

The background of the entire page is a light gray technical drawing or blueprint. It features various geometric shapes, including circles, rectangles, and lines, some of which are hatched or shaded. There are also some faint numbers and letters scattered throughout, such as '313', '26', '245', and '23'.

# PARTNERSHIP SCHOOL PLAN

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
COMMUNITY DISTRICT

2018-2019

## Board Leadership



**Dr. Iris Taylor**  
Board President



**Angelique  
Peterson-Mayberry**  
Vice President



**Sonya Mays**  
Treasurer  
Chair, Finance Sub-  
Committee



**Misha Stallworth**  
Secretary  
Chair, Policy Ad Hoc  
Committee



**Dr. Deborah  
Hunter-Harvill**  
Chair, Academic  
Sub-Committee



**Georgia Lemmons**  
Member



**LaMar Lemmons**  
Member

## Table of Contents

Board Leadership.....	2
Table of Contents .....	3
Overview .....	4
Improving Access to High Quality Teachers.....	5
Rigorous Content.....	8
Expanded Wraparound Services.....	10
Improving Parent and Community Engagement .....	11
Appendix .....	12

# PARTNERING FOR OUR STUDENTS' FUTURE

DPSCD

A Comprehensive Plan for Improving Results in the District's Partnership Schools

## Overview

The State of Michigan holds historically lower performing schools accountable for the achievement of their students using a "Top to Bottom" methodology. Each school in the state is ranked based on student performance in literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies through state assessments and the SAT, and graduation rates are also included for high schools.

In March 2017, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) initiated an agreement with the ten school Districts with schools in the bottom five percent that the then School Reform Office (SRO) had recommended for closure. Forty-five schools were identified in Detroit Public Schools Community District (DPSCD). An additional 13 schools were also identified in March 2018 for a total of 58 schools in the District.

Through this agreement, the MDE, Wayne RESA Intermediate District, and the District agreed to collaborate on strategies for improvement while also setting three improvement goals. The Partnership Agreement was designed to avoid the immediate closing of schools and instead establish partnerships to increase resources and support to struggling schools. As part of that agreement, Detroit Public Schools Community District and MDE arrived on the achievement of the following goals over the next three years:

- 1) In grades three through eight, each school will increase proficiency by at least 1.8 percentage points each year in math and literacy
- 2) In grades three through eight, each school will increase growth by at least 1.8 percentage points in reading and 1.4 percentage points in math over the next 3 years
- 3) High schools will increase the percentage of students at or above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile in reading and math on SAT by at least 2.4 percentage points over the next 3 years

The mid-year performance data linked to student achievement are summarized in Appendix E. This preliminary data indicates that 50% of the cohort one schools are projected to show growth in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading but minimal growth in the other accountability areas.

The overall Partnership Agreement has a three year window with the 18 month progress report on growth and proficiency goals to be completed by November 1, 2018.

As a part on the Partnership Agreement with MDE and Wayne RESA, the plan will address the root causes of lower student performance through:

### PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT TIMELINE

**March 2017:** Agreement between MDE and Districts initiated

**Summer 2017:** Districts develop school profiles, set initial goals, and formed operating teams

**January 2018:** Schools to share school profiles with their communities

**November 2018:** Mid-way progress report on growth and proficiency goals are due

IMPROVING ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS AND LEADERS: Improve students' access to high quality teachers and leaders.

RIGOROUS CONTENT: Improve students' access to grade-level, standards aligned core content and intervention strategies that will help them catch up.

EXPANDED WRAPAROUND SERVICES: Improve students' access to social, emotional and health resources that position them for success in the classroom and beyond.

IMPROVING PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Improve the capacity of parents to advocate for their children's education and expand opportunities for the community to understand the progress and challenges of improving performance in the Partnership Schools.

## IMPROVING ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY TEACHERS AND LEADERS

The effects of a high-quality teacher on student achievement are well documented.<sup>1</sup> In high poverty schools, students with an effective teacher are twice as likely to meet standards compared to their peers with a low quality teacher.<sup>2</sup> School leadership is also crucial; the effect of a highly effective principal can be between two to seven months of additional learning each school year.<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, the District's Partnership Schools have struggled with persistent teacher vacancies. Addressing these issues is paramount and a focus of the District's Partnership plan.

### ADDRESSING THE STAFFING CHALLENGE

#### Improving Teacher Salaries

The needs and rewards of working in the District's most challenged schools are unique, and thus, interested candidates need customized recruitment messages and experiences. The District is prioritizing recruitment fairs for Partnership schools to increase their exposure to available candidates and supporting Principals in their efforts to explain the value of working in high-need school communities to prospective teachers. With support from the Detroit Federation of Teachers, the District has developed a plan to improve compensation by accepting outside experience for prospective candidates and providing compensation for existing teachers who were never credited for years of experience. This two-pronged strategy addresses one of the most commonly cited barriers to teacher recruitment and retention in the District: pay. Should a recruitment barrier still exist then the option of recruitment bonuses will be explored.

#### Student Teaching Partnerships and Residency Programs

To overcome persistent teacher vacancies in its Partnership Schools, the District must become a premier host of pre-service educators and ensure that candidates placed in Partnership schools become full-time employees. The District has sought to strengthen established relationships with area universities, and has already increased the number of pre-service teacher candidates being placed in District schools over previous years. A new partnership with Wayne State University, launched in the 2018-19 school year, will

---

<sup>1</sup> Hanushek and Rivkin. (2010). Generalizations about Using Value-Added Measures of Teacher Quality. Retrieved from [http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%2BRivkin%202010%20AER%20100\(2\).pdf](http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Hanushek%2BRivkin%202010%20AER%20100(2).pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Peske and Haycock (2006). Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students Are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality. Retrieved from: <https://1k9gl1yevnfp2lpg1dhrqe17-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/TQReportJune2006.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Branch, Hanushek and Rivkin (2013). School Leaders Matter. Retrieved from: <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter>

allow pre-service teachers to be placed with master teachers for a full time internship with a commitment of continued employment at the end of internship. Placing these pre-service teachers in Partnership schools is particularly important as they are learning to perfect their craft in an environment that is often more demanding.

