



December 5, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE:

Cambridge Public Schools District Plan Framework Outcomes 2017-2020

Recommendation: That the School Committee approve the Cambridge Public Schools District Plan Framework Outcomes 2017-2020

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Salim", is written over the printed name.

Kenneth N. Salim, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools



CPS STRATEGIC PLAN OUTCOMES DASHBOARD

FALL 2017



This dashboard was prepared to report on the key outcomes established in the district's three-year strategic plan. By implementing this plan for all students – providing the tailored instruction and supports each student needs to achieve academically and meet their individual goals – we will accomplish the following outcomes for all students and each subgroup.

CPS Strategic Objectives: *Provide Equity and Access to Increase Opportunity and Achievement • Provide Engaging Learning for Struggling Students and Staff to Strengthen Instruction for All Types of Learners • Support the Whole Child as an Individual • Expand and Strengthen Family Partnerships and Community Partnerships • Improve Implementation and Progress Monitoring*

OUTCOME 1	Grade 3 Literacy¹: By fall 2020, increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on grade 3 ELA MCAS to 62% overall.
Related Strategic Initiatives	• 3.2 Develop and expand effective inclusive practices in all classrooms through professional learning. • 3.4 Continue to develop multi-tiered systems of support for academic and social-emotional learning, such as Response to Intervention. • 5.2 Conduct grade-span reviews based on defined criteria and act on recommendations, beginning with the elementary and upper school spans.

Percentage of Students Proficient/Advanced on Grade 3 ELA ²	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016 ³	2017 ⁴	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students: CPS	64%	58%	65%	66%	65%	54%	62%
All Students: State	61%	57%	58%	60%	n/a	47%	
African-American/Black Students	42%	34%	44%	48%	55%	37%	47%
Asian Students	61%	70%	74%	77%	64%	58%	65%
Hispanic/Latino Students	--	39%	52%	43%	49%	23%	36%
White Students	84%	81%	79%	77%	79%	72%	77%
Students with Disabilities	27%	26%	26%	27%	30%	18%	32%
English Language Learner (ELL) Students	--	20%	33%	32%	36%	16%	30%
Economically Disadvantaged Students ⁵	50%	37%	46%	45%	49%	32%	43%

¹ MCAS growth data are not available for Grade 3, as it is the first year students participate in MCAS.

² Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

³ Students in grades 3-8 in CPS participated in PARCC in ELA and math in spring 2016. This percentage reflects the percent of students scoring in Levels 4 & 5, which approximates with the MCAS categories of Advanced & Proficient. Further, since a subset of schools in the state participated in the PARCC, state performance data were not released.

⁴ Next Generation MCAS proficiency levels for grades 3-8 in ELA and math are Exceeding & Meeting Expectations for spring 2017 MCAS data and beyond.

⁵ Economically Disadvantaged changed from Low Income in 2015. The current methodology is calculated based on a student's participation in one or more of the following state-administered programs: the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); the Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children (TAFDC); the Department of Children and Families' (DCF) foster care program; and MassHealth (Medicaid).

Target Setting Rationale: Spring 2017 is serving as the new baseline for MCAS, which means that results cannot be compared to prior MCAS data. We relied on the state's [ESSA plan](#)⁶ to inform our thinking about MCAS target setting. The state's ESSA plan sets out to reduce proficiency gaps by one-third over six years, so the district's target will be based on this methodology.

Next Generation MCAS, or MCAS 2.0, that students participated in last spring was designed to be a more rigorous test with higher proficiency standards to provide a clear signal of readiness for the next grade level or college and career. It is also designed to be administered on the computer (in all grades by spring 2019.) Next Generation MCAS focuses on students' critical thinking abilities, application of knowledge, and ability to make connections between reading and writing. New performance levels were determined and new baselines were established for school and district performance.

Outcome Monitoring: In addition to the ongoing formative assessments in which teachers are engaged, FAST reading screeners will be used to monitor students' reading profile and progress on discrete reading skills throughout the year. At the end of the year, the Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) reading assessment will be used to assess overall reading proficiency, including independent reading levels and whether students are reading on grade level. Writing assessments will also be administered to students in the fall and winter to assess students' skills overall and in specific areas of writing. All of this data are used in the Response to Intervention (RTI) process to plan for interventions and enrichment at the individual, small group and whole class levels.

OUTCOME 2	Grade 8 Math: By fall 2020, increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations to 52% overall and have high growth for certain student subgroups.
Related Strategic Initiatives	• 3.2 Develop and expand effective inclusive practices in all classrooms through professional learning. • 3.4 Continue to develop multi-tiered systems of support for academic and social-emotional learning, such as Response to Intervention.

