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# MEMORANDUM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **To:** | Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| **From:**  | Jeffrey C. Riley, Commissioner |
| **Date:**  | December 6, 2019 |
| **Subject:** | Quarter 2 Update on Chronically Underperforming Schools |

This month, I am presenting the second of four quarterly progress updates to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Board) on the four chronically underperforming schools and their implementation of their school turnaround plans. These updates are focused on activities from November and December 2019. As described in the first quarterly report[[1]](#footnote-1), the narrative for this progress update has been provided by the School Empowerment Network, based on classroom observations led by that group during that timeframe. The third quarterly update will be presented in March 2020 and a final annual review will come in June 2020.

Demographic and discipline data for each school, covering the last three school years, are included for your reference.

**Chronically Underperforming Schools**

In the fall of 2013, four schools were designated as chronically underperforming schools in response to their low performance and lack of improvement while in underperforming status: John P. Holland Elementary School (UP Academy Holland) and Paul A. Dever Elementary School (Dever) in Boston, Morgan Full Service Community School (Morgan) in Holyoke, and John Avery Parker Elementary School (Parker) in New Bedford.

**Paul A. Dever Elementary School, Boston, MA**

Narrative Prepared by School Empowerment Network[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Information** |  | **Student Enrollment and Demographics** |
|  |  |  |  | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **2019-2020[[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| **Location** | Boston | **Total enrollment** | 356 | 410 | 409 |
| **Current status** | Chronically underperforming | **Students with disabilities** | 14 percent | 13 percent | 13 percent |
| **Receiver name** | Michael Contompasis | **English learners** | 48 percent | 50 percent | 48 percent |
| **Year designated chronically underperforming** | 2013 | **Economically disadvantaged** | 81 percent | 76 percent | 80 percent |
| **Year designated underperforming** | 2010 | **African American students** | 25 percent | 26 percent | 27 percent |
| **Hispanic students** | 61 percent | 63 percent | 60 percent |
| **Grade span** | Pre-K-5 | **Asian students** | 6 percent | 4 percent | 4 percent |
| **Full-time teachers in SY 2018–2019** | 35 | **White students** | 5 percent | 5 percent | 6 percent |
| **Full-time teachers in SY 2018-2019** | 36 | **Multi-race, Non-Hispanic students** | 2 percent | 2 percent | 2 percent |
| **New teacher hires for SY 2019-2020** |  | **Student Discipline** |
| **Student Attendance** |  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Students disciplined** | 43 | 9 | 4 |
| **Attendance Rate** | 92 percent | 92 percent | 91 percent | **In-School suspension**  | 1 percent | 0 percent | - |
| **Chronically absent**  | 32 percent | 34 percent | 33 percent | **Out-of-School suspension**  | 9 percent | 2 percent | - |
| **Student Restraint** | **Expulsion** | 0 percent | 0 percent | - |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Removed to alternate setting**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | - |
| **Students restrained** | 18 | 9 | **-** | **Emergency removal**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | - |
| **Number of Restraints** | 29 | 16 | **-** |  |  |  |  |

**Demographic and Discipline Data**[[4]](#footnote-4)

**School Strength(s)**

## Areas of Strength # 1Positive Learning Environment

### Description:Paul A. Dever school leaders and teachers have prioritized building relationships with students. Family members report they appreciate that several different adults at the school know their children well. Students report that adults in the school treat them with respect and that they feel safe there. Students can name people who work in the school whom they feel they can go to if they have a problem. Most classrooms have “calm corners” to help students re-regulate, if needed. Most teachers have clear routines, procedures, and expectations for classroom behavior Most classes are safe, supportive learning spaces.

# Areas of Focus

## Area of Focus # 1

Pedagogy

### Description:Leaders articulate a few instructional expectations including following curricular frameworks, making content relevant and engaging, discourse, and use of academic language. Beyond these expectations, there is currently not a common, normed set of beliefs about how students learn best. Nor are there corresponding schoolwide practices and non-negotiables aligned to these beliefs. The instructional expectations school leaders identified are not consistently evident in classroom practice.

Area of Focus # 2
High Expectations

### Description:Paul A. Dever school leaders and teacher teams have not yet established expectations which are clear or precise enough to guide and facilitate action planning by teachers, students, or families to advance student achievement. Students could not identify goals they are working toward nor specific next steps they needed for improvement. Family members were not aware of expectations, short-term learning targets, criteria for success, or specific next steps their children must take to meet criteria or standards. Families expressed the need for clearer communication about learning targets and their children’s progress toward meeting those targets.

