

Narratives

School Narrative/Story

District or Charter School Name

Pittsburgh Public School District

School Name

Pittsburgh Westinghouse 6-12

Grade Span

6-12

Percentage Free and Reduced Lunch

100

SIG eligible schools are identified on the School Performance Profile as a Priority or Focus School based on student achievement, academic growth, graduation rate, and test participation. The methods used to identify eligible schools are intended to select schools most in need of reform. While this data analysis is sufficient for determining SIG eligibility, it does not provide sufficient information to make instructional and management decisions at the school level.

Provide specific, explanatory information regarding the 3-5 year history of the school to include:

- Information from other data sources (academic, behavioral, other non-academic, etc.)
- Changes in administration, governance structure and leadership
- Curriculum mapping, revision and development activities
- Implementation of new core instructional programs
- Staffing changes, recruiting efforts, incentives, supports and mentoring for new and/or struggling teachers
- Professional development plans and initiatives
- School reform planning efforts to include data analysis, data review and root cause analysis
- Parent and community involvement in school reform efforts
- Any other relevant information to describe the school history and current school environment.

For the past 10 years, Westinghouse has been plagued with low student achievement, high mobility rate (over 50%), high suspension rate, a significant need for mental health services, and a high rate of students in crisis and/or experiencing trauma. The leadership team consisted of three principals and a program manager that would support the new initiatives that included changing from a comprehensive 9-12 high school, to a 6-12 school with gender specific academies for students in grades 6-8. In August 2011, Westinghouse opened as a gender specific academy that used a trimester scheduling structure. Students from two middle schools and one high school that closed were absorbed. In this shift, approximately 50% of the students opted not to attend the gender specific academies. Also, significant teacher turnover occurred with only about 10% of the original staff remaining under the new model. During the 2011-12 SY, a reading and math coach were added to support the academics and provide professional development (PD) to teachers. An extended day and school year was added providing 20 additional minutes for reading and math interventions and 10 additional school days. Westinghouse received support from a local foundation who provided 10 fellows that mentored students as well as provided support in the classrooms. Westinghouse also partnered with a local community organization who provided graduate level social work interns to support students experiencing crisis and trauma, in need of social services, as well as mental health services. Due to neighborhood violence, the organization provided additional transportation options for students who did not meet district guidelines for transportation. Unfortunately, unsuccessful planning and implementation of the plan plus the threat of an American Civil Liberties Union lawsuit regarding the emphasis of the gender specific academy, caused the school to be reverted back to a co-educational, comprehensive 6-12 school that operated under the

two semester structure. In 2012-13 the school continued with both a new principal and new assistant principal. During that school year, Westinghouse partnered with a University to gain additional support for Culturally Relevant Education (CRE) to help increase academic and improve behavioral outcomes of the students. The staff participated in educational rounds; observing each other's class during instruction and giving feedback. As a result, the Guardians of Equity team was created to support all teachers to implement equitable teaching practices for all students. A plan was created to put supports for students in place based on their academic, attendance and behavior/mental health needs. Supports were put into place for new and struggling teachers as well. For example, a new teacher induction program was provided specifically for our school that included mentor teachers working with both struggling and new teachers. In the 2013-14 SY, a new principal and two new assistant principals were in place. A new partnership with Specialized Education Schools Incorporated (SESI) was formed who provided three staff to support administration with creating and implementing a positive behavior structure. That year, for the first time, Westinghouse students traveled abroad, were visited by professional sororities and fraternities to present to the student body, and over 36 community partnerships supported both the academic and extracurricular program. During this school year, Westinghouse continued to have staffing challenges. The program manager resigned and several key staff members were on medical leave for an extended period of time. To help support students with mental health concerns, Westinghouse contracted with a community agency that created a School Based Behavioral Health team. This team began working with us in December 2012 and consisted of two therapists, five case managers, and a consultant psychiatrist. On July 1, 2014, another new principal was hired to lead the transformation of the school. The current administration consists of the new principal and the two returning assistant principals. This year, due to the number of staff changes, administration focused on stabilizing the school environment by focusing on systems and structures. The 2015-16 SY will focus on meeting the needs of the whole child by creating structures to help identify academic and social/emotional needs. We will employ three Promise Readiness Corp teachers for grades 8-10 that will loop, team and advise with the students. These teachers will work an extended day and have time to meet daily to discuss student needs. The academic counselor and social worker will be included in weekly meetings as well. We also hired two Instructional Team Leaders to focus on English, Social Studies, Mathematics and Science.

Needs Assessment

Complete the following sections below to explain the process used to assess and prioritize the needs of the school. Use the categories below to complete the text boxes.

DATA SOURCES - List data analyzed: Student Demographic Data (grade level, ethnicity, gender, special education status, ESL/Migrant/Refugee/Homeless status, etc.), Student Assessment data (PSSA, PVASS, Keystone Exams, 4Sight, DIBELS, etc.), graduation and drop-out data, attendance data, discipline incidence data, student intervention data (academic intervention/social-behavioral interventions), parent/family/community data (parent surveys, focus groups, etc.), socio-economic data (poverty, housing stability, etc.) and teacher effectiveness data.

DATA REVIEWERS - List groups involved in reviewing and analyzing the data: Administrators, Teachers, Parents, Community Members, etc.

CONCLUSIONS - Describe the conclusions drawn by the data reviewers after analyzing the data.