The District has developed a university partnership with Wayne State University, Michigan State University, University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University to establish a Partnership Schools Fellows program. The program will recruit high-performing undergraduates to serve in partnership schools for a semester or two, while working with a master teacher and receiving specialized supports from the university collaborative team. Teachers in this program will be recommended a teaching position upon successful program completion. .

### **Retention of Top Talent**

If top educators in Partnership Schools opt out of employment with the District, or even move to other schools, students lose out. Thus, staff retention is as important as staff recruitment. The District has created a master teacher program that will offer English and Math teachers the opportunity to spend half of their instructional day teaching students while spending the other half providing support to teachers. Master teachers will be offered a stipend to engage in high level learning activities, including extensive professional development, and to help build the capacity of other teachers. High- quality teachers often leave the classroom in pursuit of additional leadership opportunities or feel frustrated with limited opportunities to grow professionally. This strategy will allow teachers to remain in Partnership school classrooms while also giving them clearly defined leadership responsibilities. This strategy will keep top teachers in the classroom with students while also leveraging their talents to improve the capacity of other adults, but it will also serve as a retention strategy.

## **DEVELOPING THE CAPACITY OF TEACHERS AND LEADERS**

### **Professional Learning on the Standards and Shifts**

As the expectations for students rise, so do expectations for the educators who support them. Launched in the winter of 2018, administrators and teachers have engaged in heightened professional development on the state standards in literacy and mathematics. Educators that support Kindergarten through third grade had the option to attend an online professional learning experience hosted by national Common Core experts which focused on the Reading Foundational Skills standards. In partnership with Achievement Network, educators working in K-8 settings also had the option to attend a three to four-day series of professional development on the math or literacy standards and shifts, the content of which prepare teachers to engage with new, more highly aligned instructional materials in future years. Through this experience, teachers and leaders work alongside peers to build insight and share ideas. Each partnership school has identified a critical mass of staff members who are participating in these activities. Through their participation, school leaders are provided specific strategies to activate a higher level of student engagement and interaction to lay the groundwork to improve student achievement.

### **Learning Walkthroughs**

Using the District's vision for excellent instruction, principals, principal leaders, Deputy of Schools and other District staff conduct weekly learning walkthroughs. These classroom visits allow the principal and support team to observe teaching practices and provide direct feedback for improvement. Using the District's vision for excellent instruction, team members provide specific areas of growth and next steps in management practices and instructional leadership both with the intended focus of student achievement.

In collaboration with MDE and Wayne RESA, a more comprehensive Learning Walk, known as an Instructional Review, will be conducted at each Partnership School. This review serves as a strategy to use the benchmarks provided through weekly learning walks to determine overall progress towards raising student achievement. As a standard practice the school and District’s instructional teams use this time to synchronize expectations, celebrate successes and identify gaps that need to be addressed. In order to effectively and collectively capture school performance, instructional teams include members from the instructional leadership team, Office of Culture and Climate, special education, MDE and the ISD (Intermediate School District). Moreover, each school leader will receive a comprehensive summative report from the instructional review team that highlights specific observable strategies and usable data regarding pedagogy, culture and climate and special education.

### **Professional Learning on Principal Competencies**

Through a grant funded by The Detroit Children’s Fund, leaders and aspiring leaders will receive professional development provided by New Leaders for New Schools (NLNS), a nationally recognized organization for Urban Leader Preparation. Through this partnership, NLNS will provide leadership development using a transformational framework focused on five major competencies—instructional, adult, culture, operational, and personal leadership; all of which are essential to school improvement.

NLNS will support Partnership School principals to strengthen their skill and capacity to advance student achievement while also assisting with the development and implementation of Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs) at the school sites to farther develop a critical mass of individuals to support sustainable school improvement.

Through a University Collaborative experience, Wayne State University and Michigan State University will service aspiring administrators in a District cohort of coursework co-taught between university and District staff. The internship will be completed in a Partnership School under the supervision of a Partnership School principal who has successfully completed the professional development provided by NLNS.

### **Executive Matching**

Through the Executive Matching Program, business executives are partnered with principals in an advisor-advisee relationship for one school year, with the goal of leadership development that will lead to school improvement. Mentors will assist mentees in problem solving strategies from a business paradigm that relate to a problem of practice in a school environment. Together they will develop a plan of action, monitor and share results. By the end of the year both participants will have gained an appreciation for the leadership needed to effect change in their industry.