### In addition, while school leaders have formed an instructional leadership team (ILT) whose goal is to analyze data and set instructional priorities, the work of the ILT has not yet resulted in clear expectations for instructional practice across the school. School leaders have established key systems (regular ILT meetings, an observation-and-feedback cycle, regular teacher team collaboration, and consistent professional development time blocks) which could be driving high expectations for instruction across the school. They are not, however, using these systems in concert to communicate an expectation that a set of practices is to be used schoolwide, support teachers with implementing these practices, or hold teachers accountable for doing so.

## Area of Focus # 3

Assessment

### Description:School leaders have established common formative assessments at each grade level in English Language Arts (ELA) and math. ANet is used quarterly and complemented by the Measures of Academy Progress (MAP) assessment. All students have Fountas and Pinnell (F&P) reading levels and DIBELS scores measured against grade-level benchmarks at least twice yearly. School leaders are in the process of creating classroom-level trackers and plan for those to include F&P, DIBELS, and ANet data, as well as attendance and discipline data. Curriculum-based assessments (EngageNY and EL English) are also used. Teacher teams devote time every other week to looking at student work using Work Sort and Looking at Student Work (LASW) protocols. There is currently no evidence of impact of the LASW process on classroom practice. While a few teachers are independently engaging in effective classroom assessment and feedback practices, this practice is not yet common across the school. School leaders have not yet provided teachers with clear expectations for the use of checks for understanding (CFUs), rubrics, feedback, and/or student self-assessments against rubrics. In addition, school leaders have not set expectations for clear, consistent communication to students and families about individual student progress-to-learning targets. As a result, students and families are not able to consistently identify their short-term learning targets. Nor do students and families know how much progress they have made to targets or what strategies, skills, practice activities, and/or specific next steps will help them achieve those targets.

**UP Academy Holland, Boston, MA**

Narrative Prepared by School Empowerment Network[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Demographic and Discipline Data**[[6]](#footnote-6)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Information** |  | **Student Enrollment and Demographics** |
|  |  |  |  | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **2019-2020[[7]](#footnote-7)** |
| **Location** | Boston | **Total enrollment** | 762 | 771 | 758 |
| **Current status** | Chronically underperforming | **Students with disabilities** | 13 percent  | 14 percent | 13 percent |
| **Receiver name** | UP Education Network | **English learners** | 37 percent | 34 percent | 34 percent |
| **Year designated chronically underperforming** | 2013 | **Economically disadvantaged** | 75 percent | 73 percent | 78 percent |
| **Year designated underperforming** | 2010 | **African American students** | 45 percent | 46 percent | 49 percent |
| **Hispanic students** | 43 percent | 44 percent | 43 percent |
| **Grade span** | Pre-K-5 | **Asian students** | 7 percent | 5 percent | 3 percent |
| **Full-time teachers in SY 2018–2019** | 63 | **White students** | 2 percent | 2 percent | 1 percent |
| **Full-time teacher in SY 2018-2019** | 17 | **Multi-race, Non-Hispanic students** | 3 percent | 3 percent | 3 percent |
| **New teacher hires for SY 2019-2020** |  | **Student Discipline** |
| **Student Attendance** |  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Students disciplined** | 79 | 14 | 30 |
| **Attendance Rate** | 93 percent | 92 percent | 92 percent | **In-School suspension**  | 7 percent | 1 percent | 3 percent |
| **Chronically absent**  | 27 percent | 26 percent | 27 percent | **Out-of-School suspension**  | 6 percent | 1 percent | 1 percent |
| **Student Restraint** | **Expulsion** | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Removed to alternate setting**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
| **Students restrained[[8]](#footnote-8)** | 0 | 19 | 16 | **Emergency removal**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
| **Number of Restraints[[9]](#footnote-9)** | - | 42 | 58 |  |  |  |  |
| **Injuries[[10]](#footnote-10)** | - | - | 6 |  |  |  |  |