Percentage of Students ⁷ Proficient/Advanced on Grade 8 Math ⁸	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students: CPS	50%	58%	46%	55%	48%		42%	52%
All Students: State	52%	54%	52%	60%	n/a		48%	
African-American/Black Students	33%	36%	28%	32%	23%		10%	25%
Asian Students	72%	81%	74%	71%	77%		60%	67%
Hispanic/Latino Students	--	40%	32%	39%	28%		29%	41%
White Students	66%	74%	61%	75%	66%		70%	75%
Students with Disabilities	15%	11%	11%	12%	13%		15%	29%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	35%	34%	30%	44%	22%		16%	30%

⁶ See page 125.

⁷ ELL students do not appear as a subgroup for grade 8 math because their numbers are too small for reporting.

⁸ Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

Median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for Grade 8 Math ⁹	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2017 MCAS GROWTH BAND	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students: CPS	60.0	58.0	55.0	50.0	52.0	39.0	Low	<i>Moderate/Expected</i>
All Students: State	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	n/a	50.0	Moderate/Expected	
African-American/Black Students	61.0	45.0	42.0	39.0	47.0	33.0	Low	<i>High</i>
Asian Students	64.0	74.0	69.5	57.0	60.0	48.0	Moderate/Expected	
Hispanic/Latino Students	n/a	57.5	57.0	47.0	54.0	37.0	Low	<i>High</i>
White Students	60.0	69.0	60.0	60.0	54.0	43.0	Moderate/Expected	
Students with Disabilities	42.0	41.0	37.0	34.0	47.0	39.5	Low	<i>High</i>
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59.0	49.5	46.5	47.0	43.0	31.5	Low	<i>High</i>

Target Setting Rationale: Spring 2017 is serving as the new baseline for MCAS, which means that results cannot be compared to prior MCAS data. We relied on the state's [ESSA plan](#)¹⁰ to inform our thinking about MCAS target setting. The state's ESSA plan sets out to reduce proficiency gaps by one-third over six years, so the district's target will be based on this methodology.

Next Generation MCAS, or MCAS 2.0, that students participated in last spring was designed to be a more rigorous test with higher proficiency standards to provide a clear signal of readiness for the next grade level or college and career. It is also designed to be administered on the computer (in all grades by spring 2019.) Next Generation MCAS focuses on students' critical thinking abilities, application of knowledge, and ability to make connections between reading and writing. New performance levels were determined and new baselines were established for school and district performance.

DESE has stated that SGP differences of 10 points or more are likely educationally meaningful; because of this, DESE emphasizes the use of SGP performance bands: very low growth (1-19), low growth (20-39), moderate/expected growth (40-59), high growth (60-79), and very high growth (80-99). Therefore, target setting should be focused on bands rather than absolute numbers.

Outcome Monitoring: In addition to the ongoing formative assessments in which teachers are engaged, students will be assessed on classroom-level standards-based end-of-unit assessments, as well as two standards-based interim assessments in the early winter and early spring. All of this data are used to plan for interventions and enrichment at the individual, small group and whole class levels.

⁹ Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

¹⁰ See page 125.

5

OUTCOME 3	Advanced Placement (AP) and Honors Enrollment: <i>By fall 2020, increase the percentage of grade 10-12 students enrolled in at least one AP and/or honors course to 66%, increase the number of students taking AP exams to 450 students, and increase the percentage of students receiving a score of 3 or higher on AP exams to 87%.</i>
Related Strategic Initiatives	• 1.1 Create a district-wide system for setting goals with students that support their postsecondary success and aspirations. Connect students to supports within and outside of school, and reflect on and monitor progress with students, teachers, families, and partners. • 1.5 Provide all students with access to challenging curriculum and technology, such as the Grade 9 Level Up and CRLS 1:1 programs. • 2.2 Expand rigorous, joyful, culturally responsive learning experiences across the district.

Percentage of Grade 10-12 Students Enrolled in at least 1 Honors and/or AP Courses	2017	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students: CPS	56%	66%
African-American/Black Students	52%	
Asian Students	57%	
Hispanic/Latino Students	53%	
White Students	60%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	
Students with Disabilities	48%	

Number of Students Taking AP Exams ¹¹	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	CHANGE: 2012 - 2016	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students	177	228	270	311	352	+175 students	450
African-American/Black Students	16	18	16	31	38	+22 students	
Asian Students	32	51	57	50	61	+29 students	
Hispanic/Latino Students	n/a	15	23	23	24	+9 students	
White Students	111	139	164	197	216	+105 students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	n/a	43	45	28	38	-5 students	

Percentage of Students with AP Score of 3-5 ¹²	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE: 2012 - 2016	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
All Students: CPS	81%	83%	84%	87%	83%	+2 pts.	87%
All Students: State	70%	69%	68%	66%	67%	-3 pts.	
African-American/Black Students	83%	81%	57%	78%	54%	-29 pts.	
Asian Students	80%	75%	78%	75%	74%	-6 pts.	
Hispanic/Latino Students	n/a	88%	70%	87%	77%	-11 pts.	
White Students	84%	87%	90%	91%	90%	+3 pts.	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	74%	64%	73%	57%	-15pts.	