### **QUALITY EDUCATOR MILESTONES**

- Initiation of Weekly Learning Walks – September 2017
- Creation of Vision of Excellent Instruction Protocol – October 2017
- Launch of Professional Development on Instructional Shifts – November 2017
- Launch of Instructional Review Process – January 2018
- Selection of Master Teachers/Superintendent Fellows – January 2018
- Selection of 2018-2019 K-8 Curriculum—April 2018
- Launch NLNS Leader Professional Development – May 2018

- Launch Executive Matching Program – June 2018

Area of Focus		Partner
Addressing the Staffing Challenge	Improving Teacher Salaries	Detroit Federation of Teachers
	Student Teaching Partnerships and Residency Programs	Eastern Michigan University Michigan State University University of Michigan Wayne State University
Developing Capacity of Teachers and Leaders	Professional Learning on the Standards and Shifts	Achievement Network
	Learning Walkthroughs	Wayne RESA, MDE
	Professional Learning and Principal Competencies	Detroit’s Children’s Fund New Leaders for New Schools
	Executive Matching	Various Business CEOs/Cabinet

## Rigorous Content

To achieve grade-level standards, students must first have an opportunity to do grade-level work. Sadly, most students spend far too little time working on aligned assignments; an Ed Trust study found a staggering 66 percent of assignments they reviewed did not align to a single grade level standard.<sup>4</sup> Fortunately, other recent research points to a promising solution for this challenge: highly aligned instructional materials. The difference between a moderately-aligned and a misaligned curriculum equates to about 8 months of additional learning for a middle school student, and teachers who use highly aligned instructional materials are also more likely to implement instructional practices like evidence-based discussion and writing.<sup>5</sup> Because many students at Partnership schools begin the school year one or more grade levels behind, a core curriculum is necessary and essential to closing the achievement gaps that exist in the District and in classrooms. Without exposure to grade level work, students will only fall further behind academically. Additionally, students also need support to make up ground on content they have not yet mastered. Teachers and students also need research-based interventions. By adopting strong instructional materials, as well as a systematic intervention framework that will help students catch up, the quality of content will improve in our Partnership Schools which will, invariably, positively impact teaching and learning, culture and climate, student achievement results and teacher retention.

### IMPROVING THE CORE CURRICULUM

#### Curriculum Audit and Curriculum Adoption

<sup>4</sup> The Education Trust. (2015). Checking In: Do Classroom Assignments Reflect Today’s Higher Standards. [http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/CheckingIn\\_TheEducationTrust\\_Sept20152.pdf](http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/CheckingIn_TheEducationTrust_Sept20152.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> Kane et al. (2016). Teaching Higher: Educators’ Perspectives on Common Core Implementation. Retrieved from <http://cepr.harvard.edu/files/cepr/files/teaching-higher-report.pdf?m=1454988762>; Choi, Richman, and Dolfin (2017). Transforming Teachers’ Practice: The Impact of EL Education’s English Language Arts Curriculum and Professional Learning on Teacher Practices. Retrieved from: <https://eleducation.org/uploads/downloads/Final-In-Focus-Brief-to-EL-10-19-17.pdf>



During the year of transition Partnership Schools were given autonomy to utilize a curriculum selected at the school level. Early observations indicated the need to review the quality of work and the overall alignment to standardized assessments.

To further identify gaps and deficiencies in resources used by the most fragile students, the District partnered with Wayne RESA to fund a K-12 literacy and mathematics curriculum audit. Two national leaders in the development and implementation of the Common Core State Standards, David Liben and Jason Zimba, led the audit. The audit process included visiting English and math classrooms and observing students engaging in learning tasks. This observation was followed by a comprehensive review of instructional materials used across partnership schools.

The findings of the audit revealed deep gaps in the current instructional materials used in partnership schools. The reports clearly called out the specific ways that the District’s adopted curriculum products compounded students’ learning challenges by failing to focus sufficiently on the foundational skills, reading fluency and vocabulary development in literacy, and simply failing to address the appropriate standards in the appropriate grades, or attend to concept development, in mathematics.

The District used the criteria these national experts applied as it reviews potential K-8 literacy and mathematics curriculum for adoption for the 2018-19 school year. Through a convening of teachers and school based leaders, the District supported the recommendation of these curriculum teams and will be adopting Expeditionary Learning for K-8 reading and Eureka for K-8 math beginning fall 2018. Summer and school year professional learning for the school year, with more intensive supports in Partnership schools, will be rooted in helping educators fully leverage the aligned materials selected and their implementation of the instructional shifts.

#### IMPROVING INTERVENTIONS

Just as students need exposure to grade level, aligned resources to meet the expectation of the standards, students need access to academic interventions that help them make up lost ground when they are not yet meeting grade level expectations. IReady is a resource that allows reading and math deficits to be identified at the skill level, while proposing an individual student work plan for remediation. The data is presented in grade level equivalence and offers opportunities to analyze student growth up to three times yearly. Each student who does not perform at his/her grade level during the initial testing session will receive an Instructional Development Plan based on academic deficiency in reading. This plan is shared with parents and functions as an interdependent document shared between the student, parent and teacher to ensure that not only are academic weaknesses in content specified, but that all relevant parties has a specific level of accountability to ensure progress towards mastery.

Ongoing professional development provided by the Curriculum and Instruction department and curriculum partners such as Curriculum Associates will assist teachers and school leaders in monitoring student performance and response to intervention.

#### RIGOROUS CONTENT MILESTONES

- Launched use of iReady reading as a diagnostic tool – October 2017
- Initiation of Curriculum Audit – November 2017
- Adoption of Aligned Curriculum in K-8 – April 2018

Area of Focus	Partner
---------------	---------

Improving the Core Curriculum	Curriculum Audit and Curriculum Adoption	Wayne RESA David Liben Jason Zimba
Improving Interventions	Improving Interventions	Curriculum Associates

## Expanded Wraparound Services

Limited access to preventative healthcare and social and emotional supports, as well as opportunities for enrichment and leadership as value propositions for time in school, exacerbate attendance and discipline challenges at the District’s Partnership Schools. On average, students in the District’s Partnership schools miss 12 days of school per year, and 24 percent of all suspensions in the District are concentrated in these schools. Our most struggling, highest-need students require an investment in their full well-being in order to achieve at their full potential. Traditional school supports, although viable, must be augmented and enhanced to address this multi-faceted challenge which, in a complex way, impacts student achievement and school success on a deep level.