STRENGTHS OR CONCERNS - Identify data-substantiated results that represent student achievement and/or performance accomplishments and identify those results that represent concerns about student achievement and/or performance.

DATA ANALYSIS - List groups involved in reviewing the results of the data analysis to identify and prioritize needs: Superintendent, school principals, outside experts, etc.

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS DATA

Data Sources:

PSSA, Keystone, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Curriculum Based Assessments (CBA) Key:
 Percentages shown in order of Below Basic; Basic; Proficient; Advanced 2013-14 PSSA 6: 64,25,4,7 7:
 43,35,16,6 8: 36,22,29,12 Keystone—Original & Retake 53,33,6,0 20,18,29,33 2014-15 SRI 6: 26, 41, 28,
 5 7: 23,29,35,13 8: 9,41,41,4 10: 12,44,35,9 11: 24,42,27,7 2014-15 CBA's Anchors/ Eligible Content 6 7
 8 11 E.B-K.1 50% 60% 42.3% N/A E.A-K-1 33.3% 50.5% 43.8 N/A E.A-V.4 12.5% N/A N/A N/A E.B-V.4
 N/A 50.7% 59.1% N/A E.A-C.2 25.0% 56.0% 42.9% N/A E.B-C.3 66.7% N/A N/A N/A L.N.1 N/A N/A N/A
 50% L.N.2 N/A N/A N/A 40.4%

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL;
 Social Studies ITL, PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

Conclusions:

PSSA/Keystone data indicate that overall, although students are showing growth from 6th grade to 11th grade; the growth is most noticeable in students moving from scoring Below Basic to Basic. Much smaller gains were made from Basic to Proficient and from Proficient to Advanced. SRI data indicate that overall, although students are demonstrating growth at each grade level, the growth as an average is below the benchmark reading level indicator. District Curriculum Based Assessments also reflect below proficiency achievement in all eligible content reporting categories.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: • % of students scoring Proficient/Advanced (P/A) on the PSSA increased from 6th to 8th grade and from 8th grade PSSA to 11th grade Keystone. • % of students scoring Below Basic/Basic (BB/B) on the PSSA decreased from 6th to 8th grade and from 8th grade PSSA to 11th grade Keystone. • Overall, 7th and 8th grades scored highest on the SRI, with 47% and 45% respectively, scoring as P/A. • CBAs - grade 7 had the most growth and grade 11 scored the highest in Reading for Meaning-Nonfiction.
 Concerns: • 6th grade students entering middle school at a great deficit affecting future growth. •

Sustaining proficiency decreases from 8th to 10th grade. 41% scored as P/A in 8th grade to only 6% 10th grade. • Overall, 6th and 11th grades scored the lowest on the SRI, with 67% and 66% respectively, scoring B/BB. • CBAs - grade 6 scored 12.5% in Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. • CBAs - grades 6-8 & 11 scored at 50% or below in most eligible content reporting categories.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL and PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal and our PSCC (Parent, School, Community Council) team

MATH DATA

Data Sources:

% shown in order of Below Basic; Basic; Proficient; Advanced 2013-14 PSSA 6: 67,17,14,2 7: 45,17,22,16 8: 41,2,21,10 Keystone Algebra 54,34,2,0 29,41,17,12 2014-15 CBA's % Anchors 6 7 8 11 M.A 39.4 50.2 27.3 N/A M.C31 6 45.0 26.4 N/A A2.1.2 N/A N/A N/A 40.5 A2.1.3 N/A N/A N/A 41.1 A2.2.1 N/A N/A N/A 38.8 A2.2.2 N/A N/A N/A 31.3 2014-15 SMI (Average) Grade 1stTest Final Test Prof 6 525 500 BB 7 580 585 BB 8 640 600 BB 9 630 585 BB 10 600 585 BB 11 590 845 BB

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL and PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

Conclusions:

PSSA/Keystone data shows that overall, although students are showing inconsistent trends in growth from 6th to 11th grade; the growth trends are demonstrating at least 50% of students still scoring as below proficiency. District Curriculum Based Assessments also reflect below proficiency achievement in all eligible content reporting categories. Minimal weight and validity should be given to SMI scores due to first year implementation issues.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: • 7th grade scored the highest with 38% scoring as Proficient/Advanced (P/A) on the PSSA • Reduction of below basic students in 6th grade with an increase in P/A students by 7th grade • A steady decrease in students scoring below basic from 6th to 11th grade • 17% of 9th grade moved out of basic/below basic on the Keystone • 15% increase in proficient students from 9th to 11th grade • 12% increase in advanced students from 9th to 11th grade. • CBAs - 7th grade classes are showing the most growth. Concerns: • 6th grade students entering middle school at a great deficit affecting future growth • 84% of 6th grade students scoring basic/below on the PSSA • 7% drop in P/A students from 7th to 8th grade • Drop in P/A students in 8th grade • CBAs - 6th–8th and 11th grades scored at 50% or below in most eligible content reporting categories. • SMI scores may not be fully accurate, as this was the first year of implementation with the SMI computer program.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL and PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal and our PSCC (Parent, School, Community Council) team

STUDENT BEHAVIOR DATA

Data Sources:

Teaching Learning Environment (TLE) Survey 13-14 school year Managing Student Conduct Students at this school understand the expectations for their conduct Overall School Average Score: Strongly disagree: 11% Disagree: 17% Agree: 49% Strongly agree: 23% The faculty work in a school environment that is safe Overall School Average Score: Strongly disagree: 5% Disagree: 15% Agree: 53% Strongly Agree: 28% School Suspension 2013–14 Incidents of Misconduct Males - 344 Females - 253 White – 1 Other – 4 Non IEP – 433 IEP – 164 Econ Disadvantaged – 539 Non-Econ. Disadvantaged - 58 Total - 597 2014-15 Incidents of Misconduct Males – 276 Females – 162 White – 0 Non IEP – 309 IEP – 129 Econ Disadvantaged – 351 Non–Econ Disadvantaged – 87 Total – 438

Data Reviewers:

Principal; Assistant Principal; Learning Environment Specialist; Project Manager; Teachers, Parent, Student; Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN)

Conclusions:

Between 2013-14 and 2014-15, our student population dropped by 139 students; our non-IEP percentage dropped by 2% from 73% in 2013-14 to 71% in 2014-15 and the IEP students increased by 2% from 27% in 2013-14 to 29 % in 2014-15. The non-economically disadvantaged increased by 10%. Economically disadvantaged decreased by 10%. The number of male incidents dropped by 68 and the number of female incidents dropped by 91 from the 2013-14 to 2014-15 school year. The number of students who committed an incident was higher for both male and female student in the 2014-15 school year. Total number of female students committing an incident was 42% in 2013-14 compared to 50% in 2014-15, which is an 8% increase. Total number of male students committing an incident was 36% in 2013-14 compared to 42% in 2014-15, which is a 6% increase. According to the TLE survey, teachers feel safe coming to school and believe students understand the expectations for their behaviors.

Strengths or Concerns:

Concerns There is a higher amount of incidents in grades 6–9 in both the 2013-14 and 2014-15 school years. The following incidents occurred by grade level in 2013-14: 6th grade-88 7th grade-76 8th grade-154 9th grade-72 10th grade-47 11th grade-25 The following incidents occurred by grade level in 2014-15: 6th grade- 61 7th grade-109 8th grade-66 9th grade-63 10th grade-51 11th grade- 27 12th grade-19 The number of students who committed an incident was higher for both male and female student in the 2014-15 school year. Total number of female students committing an incident was 42% in 2013-14 compared to 50% in 2014-15, which is an 8% increase. Total number of male students committing an incident was 36% in 2013-14 compared to 42% in 2014-15, which is a 6% increase.

Data Analysis Review:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Project Manager; Teachers; Parent; Student; Pennsylvania Training and Technical Assistance Network (PaTTAN) Discussed at our PSCC and PTO meetings

STUDENT GRADUATION DATA**Data Sources:**

The Cohort Graduation Rate was utilized from the Pennsylvania School Performance Profile. The performance trend of the past two years' Cohort Graduation Rate has been analyzed. This performance measurement represents the percent of Westinghouse students that graduated within four year with a

regular high school diploma. The Cohort Graduation Rate for the previous two years are as follows: 12-13 SY: 70% 13-14 SY: 87% The PIMS State Graduate Report (Post High School Activity) was also utilized to determine the number of seniors who went off to a 4-year College or University after graduation. 10-11 SY: 29% (Class size of 76) 11-12 SY: 32% (Class size of 74) 12-13 SY: 21% (Class size of 63) 13-14 SY: 25% (Class size of 69)

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL and PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

Conclusions:

There was a significant reduction in the amount of students that are graduating from Westinghouse within four years with a regular diploma. Among those students who are graduating very few of those students are eligible to receive our district's Pittsburgh Promise scholarship of \$40,000 over four years. This Promise scholarship could make a huge difference in the lives of our students. We have to be able to develop a plan that will assure that our students meet the following criteria to obtain the scholarship: graduate from school in four years and maintain 90% attendance and 2.5 GPA or higher.

Strengths or Concerns:

Concerns The decrease in the number of students graduating from Westinghouse over the course of the last few years is designated as a concern. It is also a concern that many of our students are not transitioning into four year colleges or universities after graduation. The number of students receiving the Pittsburgh Promise has fluctuated and is still extremely low. Strengths On the other hand because our district offers our students the possibility of earning the Pittsburgh Promise scholarship of \$40,000 over a four year period this is considered a strength. Our schools goal now is to develop a plan to ensure that our students receive that scholarship each year. The graduation rate increased.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL and PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

STUDENT ATTENDANCE DATA

Data Sources:

Student Attendance Data (Pinnacle, RTI, and Insight) 12-13: 81.63 13-14: 85.14 14-15: 87.92 Satisfactory: absence rate is 4.98% or less At Risk: absence rate is between 4.99% and 9.98% Chronic: absence rate is between 9.99% and 19.98% Severe: absence rate is 19.99% or above Based on these categories the following data indicates absence rates this school year: Satisfactory At Risk Chronic Severe 6 27% 43% 27% 3% 7 25% 35% 34% 6% 8 39% 33% 18% 9% 9 24% 26% 37% 13% 10 29% 20% 31% 20% 11 27% 16% 20% 15% 12 27% 27% 35% 11% Overall: 26% 29% 33% 12%

Data Reviewers:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Social Worker; Guidance Counselor; Transition Counselor

Conclusions:

Although we have seen a continued increase in attendance. more work must be done to improve the daily

attendance rate with students. Although over 50% of the students fall in the At Risk and Satisfactory categories, the mobility rate at Westinghouse is over 50%- which is a great contributor to our attendance data along with a 26% homeless population.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths Communication between the school, parents and students regarding attendance has increased bringing more awareness to student absences. Parents are beginning to understand the difference between excused and unexcused absences. Participation in truancy prevention meetings has increased over the past 3 years and parents and students are following through with recommendations to increase their child's attendance. Concerns Student attendance continues to be a concern going into the new school year as our academic data shows that when students are not in school they are not learning.