¹¹ Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education.

¹² Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

Target Setting Rationale: The target set for the number of students taking AP exams was established based on historical patterns. To achieve these targets, special attention will be paid to the AP/Honors pathways and preparation of traditionally under-represented subgroups.

Outcome Monitoring: Disaggregated course enrollment data will be tracked and shared annually to ensure CPS is meeting this goal.

OUTCOME 4	Percentage of Teachers of Color: <i>By fall 2020, increase the percentage of teachers of color by 7 percentage points to 30%.</i>
Related Strategic Initiatives	1.2 Embed ongoing cultural proficiency professional learning for all CPS educators. 1.3 Implement the Dynamic Diversity program to recruit, hire, and retain a CPS workforce that reflects the diversity of Cambridge.

Percentage of Teachers of Color	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE: 2012 - 2017	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
% Teachers of Color: CPS ¹³	19%	19%	19%	20%	20%	23%	+4pts.	30%
% Staff ¹⁴ of Color: State ¹⁵	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	8%	+1 pt.	

Target Setting Rationale: This target was previously set by the School Committee.

Outcome Monitoring: CPS staff will collect and monitor disaggregated hiring and retention data and will review this data annually.

OUTCOME 5	School Climate Survey: <i>By fall 2020, improve student, staff, family perceptions on engagement, instruction and community support.</i>
Related Strategic Initiatives	1.2 Embed ongoing cultural proficiency professional learning for all CPS educators. 3.1 Implement a PK-12 social, emotional, and behavioral learning framework and vision. 3.2 Develop and expand effective inclusive practices in all classrooms through professional learning. 4.1 Engage families as partners with a formal, ongoing feedback mechanism that creates differentiated opportunities for family voice and engagement.

Target Setting Rationale: CPS is currently in the procurement process to identify a new survey provider to ensure we have an instrument that reflects our needs and a survey strategy that yields acceptable response rates. We hope to have a new partner in this work by winter 2017/18. Therefore, we currently do not have an adequate baseline on which to identify a target.

Outcome Monitoring: This is currently an annual measure at the district level and no plans are in place to collect this data more frequently, though individual schools often deploy surveys for more formative purposes.

¹³ Data Source: CPS Human Resources.

¹⁴ This level of data was only available at the general "staff" level for the state, rather than at the teacher level.

¹⁵ Data Source: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education

OUTCOME 6	Students' Meaningful Connections with Adults: <i>By fall 2020, increase students' meaningful connections with adults by six percentage points as measured by the Teen and Middle School Health Surveys.</i>
Related Strategic Initiatives	• 3.1 Implement a PK-12 social, emotional, and behavioral learning framework and vision. • 3.3 Improve student engagement by strengthening student experiences in all classrooms, improving existing programs, exploring mentorship programs, and providing relationship building professional learning.

Percentage of Students Reporting "having at least one teacher or other adult at school that they can talk to if they have a problem." ¹⁶	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016	PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE: 2008 - 2016	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
% of Students: High School	63.7%	63.2%	64.4%	66.4%	67.8%	+ 4.1 pts.	73.8%
Male Students	63.7%	67.4%	63.3%	64.4%	66.6%	+2.9 pts.	
Female Students	63.8%	60.0%	65.8%	68.7%	69.3%	+ 5.5 pts.	
African-American/Black students	62.3%	59.9%	58.6%	61.0%	61.9%	- 0.4 pts.	
White Students	67.4%	66.0%	69.7%	73.4%	75.3%	+7.9 pts.	
Hispanic/Latino Students	63.1%	63.4%	66.7%	65.2%	68.2%	+5.1 pts.	
Asian/Pacific Islander Students	72.2%	70.9%	60.0%	61.0%	62.2%	-10.0 pts.	
Bi-Racial, Mixed or Multi-Racial Students	60.0%	58.9%	65.6%	64.6%	68.2%	+8.2 pts.	
Percentage of Students Reporting "having at least one teacher or other adult at school that they can talk to if they have a problem." ^{17,18}	2007	2009	2011	2013	2015	PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE: 2007 - 2015	2019 ¹⁹ 3-YEAR TARGET
% of Students: Middle School	60.5%	57.1%	64.4%	62.0%	58.7%	-1.8 pts.	64.7%
Male Students	61.4%	58.1%	64.0%	62.3%	61.4%	0.0 pts.	
Female Students	59.8%	56.2%	65.0%	61.8%	56.5%	-3.3 pts.	
African-American/Black Students	54.6%	49.2%	64.5%	59.8%	58.5%	+3.9 pts.	
White Students	63.8%	64.1%	66.7%	62.0%	55.9%	-7.9 pts.	
Hispanic/Latino Students	62.8%	71.8%	67.3%	68.8%	72.1%	+9.3 pts.	
Asian/Pacific Islander Students	56.7%	48.8%	61.5%	60.0%	46.4%	-10.3 pts.	
Bi-Racial, Mixed or Multi-Racial Students	63.5%	58.4%	56.6%	69.2%	63.2%	-0.3 pts.	