### SUPPORTING STUDENTS

#### **Inclusionary Disciplinary Practices**

Positive Behavior and intervention Supports (PBIS) will be planned and monitored by a school team and supported by District staff. Each school will develop and implement a PBIS plan to focus on school wide culture and strategies enhance student behavior and attendance. Each plan will include goals and incentives to be provided to students when those goals are met.

Through a reorganization of the Student Code of Conduct, schools will be trained in Restorative Practices as a strategy to improve student behavior. Each school will hire a Dean of Culture, a School Culture Facilitator, attendance agent and guidance counselor/social worker, to drive the implementation of school-wide PBIS. The School Culture facilitator will assist staff in reinforcing positive behaviors through daily support sessions and Restorative Practice interventions. Likewise the School Culture Facilitator will conduct in school suspension sessions as necessary to help modify student behavior in the school setting.

#### **Healthcare Partnerships**

Staff will receive additional training in mental health and first aid to help better identify students in need of mental health support. Access to mental health and other medical services will be provided through community partnerships with organizations such as Wayne Mental Health and Department of Health. Schools will have an option to hire a mental health support counselor to provide case management and individual and small group counseling to students in need of support.

#### **Individualized Attendance Support**

To address chronically absent students, each school will employ a school based attendance agent to service the student population. Utilizing previous data the attendance agent will contact families of students who have been identified as chronically absent prior to the start of school. The agent will maintain an open communication pattern with the parent/guardian to make improvement more likely. Using a 3-6-9 approach, attendance agents will make connect with families once a student has missed six days which is a third of the way to being chronically absent. With the support of school leadership, guidance counselor/social worker, etc., the agent will develop and monitor an Attendance Intervention Plan including strategies to improve attendance. Additionally the Attendance Intervention Plan will be monitored through daily interactions, weekly parent contact and monthly home visits.

Additional partners such as City Year and Attendance Works, will provide direct service to a caseload of 50 students who have been identified as challenged with daily attendance. Through targeted focus they will also make contact with families, contact students when they are absent, reward students when they are present and consistently monitor performance.

**Full Service Community School**

In partnership with the DTF, Full Service Schools will be developed to provide a comprehensive location to address physical and mental health issues, social work needs and additional wraparound services for families. The Full Service Community School (FSCS) will be staffed with a social worker, medical professional and mental health provider. Neighboring schools will be able to access the location after school hours to receive services within their neighborhood.

**STUDENT SUPPORT MILESTONES**

- Revision of Student Code of Conduct—April 2018

Area of Focus		Partner
Supporting Students	Healthcare Partnerships	Wayne Mental Health Authority Department of Health
	Individualized Attendance Support	Attendance Works City Year Skillman
	Full Service Community School	Detroit Federation of Teachers

**Improving Parent and Community Engagement**

In an effort to keep the community abreast of the progress in Partnership Schools, a Partnerships Schools update will be provided quarterly during Academic Sub-Committee Meetings and through the Superintendent’s Report to the entire board during a regularly scheduled board meeting. The Partnership Schools Support team meets bi-monthly and includes representation from MDE and Wayne RESA. During these meetings the support team reviews progress and supports needed for each Partnership School. Likewise, each school will share their progress data with school stakeholder groups, including their newly established School Advisory Council, at least twice a year. School Alumni associations will also be encouraged by the school leadership and asked to complete at least one project for the school year.

To further engage parents, each Partnership School will host at least one Parent Academy session on site the school session topic will be determined by common themes from parent surveys. Parents will be encouraged to participate in the full menu of courses offered by the office of Family and Community Engagement. Each school is encouraged to participate in the teacher visit program through the Family and Community Engagement office. Social workers and other school staff will assist with conferences in public locations that may be more convenient than the school site.

Area of Focus		Partner
Parent and Community Engagement	Parent and Community Engagement	National PTA Michigan PTA

## Appendix A: Partnership Schools: Phases and Timelines

School Name	Cohort	Date Identified	Goals Met By
A. Philip Randolph Technical High School	Cohort 3	Apr-17	Apr-20
Ann Arbor Trail Magnet School	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Blackwell Institute	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Bow Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Brenda Scott Academy for Theatre Arts	Cohort 3	Apr-17	Apr-20
Brewer Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Brown, Ronald Academy	Cohort 3	Apr-17	Apr-20
Burns Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Carleton Elementary School	Cohort 3	Apr-17	Apr-20
Carstens Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Central High School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Clark, J.E. Preparatory Academy	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Cody Academy of Public Leadership	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Denby High School	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Detroit Collegiate Preparatory High School @ Northwestern	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Detroit Institute of Technology at Cody	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Detroit International Academy for Young Women	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Dixon Elementary School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Dossin Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
Douglass Academy for Young Men	Cohort 3	Apr-17	Apr-20
Durfee Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Apr-17	Apr-20
Earhart Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Apr-17	Apr-20
East English Village Preparatory Academy	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Eastside Detroit Lions Academy	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Edward "Duke" Ellington @ Beckham	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Emerson Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Fisher Magnet Lower Academy	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Fisher Magnet Upper Academy	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Ford High School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Gardner Elementary School	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Garvey Academy	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Gompers Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Greenfield Union Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Henderson Academy	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
King High School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
King, John R. Academic and Performing Arts Academy	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Law Elementary School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Mackenzie Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Mann Elementary School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21