Data Analysis Review:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Social Worker; Guidance Counselor; Transition Counselor Discussed with PTO and PSCC

TEACHER ATTENDANCE DATA

Data Sources:

Teacher attendance rates for the last 3 years. 2014-15 - 95.42% 2013-14 - 94.83% 2012-13 - 90.84%

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

Conclusions:

The teachers attendance data from 2012-13 to 2014-15 has increased. We have increased from 2012-13 to 2013-14 by 3.99% and in the following year by .59% with an overall increase from 2012-13 to 2014-15 of 4.58%. This data does not indicate why teachers are absent. This last year, we had several teachers out for training in other cities which is also impacts this data, as well as two teachers on medical leave for pregnancy and two teachers on medical leave for surgeries. We also had two teachers suspended for three weeks due to an investigation of inappropriate behavior.

Strengths or Concerns:

This data indicates that about 95% of our teachers were and are in classes with students daily. This data is seen as a strength as students benefit from having their teacher providing rigorous instruction. The concern is that for the 5% of the time that teachers are absent, securing substitutes for teachers is a challenge. As a result, teachers that are in the building are asked to cover classes. This causes them to miss out on their preps and in getting prepared for their next class. This also means that students are receiving disjointed instruction from several teachers across the day and possible little instruction from a substitute teacher.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

EXTENDED LEARNING/REMEDIATION DATA

Data Sources:

Period 10, a credit recovery program, was offered after school 2 days/week for 10 weeks with 4 subjects that averaged 10 students in each class. 70% of students completed their course and recovered credits. Novanet, a computer-based credit recovery prg, was also offered to students on Saturday for 4 hours. Summer 2013-10 students attended, 13 different subjects were offered and 15 classes were recovered. All students had at least a 90% attendance rate and 81% grade average. Fall of 2013-28 students enrolled. Attendance averaged between 28 to 8 students over the 10 week period. Over 90% of the students completed classes with an 80% grade average. Spring 2014-17 students enrolled in Novanet and 29 courses completed. Summer 2014-31 students enrolled in Novanet over 16 different courses and 47 completions. 2014-15 SY Compass Learning was used for credit recovery. 15 students enrolled in 15 different subjects. 20 course completions with 62% grade average.

Data Reviewers:

Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Transition Counselor, Principal and Assistant Principal

Conclusions:

Students in ninth and tenth grades did not participate at a high rate in credit recovery. Students at the junior and senior level were more apt to take advantage of the credit recovery program. There is higher attendance, participation and completion rates in the summer programs than in the program offered during the school year. Regarding after-school programming, we have a large number of programs for students to participate, but at this time, do not have clear metrics for evaluation.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: Because the programs offered students a choice to complete the work in or out of the classroom, students took advantage of the programs offered and completed courses. Another advantage of the computer based programs is that they are self-paced and accessible during non-school hours to offer flexibility. We have a variety of after-school programming that allows our students choice as well as programs to meet individual needs. Concerns: Due to the fact that the program is a computer-based model, there is a lack of teacher instruction, which is not best for all learners. It is also difficult to modify/adapt learning outcomes and the curriculum to the instructional level of the students with exceptionalities. At this point, we do not have data on the effectiveness of all the after-school programs in our school.

Data Analysis Review:

Guidance Counselor, Social Worker, Transition Counselor, Principal and Assistant Principal

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DATA

(data regarding topics covered, number of sessions, participation, and classroom usage)

Data Sources:

The following topics were covered in small group PD {Topic, # Sessions}: Research-Based Inclusive System of Evaluation (RISE) as a Tool for Growth, 10; Peer Observations, 6; Student Learning Outcomes, 16; Parents, 5; Writing, 8; Assessments, 9; PBIS, 17; Content, 10. Individual PD was also completed throughout the year by our Common Core Curriculum Supervisor, Curriculum Coordinator 6-12 mathematics, and KtO specialist provided intense 1-1 PD for core content. PD for new teachers, which

consisted of recording lessons, reflecting on best practices, curriculum and text analysis, data analysis and progress monitoring of student growth and Positive Behavior Intervention Systems. The 13-14 Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey showed: 81% agreed that an appropriate amount of time is provided for PD, 72% of the staff believe that PD opportunities are aligned with the school's improvement plan. 35% of the staff believe that PD is differentiated to meet teacher needs.

Data Reviewers:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Counselor; ITL Special Education; ITL Science; ITL Social Studies; ITL Career and Technical Education; CAS Facilitator

Conclusions:

After reviewing the PD sessions that were provided to the staff this year, it is clear that we focused on implementing strategies for behavior management and PBIS. Our PDs also allowed for teachers to collaborate to identify Tier 1 and 2 interventions for our students prior to referrals. Teachers provide daily feedback to students based on PRIDE, P = Polite, R = Responsible, I = Inquisitive, D = Determined, and E = Engaged. Teachers meet weekly to calibrate and progress monitor student behavior based on PRIDE. PD provided a clear link to classroom usage through Student Learning Outcomes. Teachers planned and identified intended learning outcomes and benchmarks, identified approaches to measure outcomes, and gathered data to share and reflect in order to make necessary changes to the teaching structures. Overall staff PD attendance during the 2014-15 school year was 98%.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: SLOs and PBIS. Students' GPA increased and the # of students on honor roll increased due to the fact that teachers were able to make decisions based on their student assessment results and better understood tools for monitoring student progress. The # of suspensions decreased. Our leveling system consisted of Bulldog Gold, Bulldog Blue, and Bulldog White. For 14-15 SY, more than half of our students were Bulldog Gold or Bulldog Blue. PD was evaluated through implementation in classrooms by peer to peer, and administrative formal and informal observations as well as exit tickets and surveys. Individualized support to align the curriculum to standards and create individualized lessons to improve the writing skills of students with a focus on close reading and argumentative writing. Teachers shared student work to help their colleagues share grading methodology. Concerns: Common planning by content was inconsistently scheduled due to the master schedule.