**School Strength(s)**

## Area of Strength # 1

Leveraging Resources

### Description:

UP Academy Holland school leaders have a process in place to use data to inform decisions about strategic planning and resource allocation. The strategic planning process begins in April, is open to all staff members, and is centered on school-wide data. School leaders recently hired three reading interventionists and a half-time English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher after analysis of reading level data and English Learner (EL) performance data demonstrated that more support for reading was needed. In addition, school leaders construct schedules which include daily intervention time. Teachers receive external training, along with curricular resources to support multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS). As a result, each classroom visited that was engaged in student intervention included effective, research-based instructional practices, such as phonics practice mats in 1st-grade intervention, and ELA intervention and nonsense word decoding in 3rd-grade intervention. School leaders have purchased new curricular materials, which include a guided reading library and materials to support the new EL curriculum used in early grades ELA. In addition, school leaders construct schedules for grades and individual teachers which protect daily, weekly, and monthly blocks of professional development (as well as collaboration time) for groups of teachers, including specialists, ESL teachers, and special education educators. School leaders utilize network-level resources as part of an intentional hiring process. That process includes surveys to screen candidates for alignment to equity work and school values. Moving forward, school leaders should work to maximize the utilization of classroom paraprofessionals, classroom aides and/or co-teachers across the school in order to both reduce adult-to-student ratio and support access for all students.

## Area of Strength # 2

Teacher Teams and Distributed Leadership

### Description:

All teachers at UP Academy Holland are engaged in structured, data-based, professional learning collaborations. Teachers meet daily in grade level teams to collaboratively prepare lessons using a protocol. School leaders have planned schedules so that ESL specialists and special education educators are able to attend meetings related to groups of students they support. Teachers also meet weekly for data-based collaboration. They analyze math data one week, ELA data next week, and guided-reading data in the last week of the cycle. Their analysis of data has resulted in adjustments to plans. In addition, teachers meet for regular “Lesson Launch” planning collaborations. The principal leads a weekly “State of UAH” meeting to review schoolwide goals, to update staff on progress to goals, and to set a focus for the week ahead. As a result, from classroom to classroom, students receive consistent content instruction and, across the school, students experience consistent classroom cultures.

In addition, leadership is distributed, with Deans of Curriculum and Instruction (DCIs), teacher coaches, and teacher content facilitators each owning the planning and facilitation of collaborative activities. Teachers report that school leaders model the growth mindset and the culture of giving and receiving feedback they espouse and that they actively seek feedback on both their own performances and on overall school performance, quickly acting on feedback. Feedback from staff to school leadership is both formal and informal. Formal systems for feedback and staff voice include staff surveys, individual goal-setting meetings with teachers, and an annual schoolwide strategic

planning process that kicks off in April, is open to all staff members, and is centered on schoolwide data to make strategic decisions on effectiveness of programs and resource allocation.

# Areas of Focus

## Area of Focus # 1

Pedagogy

### Description:

School leaders have identified curriculum for each grade and content area. Teachers are trained to teach toward "exemplar" instructional products and have their "exemplar in hand" during instruction. As a result, lessons are aligned to curriculum and standards in all classrooms. School leaders and teachers articulate a set of beliefs about how students learn best. They believe that all students have access to rigorous curriculum, that students do most of the thinking in lessons, that students engage in accountable talk, that students remain engaged throughout instruction, and that students learn with and from peers. School leaders and teachers cite the need for students to "think deeply and discuss" as an instructional priority with a focus on providing students with the right "thinking jobs" within each lesson. However, delivering lessons that adhere to the objectives and the sequence of learning activities dictated by the curriculum (while also incorporating instructional strategies, which provide access to curricula and rigorous tasks) is a challenge across most classrooms

## Area of Focus # 2

Curriculum

### Description:

For each grade level and content area, UP Academy Holland school leaders have selected a curriculum that aligns to standards. Curriculum varies by grade and content area, though it includes EL Education, Brooke Math, Success, Foundations, and Achievement First curricula. It is not yet clear how utilizing such a range of curricula will impact vertical alignment and student achievement over time. School leaders should monitor student progress from grade level to grade level to determine effectiveness of curricula used. Teachers are given time daily to collaboratively prepare lessons aligned to curriculum. School leaders have provided a lesson prep protocol and clear expectations for lesson preparation, Drop Everything and Prep (DEAP). School leaders report--and teachers agree--that teachers are making very few modifications to curriculum and that this is intentional. The modifications teachers make are decided on as a team during dedicated "Unit Launch" planning sessions or in grade-level DEAP meetings.