Mark Twain Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Marquette Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Marshall, Thurgood Elementary School	Cohort 2	Nov-17	Mar-21
Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Mason Elementary School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Medicine and Community Health Academy at Cody	Cohort 3	Nov-17	Mar-21
Mumford High School	Cohort 1	Nov-17	Mar-21
Neinas Dual Language Learning Academy	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21
Nichols Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 3	Mar-18	Jul-21
Noble Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21
Osborn Academy of Mathematics	Cohort 1	Mar-18	Jul-21
Palmer Park Preparatory Academy	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21
Pershing High School	Cohort 1	Mar-18	Jul-21
Pulaski Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21
Robeson Academy, Malcolm X Academy	Cohort 3	Mar-18	Jul-21
Sampson Academy	Cohort 1	Mar-18	Jul-21
Schulze Elementary-Middle School	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21
Southeastern High School	Cohort 1	Mar-18	Jul-21
Thirkell Elementary School	Cohort 1	Mar-18	Jul-21
Wayne Elementary School	Cohort 2	Mar-18	Jul-21

\*As a caveat, note that school goals are fluid and may change based on state measures and accountability for a given year. Therefore, utilize this information in the context that the current information represents an approximation of expectation, but may shift according to alterations in the partnership agreement or state accountability.

## Appendix B: Partnership Implementation Timeline

Strategies	Initiation Date	Status
Identified assessments for all schools and solidified assessment calendar	8/1/2017	Complete
Identified and selected iReady as diagnostic and progress monitoring tool	8/1/2017	Complete
Curriculum decision identified and supported from school site	8/15/2017	Complete
Weekly onsite District monitoring, problem solving, and support with Principal Coach and District Team	9/4/2017	Complete
Weekly walkthroughs with leadership to observe instruction and review data	9/4/2017	Complete
Partnering with RESA to support schools with School Improvement Coaching	9/4/2017	Complete
Assignment of District staff in schools with high number of vacancies	9/10/2017	Complete
Identified District support staff for HR and SPED	10/1/2017	Complete
Small group meeting to problem solve vacancy challenges	10/1/2017	Complete
Vision planning and mapping on Vision of Excellent Instruction Protocol: Culture Focus	10/1/2017	Complete
Professional Development for teachers and leaders on the instructional shifts and best practices in urban education	11/7/2017	Complete
Audit of Instructional Materials and recommendations for improvement	11/7/2017	Complete
Initial curriculum audit walkthroughs (4 schools)	11/8/2017	Complete
Attendance support in each school through the assignment of an Attendance Agent	11/14/2017	Complete

Individual Principal Data Chats with Superintendent, Cabinet and Cohort Principals	11/21/2017	Complete
PBIS Plan Review	11/29/2017	Complete
PBIS Internal Coach Training and Support sessions	12/4/2017	Complete
Initiation of Instructional Review at each school	1/16/2018	Complete
School wide Professional Development	1/8/2018	Complete
Application and selection of Master Teachers	1/31/2018	Complete
Monitoring activity through weekly school visits	3/1/2018	Ongoing
Monitoring statewide assessment processes during school visits	4/10/2018	On Target
Reviewing graduation process documentation and senior status updates	4/16/2018	On Target

## Appendix C: Academic Initiatives and Strategies

Academic initiatives and strategies for improvement are presented and discussed at the monthly Academic sub-committee and brought to the larger community at the general board meeting. These strategies are aligned to the Strategic Plan and support the identified goals and metrics. Below is a list of academic initiatives that have been rolled out to support student growth and achievement:

- iReady Diagnostic for K-3
- Khan Academy for SAT prep
- Teacher and Leader Evaluation
- Curriculum Audit and Adoption for K-8 Reading and Math
- M-STEP Preparation
- Revised Staffing Model

Each initiative is essential to the mission of the District and will, of course, be integrated fully into the 2018-2019 work. Some initiatives, such as IReady diagnostic, may be expanded to support K-8 students during the 2018-2019 school year.