Data Analysis Review:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Counselor; ITL Special Education; ITL Science; ITL Social Studies; ITL Career and Technical Education; CAS Facilitator

TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS DATA

(data regarding teacher needs, classroom observations, and student needs)

Data Sources:

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS 12-13 Distinguished:4% Proficient:76% Needs Improvement: 4% Failing:16% 13-14 Distinguished: 3% Proficient: 94% Needs Improvement:3% Failing:0% VAM (Value-Added Measures) 12-13 Average Westinghouse Teacher VAM: 40 Average District Teacher VAM: 51 13-14 Average Westinghouse Teacher VAM: 47 Average District Teacher VAM: 51 RISE Component 3f: Impacts Student Growth 2012-13 Distinguished: 0% Proficient: 80% Needs Improvement: 20% Failing: 0% 2013-14 Distinguished: 3% Proficient: 94% Needs Improvement: 3% Failing: 0% TRIPOD STUDENT PERCEPTION SURVEY RESULTS- Scores reported in Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) 12-13 Overall School Avg Score: 41 Overall District Avg Score: 53 Lowest Category: Control 28 (District Avg 51) Highest Category: Care 40 (District Avg 53) 13-14 Overall School Avg Score: 36 Overall District Avg Score: 53 Lowest Category: Control 28 (District Avg 51) Highest Category: Care 40 (District Avg 53)

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

Conclusions:

From 12-13 to 13-14, teachers have improved their Educator Effectiveness report. There was an 18% jump in proficiency. Distinguished fell slightly but is consistent with 1 teacher being Distinguished. Rise 3f; teachers improved from 20% Needs Improvement to 3%; 3% of the teachers were Distinguished from one year to the next. For the last two years the VAM has increased 7%. Westinghouse teaching staff is capable of providing effective instruction in order to increase student achievement as indicated by the Educator Effectiveness Report and our RISE 3f data. Although we are capable of increasing student achievement, our VAM does not reflect it. In both our 12-13 and 13-14 Tripod data, it shows that our lowest category was in classroom control i.e. behavior management and relationships. It is clear after reviewing our data, that control is something our students and staff need to improve. Providing staff with the appropriate PD and resources to do this is essential.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths According to the Educator Effectiveness Report, teachers at Westinghouse have shown growth as demonstrated by the increase in the numbers of Proficient and Distinguished teachers over the last 2 years. Students have also rated teachers highest in the Care category of the Tripod Survey. Teachers are able to select an instructional element and progress monitor it resulting in students' growth. Concerns Although teachers are making progress on their Educator Effectiveness Reports and Rise 3f, our VAM scores as well as our PSSA scores and Keystone exam scores are not showing the growth we are capable of. Our students see control as the lowest category on the Tripod Survey. This is also reinforced by our suspension data.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal

ADDITIONAL REFORM DATA**Data Sources:**

13-14 Parent Survey Parents indicated that the school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students: The district avg from parents: Strongly Agree: 18% Agree: 37% Neutral: 28% Disagree: 10% Strongly Disagree: 7% Westinghouse avg from parents: Strongly Agree: 8% Agree: 31% Neutral: 40% Disagree: 13% Strongly Disagree: 8% TLE (Teaching Learning Environment) SURVEY The TLE Survey is an actionable teacher feedback survey which promotes excellence in teaching and learning. The TLE asks teachers to give feedback on specific aspects of the classroom and school environment. 2013-14 Managing Student Conduct. Students at this school understand the expectations for their conduct Overall School Average Score: Strongly disagree: 11% Disagree: 17% Agree: 49% Strongly agree: 23% The faculty work in a school environment that is safe Overall School Average Score: Strongly disagree: 5% Disagree: 15% Agree: 53% Strongly Agree: 28%

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal; PTO, PSSC, PBIS, Restorative Justice Team

Conclusions:

According to the Parent survey, 48% of our parents agree that Westinghouse has effective ways of dealing with student discipline. Parents are confident that the school is able to handle student behavior effectively. The TLE survey indicates teachers believe that 72% of the students understand the expectations for their behaviors/conduct. 83% of the teachers also believe that Westinghouse is a safe place to work.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: Parents feel like we are effectively dealing with behavior. More than half of the teachers feel like students understand the expectations for their actions and feel like Westinghouse is a safe environment to work in. Concerns: 52% of our parents still feel unsure or neutral about whether we are dealing with behavior effectively. There is still 20% of the staff that do not feel safe in the environment they are working in. This is a concern because it could affect teacher attendance. Finally 28% of the teachers do not feel like students understand the expectations for their behavior.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet: Science ITL; Elective ITL; Reading Interventionist; English ITL Temp; PSE ITL; Social Studies ITL; PFT rep; Assistant Principals; Learning Environment Specialist; Principal; PTO, PSCC, PBIS, Restorative Justice Team