**Morgan Full Service Community School, Holyoke, MA**

Narrative Prepared by School Empowerment Network[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Demographic and Discipline data**[[12]](#footnote-12)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Information** |  | **Student Enrollment and Demographics** |
|  |  |  |  | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **2019-2020[[13]](#footnote-13)** |
| **Location** | Holyoke | **Total enrollment** | 416 | 306 | 362 |
| **Current status** | Chronically underperforming | **Students with disabilities** | 18 percent | 17 percent | 26 percent |
| **Receiver name** | Stephen Zrike  | **English learners** | 31 percent | 23 percent | 25 percent |
| **Year designated chronically underperforming** | 2013 | **Economically disadvantaged** | 93 percent | 93 percent | 91 percent |
| **Year designated underperforming** | 2010 | **African American students** | 4 percent | 5 percent | 4 percent |
| **Hispanic students** | 91 percent | 90 percent | 88 percent |
| **Grade span** | Pre-K-4 | **Asian students** | 1 percent | 1 percent | 1 percent |
| **Full-time teachers in SY 2018–2019** | 18 | **White students** | 2 percent | 3 percent | 4 percent |
| **Full-time teacher in SY 2018-2019** | 3 | **Multi-race, Non-Hispanic students** | 1 percent | 2 percent | 3 percent |
| **New teacher hires for SY 2019-2020** |  | **Student Discipline** |
| **Student Attendance** |  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Students disciplined** | 39 | 36 | 9 |
| **Attendance Rate** | 93 percent | 93 percent | 91 percent | **In-School suspension**  | 1 percent | 1 percent | 0 percent |
| **Chronically absent**  | 29 percent | 24 percent | 33 percent | **Out-of-School suspension**  | 8 percent | 7 percent | 2 percent |
| **Student Restraint** | **Expulsion** | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Removed to alternate setting**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
| **Students restrained[[14]](#footnote-14)** | - | - | **-** | **Emergency removal**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
| **Number of Restraints** | - | - | **-** |  |  |  |  |
| **Injuries[[15]](#footnote-15)** | - | - | **-** |  |  |  |  |

**School Strength(s)**

Area of Strength # 1

Positive Learning Environment

*Description:*Morgan Full Service Community School (Morgan) leaders have prioritized creating positive learning environments for both children and adults in the school community. Teachers are required to do 12 home visits over the course of the school year and they report that the visits they have completed so far have already had a positive impact on their relationships with students and families. A staff developer/consultant visits the school monthly to work with teachers on developing and implementing both routines and procedures to promote social-emotional learning. In an effort to reduce office discipline referrals, school leaders have provided teachers with professional development on teaching social skills and providing positive feedback. Morgan is piloting a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) system in a subset of classrooms and plans to scale it up later in the year. The classrooms visited were safe and supportive learning environments. Family members report that their children are both well-known and cared for by school staff and that the school principal is responsive to their feedback. In addition, school leaders have developed an "adult learning facilitation" structure for teacher support and coaching. While this structure has not yet resulted in an accountable culture of feedback and high expectations for all, teachers report feeling supported and believe that building positive adult relationships is an important first step toward developing a balance of accountability and support.

Area of Strength # 2

Leveraging Resources

*Description:*

The principal (with the support of the leadership team) has structured the daily schedule, as well as individual staff members' schedules, to support the school's instructional goals. For example, he has realigned the school schedule to include a block of uninterrupted time for core instruction every morning. As a result, teachers shared that they feel they can be more intentional in their lesson planning. Teachers have time built into their schedules each week for collaborative teamwork. A morning social skills block has also been incorporated into the daily schedule in response to student referral data. School leaders have invested in curricular resources including EngageNY, Making Meaning curricula, and Teaching Social Skills text to ensure that standards-aligned resources are available to teachers and to students. They have also invested in a staff developer to support leaders and teachers with building positive learning environments to better meet the social-emotional needs of students. In addition, school leaders are making use of resources supplied by the district (including professional development, after-school activities, and coaching) to support the school’s instructional goals and meet student needs.

**Areas of Focus**

Area of Focus # 1

Assessment

*Description:*

School leaders have established common school and grade-level assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math. In addition, the leadership team has created a calendar and protocol for analyzing data from those assessments in collaboration with teacher teams. This work has yet to be fully implemented, thus its impact remains to be seen. In addition, there is no evidence of consistent, daily assessment for learning practices. School leaders have not yet provided teachers with clear expectations for the use of checks for understanding, rubrics, feedback, and/or student self-assessment against rubrics. Similarly, they have not yet set expectations for clear, consistent communication to students and families about individual progress toward learning targets.

Area of Focus #2Pedagogy

*Description:*In most Morgan classrooms, objectives are aligned to grade-level content standards. Many teachers' lesson plans include a similar structure that meets the expectations of the leadership team and includes a purpose statement, lesson launch, whole group instruction, and small group or independent work time. However, staff members could not clearly articulate the school's beliefs about "how students learn best" nor communicate school leaders' expectations for teaching practices aligned to those beliefs. It was observed that, as a result, there is a high degree of variation in teaching practices across classrooms visited and high-quality instructional tasks were not evident across classrooms. This lack of coherent instructional practices, rigorous instructional tasks, intentional groupings, and structures for access led to numerous missed opportunities to cognitively engage students in meaningful discussion and work.