# Appendix D: Vision for Excellent Instruction Protocol

## Vision of Excellent Instruction

### Literacy

MANAGEMENT, CULTURE & CLIMATE			
Do the expectations, systems and routines in this classroom promote student learning and personal growth?			
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classrooms are <b>clean, neat, orderly and inviting</b> for students.</li> <li>Students follow <b>behavioral expectations and directions</b> consistently, receiving positive reinforcement and redirection as needed.</li> <li>Students <b>know what they should be doing and learning</b> in the lesson.</li> <li><b>Time is maximized</b> bell to bell; students do not have idle time during the lesson.</li> <li>Students <b>execute transitions and procedures</b> efficiently.</li> <li>Students work hard to <b>complete instructional tasks</b>, volunteer responses and/or ask appropriate questions.</li> <li>Students and their teacher share a <b>positive relationship</b> built on <b>mutual respect</b>.</li> <li>Students unique <b>cultural strengths</b> are identified and nurtured by the teacher and one another to promote achievement and a sense of well-being about the student's cultural place in the world.</li> </ul>		
	NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY
RIGOROUS CONTENT			
Is the lesson focused on a high quality text(s)?			
2a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A majority of the lesson is spent <b>listening to, reading, writing, or speaking</b> about text(s).</li> <li>The text(s) are at or above the <b>complexity</b> level expected for the grade and time in the school year. <i>Consider Lexile level, levels of meaning or purpose, text structure, language, knowledge demands (life experiences, cultural/literary knowledge, content knowledge), and scaffolding provided by the teacher.</i></li> <li>The text(s) exhibit <b>exceptional craft</b> and thought and/or <b>provide useful information</b>; where appropriate the texts are richly illustrated. <i>Consider whether the text(s) are part of a coherent sequence of readings, that represent a range of text complexity, that enrich or build students' understanding of the world.</i></li> </ul>		
	NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY
Does this lesson employ questions and tasks, both oral and written, which integrate the standards and help students understand the content and meaning of the text(s)?			
2b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Questions and tasks integrate reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language standards</a> to support students in building their understanding of the text(s) and topics under consideration.</li> <li>Questions and tasks address the text by attending to its <b>particular structure, concepts, ideas, events, and details</b>.</li> <li>Questions and tasks require students to use <b>evidence from text</b> to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas about the text. These ideas are expressed through both written and oral responses.</li> <li>Questions and tasks attend to the <b>words, phrases, and sentences</b> within the text.</li> <li>Questions are <b>sequenced to build knowledge</b> by guiding students to delve deeper into text and graphics.</li> </ul>		
	NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY
When students are working on foundational skills, does the lesson target the skills in service of comprehension and address what students need, not what they already know?			
2c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The foundational skills being taught are <b>aligned to the reading foundations standards</b> for the grade.</li> <li>Instruction and materials address foundational skills by attending to <b>phonological awareness, concepts of print, letter recognition, phonetic patterns, word structure, and/or fluency</b>. <i>Not all strands will be addressed in each lesson.</i></li> <li>Instruction &amp; materials provide opportunities for all students to <b>practice reading and writing</b> newly acquired foundational skills.</li> <li>Instruction and materials <b>connect</b> acquisition of <b>foundational skills</b> to <b>making meaning</b> from reading.</li> <li><b>Frequent monitoring of student progress</b> ensures students get practice with what they need to learn and not what they already know.</li> </ul>		
	NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY
When students are working to overcome reading difficulties, does the lesson address what students need?			
2d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Frequent monitoring of students' reading abilities</b> drives content of intervention so that students get what they need, not what they already know.</li> <li>The content being taught addresses specific reading difficulties that hold students back from comprehending grade-level complex text such as <b>decoding, word recognition, vocabulary, fluency, complex syntax, or cultural or literary knowledge</b>. <i>Not all strands will be addressed in each lesson.</i></li> <li><b>Instruction and materials accelerate growth</b> such that students are on a trajectory to read, write and speak about grade-level text and topics with independence.</li> </ul>		
	NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY

**Vision of Excellent Instruction**  
**Literacy**

**ACADEMIC OWNERSHIP**

Are students responsible for doing the thinking in this classroom?

- The teacher creates the **conditions for student conversations** and plans tasks where students are encouraged to talk about each other's thinking, including whole group, center, circles, and discussions.
- Students display **persistence with challenging tasks**, particularly when providing textual evidence to support answers and responses, both orally and in writing
- Students provide **textual evidence** to support their ideas and display **precision** in their oral and written responses.
- 3 • Students have opportunities for **productive struggle** and persevere in reasoning and problem solving in the face of initial difficulty.
- Students **respond to and build on one another's thinking** throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content.
- Students can **articulate their successes and needs** as they work toward learning outcomes.
- When appropriate, students demonstrate progress toward **independence in reading and writing**.
- Students demonstrate use of **language conventions and decoding skills**, activating such strategies as needed to read, write, and speak with grade level fluency and skill.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

**DEMONSTRATION OF LEARNING**

Do all students demonstrate that they are learning?

- Questions, tasks or assessments **yield data that allow the teacher to assess students' progress** toward learning outcomes aligned to grade level standards, and item specifications (as relevant), and **allow for lesson adjustments**.
- 4 • Students **demonstrate how well they understand lesson content** and their progress toward learning outcomes through their work and/or responses.
- Student responses, work and interactions demonstrate that **students are on track** to achieve stated or implied learning outcomes.
- 

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----





**Vision of Excellent Instruction**  
**Mathematics**

**ACADEMIC OWNERSHIP**

Are students responsible for doing the thinking in this classroom through the mathematical practices?

- Students **share their developing thinking** about the content of the lesson to **make sense of the mathematics**.
  - Students have opportunities for **productive struggle and persevere in reasoning and solving problems** in the face of initial difficulty.
  - Students elaborate on initial thoughts to **explain their thinking and look for patterns in the mathematics**.
  - Students **talk about and ask questions about each other’s thinking**, in order to clarify or improve their own mathematical understanding.
- 3**
- Students use **precise mathematical language and calculations** in their explanations and discussions.
  - Students **use appropriate tools and/or models** strategically when solving a problem.
  - Students **revise initial work**, especially their explanations and justifications.
  - Students can **articulate their successes and needs** as they work toward learning outcomes.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

**DEMONSTRATION OF LEARNING**

Do all students demonstrate that they are learning?

- Questions, tasks or assessments **yield data that allow the teacher to assess students’ progress** toward learning outcomes aligned to grade level standards, and item specifications (as relevant), and **allow for lesson adjustments**.
- 4**
- Students **demonstrate how well they understand lesson content** and their progress toward learning outcomes through their work and/or verbal and nonverbal responses.
  - Student responses, work and interactions demonstrate that **students are on track** to achieve stated or implied learning outcomes.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----





**Vision of Excellent Instruction**  
Social Studies

**MANAGEMENT, CULTURE & CLIMATE**

Do the expectations, systems and routines in this classroom promote student learning and personal growth?

- Classrooms are **clean, neat, orderly and inviting** for students.
- Students follow **behavioral expectations and directions** consistently, receiving positive reinforcement and redirection as needed.
- Students **know what they should be doing and learning** in the lesson.
- **Time is maximized** bell to bell; students do not have idle time during the lesson.
- 1 • Students **execute transitions and procedures** efficiently.
- Students work hard to **complete instructional tasks**, volunteer responses and/or ask appropriate questions.
- Students and their teacher share a **positive relationship** built on **mutual respect**.
- Students unique **cultural strengths** are identified and nurtured by the teacher and one another to promote achievement and a sense of well-being about the student’s cultural place in the world.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

**RIGOROUS CONTENT**

Does this lesson reflect the demands of the standards for this grade and course?