LEADERSHIP OR BUILDING CHANGES

Data Sources:

PPS Human Resources 11-12 school year, 97 % of the teachers at Westinghouse were new. 12-13 school year, 40% of the teachers at Westinghouse were new. 13-14 school year, 22.2% of the teachers at Westinghouse were new. 14-15 school year, 29.5% of the teachers at Westinghouse were new. The average teacher turnover rate at Westinghouse is 47.1%. In 11-12 school year, three new Principals were assigned at Westinghouse, during the same school year the three Principals were moved and another new principal was placed at the school along with a new vice principal. About a month later, that vice principal left and another one came in his place. In 12-13 school year, the new principal and vice principal were in place from the previous year. In 13-14 school year a new principal and two brand new assistant principals were assigned to Westinghouse. In 14-15 another new principal was assigned with the previous two assistant principals.

Data Reviewers:

Instructional Cabinet Members, Human Resources, Administrative team

Conclusions:

There has been a new emphasis placed on providing students with quality instruction within the school because of teacher turnover. Teachers engaged in the RISE process have a difficult time improving their practice due, in part, to the constant change in administration. Students, faculty and staff have a difficult time building relationships with each other because of the constant turnover of teachers and administration. There is a need for a consistent teaching staff as well as an administrative staff.

Strengths or Concerns:

Concerns: The data presented above is a concern for all years indicated. The constant turnover of staff impacts the building by creating a gap in knowledge for the faculty. In some cases teachers were just placed here and did not want to be here. It is challenging for the leadership team, teacher leads and district level curriculum team to consistently implement PD to keep all staff members' knowledge of pedagogy and best practices current. The leadership team at Westinghouse was challenged by the constant turnover of administration. It was difficult for staff and students to continue to build relationships with new people and to buy into expectations and routines established by each new administrator. Strengths: The current principal has a proven commitment to the Homewood community and a proven record of positive school transformation. Both current asst principals were former teachers at Westinghouse and both have chosen to remain at Westinghouse for three years in a row.

Data Analysis Review:

Instructional Cabinet Members, Human Resources, Administrative team

PARENT/COMMUNITY DATA

(level of involvement, opportunities for involvement, and parent feedback)

Data Sources:

Parent Engagement Survey: At Westinghouse, 11.73% parents participated. The responses and suggestions from parents help the team with developing and implementing new, engaging and creative ways to involve parents with upcoming events throughout the school year. Parent School Community Council (PSCC): The attendance (data: sign in sheets) for our monthly meetings has increased from 10 to 25 parents, community members and school staff in attendance. Parent Teacher Organization: The PSCC worked with our FACE Coordinator to begin a PTO during the 13-14SY. This year we elected officers and had a monthly meeting with agendas that were developed collectively. TLE Survey: Teaching and learning environment Parents/guardians are influential decision makers in this school. 2013-14 District Averages: Strongly agree: 16% Agree: 45% Disagree: 30% Strongly Disagree: 9% Westinghouse Avg: Strongly agree: 2% Agree: 15% Disagree: 49% Strongly disagree: 34%

Data Reviewers:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Teachers; FACE Coordinator; and Parents

Conclusions:

Our Parent Engagement Data shows that 20.9% responded to the survey and for the ones who did respond, 63% attend the school for parent meetings and/or other events. However, during our monthly PSCC meetings, time is spent to develop parental involvement in regard to our Bulldog PRIDE (PBIS) initiative, parent workshops and training to support student achievement and on-going communication with parents. According to the teachers at Westinghouse 17% agree that parents are influential in decision making.

Strengths or Concerns:

Strengths: We have a supportive and active PSCC and emerging PTO to plan, develop and implement parental involvement opportunities for all parents. Concerns: However, our data shows of the 11.73% who did participate, many did not provide feedback to the school when asked. The majority of parents did not respond for us to effectively support all parents. There are many barriers that prevent our parents from effectively being involved at meetings and school events such as but not limited to: safety, transportation and educational resources. 83% of the teachers still feel like parents are not influential in decision making in the building which means that they do not feel like parents' voices are heard.

Data Analysis Review:

Principal; Assistant Principals; Teachers; FACE Coordinator; and Parents

Explain how the stakeholders will continue to be involved in the implementation of the SIG model in this school.

The stakeholders will be involved with the SIG grant by incorporating SIG as a topic into already established monthly team meetings. The following teams have a variety of different parents, students, community members and staff: PBIS Culturally Responsive Education team, Community Design team, PTO, and the PSCC. During these monthly meetings, members of these teams will continue with a two-way dialogue which will allow for feedback, questions and monitoring to occur. Once that is done, ongoing areas of focus at the monthly meetings will include, but not be limited to implementation progress, budget review and program analysis. These monthly meetings are open to all staff, parents and community members. This collaborative structure will allow for teachers, parents and community members to share the building of agendas and discussion points among all stakeholders.

When providing prioritized needs, based on the Needs Assessment, each need should be numbered (1,2,3) so that prioritized needs can be easily linked to the goals, activities, and evaluations throughout the application.

Please be concise and limit your characters to 800 per text box when completing the table below.

