester	Worcester Voc	HS	High-Needs	63	58.5	100	98	96	92

Notes on List of 2006 Schools Meeting Level 4 Exit Criteria in 2009:

¹ **School Type:** High schools had to meet the state's 2009 graduation rate standard required under NCLB for all reportable student groups.

² **SGP:** All schools had to achieve a 2009 median student growth percentile (SGP) of 40 or higher in both ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for high needs students.

³ **CPI Percentile:** Elementary and middle schools had to increase the CPI in ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for high needs students at the 70th percentile or higher between 2006 and 2009; high schools had to increase the CPI at the 60th percentile or higher.

⁴ **MCAS Percentile:** Elementary and middle schools had to decrease the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing on standard MCAS tests in ELA and mathematics in the aggregate and for high needs students at the 70th percentile or higher between 2006 and 2009; high schools had to decrease the percentage of students scoring Warning/Failing at the 60th percentile or higher.