Target Setting Rationale: According to our survey partner, Social Science Research & Evaluation, Inc. (SSRE), natural variation in the data averages about 1-3 percentage points. Deliberate strategies intended to target this outcome should yield a change in the order of four percentage points or more over time. In looking at our historical trends and national norms, the above targets were recommended by SSRE. In consultation with School Committee, these targets were increased to reflect a six percentage point gain over the time periods above. These data are collected every other year in middle schools and in CRLS, so you will see different target dates for each data point above.

Outcome Monitoring: The annual school climate survey will likely have questions related to this measure that can be tracked annually and compared to a national norm.

¹⁶ Data Source: Cambridge Teen Health Survey. The survey is administered in alternating years in the middle school and high school; therefore, data can only be reported every other year.

¹⁷ Data Source: Cambridge Teen Health Survey. The survey is administered in alternating years in the middle school and high school; therefore, data can only be reported every other year.

¹⁸ Some racial/ethnic group names may be different than for other data sources, due to how the data were collected.

¹⁹ This survey is not administered in 2020, so 2019 will be used since this is when the survey will be administered.

OUTCOME 7	Chronic Absenteeism: <i>By fall 2020, decrease chronic absenteeism by 3.2 percentage points to 14.0%.</i>
Related Strategic Initiatives	• 3.1 Implement a PK-12 social, emotional, and behavioral learning framework and vision. • 3.3 Improve student engagement by strengthening student experiences in all classrooms, improving existing programs, exploring mentorship programs, and providing relationship building professional learning. • 4.1 Engage families as partners with a formal, ongoing feedback mechanism that creates differentiated opportunities for family voice and engagement.

Percentage of Students Chronically Absent (10% or more of days missed)	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	PERCENTAGE POINT CHANGE: 2012 - 2017	2020 3-YEAR TARGET
% of Students Chronically Absent: CPS ²⁰	17.7%	17.0%	17.3%	17.7%	18.3%	17.2%	-0.5 pts.	14.0%
% of Students Chronically Absent: State	12.5%	12.7%	12.3%	12.9%	12.3%	13.5%	+ 1.0 pts.	
African-American/Black Students	15.9%	16.4%	15.8%	16.2%	16.2%	16.9%	+1.0 pts.	
Asian Students	14.6%	12.7%	12.9%	15.6%	15.5%	15.2%	+0.6 pts.	
Hispanic/Latino Students	21.2%	20.7%	20.8%	20.8%	23.3%	19.9%	-1.3 pts.	
White Students	13.8%	12.6%	12.8%	13.9%	14.2%	12.8%	-1.0 pts.	

Target Setting Rationale: DESE's Planning for Success resource guide on "Selecting Outcome Measures and Setting Targets" indicates that typical change for chronic absenteeism over three years is a 1.0 percentage point decrease. Given the district's attention on this outcome and strategies related to it, we would expect to see a decrease that is double that of typical districts. In consultation with School Committee, this target was further increased to be reduced by 3.2 percentage points over three years to 14.0% in 2020. CPS uses the state definition of chronic absenteeism, which is students missing 10% or more of days.

Outcome Monitoring: The district generates a weekly report to analyze overall attendance rates. In fall 2017 chronically absent rates were added to this report. On a monthly basis, schools will also be provided with student-level spreadsheets flagging students who are chronically absent. Schools are also able to generate chronic absenteeism reports from the district's Student Information System (SIS), Aspen. In examining district-level patterns, data will be disaggregated at the school level to identify issues unique to elementary and upper school students.

²⁰ Data Source for district and state overall numbers: Department of Elementary & Secondary Education. This data includes students in out-of-district placement. The disaggregated data by racial/ethnic groups is internal data and does not include students in out-of-district placement.