- Instruction and materials are aligned to Michigan content standards([GLCE](#) and [HCLE](#)), the C3 Framework, as well as Reading History ([CCSS.RH](#)), Writing History ([CCSS.WHST](#)) and Speaking and Listening Standards ([CCSS.SL](#)) as described in course descriptions.
- 2a • Instruction and materials provide opportunities for students to **explore key disciplinary questions and build knowledge and skills** with the social studies content.
- Students develop social studies knowledge by spending the **majority of time reading, listening to, speaking, or writing about content-rich, complex text(s)**, including primary and secondary sources of different types (i.e., print and non-print, including video, audio, art, maps, charts, etc.) and varied lengths.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

Does this lesson employ questions and tasks, both oral and written, which integrate the standards and help students develop and deepen social studies content knowledge and skills?

- Questions and tasks focus on **engaging students with content in varied contexts** (e.g., examining different sources, completing tasks, answering multiple-choice questions, writing, engaging in speaking/listening).
- Questions and tasks are **intentionally sequenced to** focus students on building, applying, and synthesizing knowledge and skills through various sources, classroom research, and conversations.
- **Source-dependent written and oral tasks require students to make claims** which demonstrate understanding of social studies content (e.g., make connections between ideas, people, and events; explain how society, the environment, the political and economic landscape, and historical events influence perspectives, values, traditions, and ideas; evaluate the causes and consequences of events and developments; recognize recurring themes across time and place).
- 2b • Questions and tasks attend to the **academic language** of the text so that students develop their vocabularies through multiple exposures and opportunities to learn word meanings.
- Questions and tasks require students to use **evidence** from readings and research to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

When students are working on skill or standards deficits, does the lesson address what students need, not what they already know?

- **Frequent monitoring of student progress** drives content of remediation so that students get what they need, not what they already know.
- The skills being taught are **aligned to the standards** for the grade or addressing specific skill deficiencies that hold them back from doing grade-level work.
- 2c • **Instruction and materials support growth** in the targeted skill or standard.
- Students **receive appropriate scaffolds and supports**, including **accommodations and modifications** where appropriate, to engage with rigorous work.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

**Vision of Excellent Instruction**  
**Social Studies**

**ACADEMIC OWNERSHIP**

Are students responsible for doing the thinking in this classroom?

- The teacher creates the **conditions for student conversations** and plans tasks where students are encouraged to talk about each other’s thinking, including whole group, center, circles, and discussions.
- Students display **persistence with challenging tasks**, particularly when providing textual evidence to support answers and responses, both orally and in writing
- 3**
  - Students provide **textual evidence** to support their ideas and display **precision** in their oral and written responses.
  - Students have opportunities for **productive struggle** and persevere in reasoning and problem solving in the face of initial difficulty.
  - Students **respond to and build on one another’s thinking** throughout the lesson to deepen their understanding of the content.
  - Students can **articulate their successes and needs** as they work toward learning outcomes.
  - Students demonstrate progress toward **independence in reading and writing**.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

**DEMONSTRATION OF LEARNING**

Do all students demonstrate that they are learning?

- Questions, tasks or assessments **yield data that allow the teacher to assess students’ progress** toward learning outcomes aligned to grade level standards, and item specifications (as relevant), and **allow for lesson adjustments**.
- 4**
  - Students **demonstrate how well they understand lesson content** and their progress toward learning outcomes through their work and/or responses.
  - Student responses, work and interactions demonstrate that **students are on track** to achieve stated or implied learning outcomes.

NOT YET	SOMEWHAT	MOSTLY	YES
---------	----------	--------	-----

## Appendix E: Mid-year Data and Goals

Table 1: Partnership Schools *ELA Proficiency Goals vs. Midyear Diagnostic Projections*

School	Grade level	16-17 M-STEP % meeting expectations	Target Partnership Annual Goal (+1.8pp)	Midyear Performance Projection	Projected Goal Difference	Assessment
Ann Arbor Trail	3	11.8	13.6	24.3	10.7	iReady
	4-8	11.8	13.6	13.3	-0.3	MAP
Bow ES-MS	3	3.6	5.4	21.5	16.1	iReady
	4-8	3.6	5.4	3.7	-1.7	MAP
J.E. Clark Prep	3	4.3	6.1	14.8	8.7	iReady
	4-8	4.3	6.1	5.4	-0.7	MAP
Durfee ES-MS	3	3.7	5.5	5.9	0.4	iReady
	4-8	3.7	5.5	5.9	0.4	MAP
Fisher Upper	3	5.3	7.1	12.2	5.1	iReady
	4-8	5.3	7.1	4.9	-2.2	MAP
Gompers ES-MS	3	15.6	17.4	15.7	-1.7	iReady
	4-8	15.6	17.4	11.9	-5.5	MAP
Henderson Acad.	3	3.1	4.9	8.5	3.6	iReady
	4-8	3.1	4.9	1.3	-3.6	MAP
Marquette ES-MS	3	1.4	3.2	10	6.8	iReady
	4-8	1.4	3.2	3.7	0.5	MAP
Mason ES	3	4.4	6.2	9.6	3.4	iReady
	4-8	4.4	6.2	5.4	-0.8	MAP
Sampson Academy	3	3.8	5.6	6.9	1.3	iReady
	4-8	3.8	5.6	4.8	-0.8	MAP
Thirkell ES	3	6.2	8	12.7	4.7	iReady
	4-8	6.2	8	9.5	1.5	MAP
Burns ES-MS	3	1.9	3.7	5.8	2.1	iReady
	4-8	1.9	3.7	4.6	0.9	MAP
Law ES	3	5.4	7.2	5.4	-1.8	iReady
	4-8	5.4	7.2	10.2	3	MAP