Area of Focus #3

High Expectations

*Description:*School leaders and teacher teams have not yet established expectations to advance student achievement that are clear or precise enough to guide and facilitate action planning by teachers, students, or families. Students cannot articulate goals they are working toward or specific next steps needed for improvement. Family members expressed frustration that they are not clear on expectations, short-term learning targets, criteria for success, or the specific next steps their children must take to meet criteria or standards.

**John Avery Parker Elementary School, New Bedford, MA**

Narrative Prepared by School Empowerment Network[[16]](#footnote-16)

**Demographic and Discipline data**[[17]](#footnote-17)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School Information** |  | **Student Enrollment and Demographics** |
|  |  |  |  | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **2019-2020[[18]](#footnote-18)** |
| **Location** | New Bedford | **Total enrollment** | 285 | 248 | 223 |
| **Current status** | Chronically underperforming | **Students with disabilities** | 14 percent | 14 percent | 14 percent |
| **Receiver name** | School & Main Institute | **English learners** | 32 percent | 34 percent | 31 percent |
| **Year designated chronically underperforming** | 2013 | **Economically disadvantaged** | 72 percent | 72 percent | 75 percent |
| **Year designated underperforming** | 2010 | **African American students** | 16 percent | 17 percent | 16 percent |
| **Hispanic students** | 35 percent | 35 percent | 36 percent |
| **Grade span** | Pre-K-5 | **Asian students** | 1 percent | 0 percent | 1 percent |
| **Full-time teachers in SY 2018–2019** | 22 | **White students** | 39 percent | 39 percent | 38 percent |
| **Full-time teacher in SY 2018-2019** | 6 | **Multi-race, Non-Hispanic students** | 8 percent | 9 percent | 8 percent |
| **New teacher hires for SY 2019-2020** |  | **Student Discipline** |
| **Student Attendance** |  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Students disciplined** | 26 | 27 | 17 |
| **Attendance Rate** | 94 percent | 94 percent | 94 percent | **In-School suspension**  | 1 percent | 0 percent | 3 percent |
| **Chronically absent**  | 15 percent | 18 percent | 15 percent | **Out-of-School suspension**  | 8 percent | 9 percent | 4 percent |
| **Student Restraint** | **Expulsion** | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
|  | **2016-2017** | **2017-2018** | **2018-2019** | **Removed to alternate setting**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 0 percent |
| **Students restrained[[19]](#footnote-19)** | - | 0 | 0 | **Emergency removal**  | 0 percent | 0 percent | 2 percent |
| **Number of Restraints** | - | - | **-** |  |  |  |  |
| **Injuries[[20]](#footnote-20)** | - | - | **-** |  |  |  |  |

**School Strength(s)**

Area of Strength # 1Positive Learning Environment

*Description:*

John Avery Parker (Parker) school leaders’ approach to culture building is rooted in articulated beliefs about how students learn best and is informed by theories of social-emotional learning, child development, and trauma. They believe Parker students have the "will" to learn and learn best when teachers and school leaders help them develop the "skill" to self-regulate, so that they maintain an alert learning state and "access their executive functioning." As a result, all classrooms were safe, supportive, and conducive to student learning. Teachers also engaged students in clear and predictable routines outside of classrooms. Professional development is in place to support staff members in internalizing core principles (such as the idea that “Punishments and consequences don’t change behavior. Skill-building does.”) and implementing practices aligned to those principles. School leaders have established a social-emotional learning leadership team. At the start of the year, all staff participated in professional development activities on culturally-responsive and trauma-informed teaching, as well as growth mindset. The majority of community members can now speak to and are embodying the desired culture.

## Area of Strength # 2

Leveraging Resources

### Description:

School leaders make strategic decisions that are aligned to the schoolwide instructional goals and in support of meeting student needs. Working within turnaround plan guidelines, school leaders have arranged the master schedule to provide teachers with blocks of dedicated collaboration and co-planning time during the school day. In addition, they have arranged individual teacher schedules to ensure that all grade team members (including special educators and instructors who support English Learners (ELs)) are able to meet together weekly. Practices that were planned, taught, and rehearsed in professional development are evident in many classrooms.