Priority Need #	Need Description	Annual Goal-Year 1	Annual Goal-Year 2	Annual Goal-Year 3	Annual Goal-Year 4	Annual Goal-Year 5
1	To decrease the number of suspensions. This is linked to our student behavior and attendance data in the previous section as well as our goal in our School Level Comprehensive Plan to ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.			10% decrease in student suspensions from the previous year. Teaching and Learning Staff Survey: Increase in the area of Managing Student Conduct, "Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct" from 47% to 52% Tripod Student Survey: Increase in the areas of Control in student perception survey from 38% to 43%. Parent Survey: Increase parent perception in "The school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students from 48% to 53%.	10% decrease in student suspensions from the previous year. Teaching and Learning Staff Survey: Increase in the area of Managing Student Conduct, "Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct" from 52% to 57% Tripod Student Survey: Increase in the areas of Control in student perception survey from 43% to 48%. Parent Survey: Increase parent perception in "The school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students from 53% to 58%.	10% decrease in student suspensions from the previous year. Teaching and Learning Staff Survey: Increase in the area of Managing Student Conduct, "Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct" from 57% to 62% Tripod Student Survey: Increase in the areas of Control in student perception survey from 48% to 53%. Parent Survey: Increase parent perception in "The school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students from 58% to 63%.

<p>Suspension Data: 10% decrease in student suspensions from the previous year. Teaching and Learning Staff Survey: Increase in the area of Managing Student Conduct, "Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct" from 37% to 42% Tripod Student Survey: Increase in the areas of Control in student perception survey from 28% to 33%. Parent Survey: Increase parent perception in "The school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students from 39% to 43%.</p>	<p>Suspension Data: 10% decrease in student suspensions from the previous year. Teaching and Learning Staff Survey: Increase in the area of Managing Student Conduct, "Students at this school understand expectations for their conduct" from 42% to 47% Tripod Student Survey: Increase in the areas of Control in student perception survey from 33% to 38%. Parent Survey: Increase parent perception in "The school has effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students from 43% to 48%.</p>			
---	---	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Increase PSSA and Keystone scores. This is linked to our Reading/Language Arts, Math, Student Behavior, Attendance, Graduation, Professional Development and Teacher Effectiveness data as well as our goal in our School Level Comprehensive Plan to ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching.</p>	<p>Increase PSSA and Keystone scores: Reading Grades 6-8 from 21% to 24% Math Grades 6-8 from 28% to 31% Keystone Literature (first-time test-takers) from 6% to 10% Keystone Algebra 1 (first-time test-takers) from 2% to 7%</p>	<p>Reading Grades 6-8 from 24% to 29% Math Grades 6-8 from 31% to 36% Keystone Literature (first-time test-takers) from 10% to 18% Keystone Algebra 1 (first-time test-takers) from 7% to 15%</p>	<p>Reading Grades 6-8 from 29% to 35% Math Grades 6-8 from 36% to 41% Keystone Literature (first-time test-takers) from 18% to 25% Keystone Algebra 1 (first-time test-takers) from 15% to 25%</p>	<p>Reading Grades 6-8 from 35% to 40% Math Grades 6-8 from 41% to 46% Keystone Literature (first-time test-takers) from 25% to 35% Keystone Algebra 1 (first-time test-takers) from 25% to 35%</p>	<p>Reading Grades 6-8 from 40% to 50% Math Grades 6-8 from 46% to 56% Keystone Literature (first-time test-takers) from 35% to 45% Keystone Algebra 1 (first-time test-takers) from 35% to 45%</p>
<p>3</p>		<p>Average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary from a 47 to 50.</p>	<p>Average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary from a 50 to 55.</p>	<p>Average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary from a 55 to 60.</p>	<p>Average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary from a 60 to 65.</p>	<p>Average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary from a 65 to 70.</p>

<p>Increase the average teacher Value-Added Measure score in our Educator Effectiveness Summary. This is linked to our Reading/Language Arts, Math, Student Behavior, Attendance, Graduation, Professional Development and Teacher Effectiveness data as well as our goal in our School Level Comprehensive Plan to ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

School Building Information for Previous SIG Recipients

This school was a previous SIG recipient.

If yes, select Yes and complete the chart and text box below.

If no, select No and Mark Section Complete.

Yes

For previous SIG recipients, complete the chart below with information from the last year the school was receiving funds.

Building Enrollment (Oct)	Building Grade Level	Intervention Model	Number of Instructional Minutes	Number of Students Completing AP/IB or Advanced Math Courses	Number of Students Completing Dual Enrollment Courses	Number of Students Completing AP/IB, Advanced Math, or Dual Enrollment Courses
438	6-12	Transformation	67140	41	13	0

Describe in detail how the goals of the previous model that was implemented during SIG were met.