Bethune ES-MS	3	4.8	6.6	8.2	1.6	iReady
	4-8	4.8	6.6	6.5	-0.1	MAP

Table 2: Partnership Schools **Math Proficiency** Goals vs. Midyear Diagnostic Projections

School	Grade level	16-17 M-STEP % meeting expectations	Target Partnership Annual Goal (+1.8pp)	Midyear Performance Projection	Projected Goal Difference	Assessment
Ann Arbor Trail	3-8	8.1	9.9	4.4	-5.5	MAP
Bow ES-MS	3-8	3.6	5.4	0.7	-4.7	MAP
J.E. Clark Prep	3-8	0.6	2.4	1.4	-1	MAP
Durfee ES-MS	3-8	4.7	6.5	2.6	-3.9	MAP
Fisher Upper	3-8	1.3	3.1	1.6	-1.5	MAP
Gompers ES-MS	3-8	5.8	7.6	3	-4.6	MAP
Henderson Acad.	3-8	0.6	2.4	1	-1.4	MAP
Marquette ES-MS	3-8	0.6	2.4	0.9	-1.5	MAP
Mason ES	3-8	1.8	3.6	2.4	-1.2	MAP
Sampson Academy	3-8	2.2	4	0.6	-3.4	MAP
Thirkell ES	3-8	2.4	4.2	3.2	-1	MAP
Burns ES-MS	3-8	1.4	3.2	0.6	-2.6	MAP
Law ES	3-8	2.2	4	0.9	-3.1	MAP
Bethune ES-MS	3-8	1.6	3.4	0	-3.4	MAP



Table 3: Partnership Schools ELA Growth Goals vs. Midyear Diagnostic Results\*

School	Grade level	16-17 M-STEP % Avg./Above Avg. Growth	Target Partnership Annual Goal (+1.8pp)	Midyear Performance Projection*	Projected-Goal Difference*	Assessment (Interpretation)
Ann Arbor Trail	3	66.7	68.5	59.5	-9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	66.7	68.5	48	-20.5	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Bow ES-MS	3	47.6	49.4	49.6	0.2	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	47.6	49.4	37.7	-11.7	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
J.E. Clark Prep	3	50.5	52.3	42.9	-9.4	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	50.5	52.3	41.5	-10.8	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Durfee ES-MS	3	46.1	47.9	35.3	-12.6	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	46.1	47.9	35.7	-12.2	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Fisher Upper	3	54.7	56.5	34.6	-21.9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	54.7	56.5	42.5	-14	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Gompers ES-MS	3	69.4	71.2	44.7	-26.5	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	69.4	71.2	49.5	-21.7	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Henderson Acad.	3	44.1	45.9	36	-9.9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	44.1	45.9	27.2	-18.7	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Marquette ES-MS	3	43.9	45.7	32.3	-13.4	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	43.9	45.7	39.5	-6.2	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Mason ES	3	58.4	60.2	22.2	-38	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	58.4	60.2	26.1	-34.1	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Sampson Academy	3	50	51.8	48.2	-3.6	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	50	51.8	45.2	-6.6	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Thirkell ES	3	52.7	54.5	26.6	-27.9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)

	4-8	52.7	54.5	48.5	-6	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Burns ES-MS	3	51.2	53	28.5	-24.5	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	51.2	53	30.4	-22.6	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Law ES	3	58.8	60.6	19.7	-40.9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	58.8	60.6	44.4	-16.2	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Bethune ES-MS	3	58.4	60.2	20.3	-39.9	iReady (Percent of students on-track to meeting 1-year's growth based on iReady scale score gains)
	4-8	58.4	60.2	34.7	-25.5	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)

Table 4: Partnership Schools **Math Growth Goals vs. Midyear Diagnostic Results\***

School	Grade level	16-17 MSTEP % Avg./Above Avg. Growth	Target Partnership Annual Goal (+1.8pp)	Midyear Performance Projection*	Projected-Goal Difference*	Assessment
Ann Arbor Trail	3-8	67.2	69	43.1	-25.9	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Bow ES-MS	3-8	48.9	50.7	36.4	-14.3	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
J.E. Clark Prep	3-8	60.2	62	39.2	-22.8	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Durfee ES-MS	3-8	42.9	44.7	42.9	-1.8	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Fisher Upper	3-8	58.7	60.5	29.5	-31	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Gompers ES-MS	3-8	54.5	56.3	40.5	-15.8	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Henderson Acad.	3-8	40.6	42.4	27.6	-14.8	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Marquette ES-MS	3-8	47.6	49.4	38.8	-10.6	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Mason ES	3-8	44.4	46.2	26.6	-19.6	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Sampson Academy	3-8	51.5	53.3	40.9	-12.4	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Thirkell ES	3-8	54.7	56.5	36.3	-20.2	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Burns ES-MS	3-8	61	62.8	31.3	-31.5	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Law ES	3-8	61.2	63	22.9	-40.1	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)
Bethune ES-MS	3-8	64.3	66.1	25.7	-40.4	MAP (Percent of students who met or exceeded their expected midyear growth as per fall MAP projections)

\* - Note: M-STEP measurements of student growth **not** directly comparable to diagnostics.