**Areas of Focus**

Area of Focus # 1

Assessment

### Description:All Parker students take common assessments in a six-week cycle and interim assessments aligned to Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. Teacher teams analyze the results of these assessments and school leaders use the data to program students for intervention. However, assessment for learning--in the form of rubrics, shared definitions of quality work, criteria-aligned feedback to students, and frequent, intentional checking for understanding during lessons--is not yet being utilized to guide daily instruction, to provide students with actionable feedback, to inform instructional and curricular decision making, nor to drive student achievement. Students and parents were not able to articulate specific learning targets students are working on nor concrete strategies and next steps related to standards or curriculum.

**Definitions**

**Attendance rate:** Attendance rate indicates the average percentage of days in attendance for students enrolled in grades PK-12.

**Chronically absent (10 percent or more):** The percentage of students who were absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. For example: A student who enrolled in a school for 50 days and missed five days, the student is counted as absent 10 percent or more that school year.

**Restraint:** Direct physical contact that prevents or significantly restricts a student's freedom of movement.

**In-School suspension rate:** The percentage of enrolled students in grades 1-SP who received one or more in-school suspensions.

**Out-of-School suspension rate:** The percentage of enrolled students in grades 1-SP who received one or more out-of-school suspensions.

**Removed to an alternate setting:** Alternative settings can include home tutoring, in-district alternative program, alternative program in another district, private alternative setting, or work/community service setting.

**Emergency removal:** The removal of a student from school temporarily when a student is charged with a disciplinary offense and the continued presence of the student poses a danger to persons or property, or materially and substantially disrupts the order of the school, and, in the principal's judgment, there is no alternative available to alleviate the danger or disruption.

1. The first quarterly report for FY2020 can be found here: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/bese/docs/fy2020/2019-10/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Please see this link for the full School Quality Review rubric: [https://tinyurl.com/wye5a4k](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__tinyurl.com_wye5a4k&d=DwMGaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=DP1vwXujPQjotTxXrobc41Py5Tn_XIgyHWy2ANeCNgk&m=pt8TIxxZfJdTqVOreXNxPebzVFI7qWGGRcQan-eAmnI&s=RJbR9Tthrh0wsRLaC03BkLm6yZ6utnS2TPKAAJIGCEw&e=) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Data as of October 1, 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See page 13 for definitions [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Please see this link for the full School Quality Review rubric: [https://tinyurl.com/wye5a4k](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__tinyurl.com_wye5a4k&d=DwMGaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=DP1vwXujPQjotTxXrobc41Py5Tn_XIgyHWy2ANeCNgk&m=pt8TIxxZfJdTqVOreXNxPebzVFI7qWGGRcQan-eAmnI&s=RJbR9Tthrh0wsRLaC03BkLm6yZ6utnS2TPKAAJIGCEw&e=) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See page 13 for definitions [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Data as of October 1, 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Suppressed when fewer than 6 students are restrained [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. UP Academy Holland experienced technical issues with reporting data in SY2017, and the school documented 132 restraints, 31 students restrained, and 2 injuries. Due to technical issues, those data elements were not included in Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s reporting for SY2017. Those issues were resolved in time for the SY2018 reporting. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Suppressed when the number of injuries to staff or students is between 1-5 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Please see this link for the full School Quality Review rubric: [https://tinyurl.com/wye5a4k](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__tinyurl.com_wye5a4k&d=DwMGaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=DP1vwXujPQjotTxXrobc41Py5Tn_XIgyHWy2ANeCNgk&m=pt8TIxxZfJdTqVOreXNxPebzVFI7qWGGRcQan-eAmnI&s=RJbR9Tthrh0wsRLaC03BkLm6yZ6utnS2TPKAAJIGCEw&e=) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See page 13 for definitions [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Data as of October 1, 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Suppressed when fewer than 6 students are restrained [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Suppressed when the number of injuries to staff or students is between 1-5 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Please see this link for the full School Quality Review rubric: [https://tinyurl.com/wye5a4k](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__tinyurl.com_wye5a4k&d=DwMGaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=DP1vwXujPQjotTxXrobc41Py5Tn_XIgyHWy2ANeCNgk&m=pt8TIxxZfJdTqVOreXNxPebzVFI7qWGGRcQan-eAmnI&s=RJbR9Tthrh0wsRLaC03BkLm6yZ6utnS2TPKAAJIGCEw&e=) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See page 13 for definitions [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Data as of October 1, 2019 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Suppressed when fewer than 6 students are restrained [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Suppressed when the number of injuries to staff or students is between 1-5 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)