In an attempt to describe in detail how the SIG goals in the previous model were implemented, we will describe each strategy and its effectiveness: Reform Strategy 1: Replace the Building Principal Implementation of this requirement was met. The school principal was replaced in 2010-11, and was granted sufficient operational flexibility. However, during the school year of 2011-12, there was a change in administration. Reform Strategy 2: Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff with skills necessary to implement reform. Implementation of this requirement was met. The Promise-Readiness Corps (PRC) program, explained in the Human Capacity section of the application, was implemented. Teams met every morning before school for progress monitoring. A new online application process was developed to recruit and hire highly qualified instructors. Building on the success of 2011-12, the PRC became a career ladder role for teachers with a proven record of increasing student achievement. Reform Strategy 3: Provide high quality, job-embedded professional development. Implementation of this requirement was not met. In short, changes in leadership made it difficult to fully implement this requirement. Reform Strategy 4: Adopt a new governance structure. Implementation of this requirement was met. Turnaround specialist was identified and hired. The timelines, details, and goals are in place for the establishment of necessary reporting systems. A plan to monitor these systems are in place. Data has been review and adjustments to the systems were made accordingly. We have evidence of ongoing intensive technical assistance from Administration and the turnaround team. Reform Strategy 5: Establish schedules and strategies that increase learning time. Implementation of this requirement was met. In 2009-10, students attended school 180 days and the instructional hours were 7 hrs and 16 min. In 2010-11, ten additional days were added and the instructional hours increased to 8 hours. The school implemented Period 10- a credit recovery program, which allows student in grades 9-10 to recover credits necessary to graduate. Additionally, there were also opportunities to recover credits during the weekend, holiday breaks, and during the summer. This demonstrates an increase in learning during the day, week, month and year that was substantial enough to support growth in student achievement. Reform Strategy 6: Implement fully-aligned high-quality curriculum. Implementation of this requirement was met through promoting continuous use of student data to inform and differentiate instruction. Teachers were given time during PD to review data with their grade-level and content area to formulate a plan. We implemented a student information system to provide student data. We also used PSAT and SAT/ACT scores in order to enroll students in Advanced Placement and College Ready level courses. Reform Strategy 7: Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement. Implementation of this requirement was met. A Parent School Community Engagement Specialist was hired. During this time a parent group was established and organized. Public meetings to review school performance and the school improvement plan was held. Surveys were also given to gauge parent and community satisfaction

Chronic Absenteeism Rate	Teacher Attendance Rate	Student Attendance Rate
50.1	95.42	85.14

and support for public schools. Partnerships were formed with parent, faith and community-based organizations, health clinics, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional and health needs. Finally, a Program Manager was hired to facilitate all of the schools providers and outside resources. Reform Strategy 8: Develop a plan to monitor staff effectiveness. Implementation of this requirement was partially met. The plan used the results of informal and formal classroom observations to place teachers into different caseloads of the administrative team or onto Supported Growth Plans, which allowed teachers to grow in a small teams based on specific trends that were observed during instruction. The administration team tracked the results of teacher performance based on the components of the observation model and then provided PD accordingly. This plan was not implemented fully due to teacher and administrative changes. Conclusion: Annual Goal Analysis The school performance measures established in the 2009-10 SIG application set a goal of: Keystone English Literacy: 100% participation and 72% prof Keystone Algebra 1: 100% participation and 67% prof Grades 6-8 PSSA Math: 78% proficient PSSA Reading: 81% proficient These goals were in progress, but were not met due to high administration and teaching staff turnover rates. The actual 2013-14 assessment results are as follows: Keystone English Literacy: 95% participation and 12.5% prof Keystone Algebra 1: 95% participation and 6.5% prof Grades 6-8 PSSA Math: 39% prof PSSA Reading: 32% prof

Selection of Model

Choose the intervention model to be used in this school.

- Turnaround
- Transformation
- Restart
- Early Learning
- Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform

The LEA must adequately support the intervention selected by each school. The LEA/school must include and describe family and community input when selecting the intervention. The LEA must describe how it will provide effective oversight and support for the implementation of the selected intervention (LEA/School leadership team, progress monitoring of leading indicators, establishing annual goals, family and community input, etc.).

Provide a brief summary of the process used to select one of the six reform models and explain why the model chosen is the best option for meeting the needs of the school. The LEA must also demonstrate how, to the extent practicable, it will implement one or more evidence-based strategies. The following links contain examples of strategies: What Works Clearinghouse at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/> or the Department of Education's comprehensive centers at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/newccp/contacts.html>.

The decision around which SIG model to implement at Westinghouse was a group effort that included input from the Principal, the District Deputy Superintendent, the entire Office of School Performance—which consists of the Chief of School Performance and five Assistant Superintendents, as well as the District Title Programs Coordinator. Given the short timeline for turning around a SIG application, the inclusion of a broader group of stakeholders in the decision making regarding what model to implement was not feasible. However, as explained in the stakeholder engagement section of the application, if the school is awarded a grant, we will fully engage our entire school community in our SIG reform efforts as we do in our Comprehensive Planning, Discipline Committee and our Community School team. The decision to implement the Transformation Model would help us leverage some of the research-based practices we already have in place at the school and ones that will be implemented during the 2015-16 school year. Some of those practices are teachers collaborating around students academically, behaviorally, and socially as part of our Promise Readiness Corps; job-embedded PD based on the needs of our students, teachers, and community; our Research-based Inclusive System of Evaluation based on Charlotte Danielson's model for teacher growth; and our Positive Behavior Intervention System. It will also allow us to build on our plan of creating a multi-tiered system of support to meet students' academic, behavior and social needs with the support of a true community school. The other five models were reviewed and deemed to be the least effective to affect change at Westinghouse. The Turnaround Model would require the school to screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50%. As mentioned in the narrative section of the grant, one of the challenges we've had is staff turnover. We are working to retain staff, removing 50% of the staff now would serve to perpetuate the staff turnover rate. Moreover, the work that would need to be done leading up to being able to screen the staff and rehire no more than 50% would be time intensive and would delay the implementation of the reform. School Closure or Restart is not warranted because as mentioned in the needs assessment, the school has shown some growth in student achievement and graduation rates and more importantly closing this school would leave a neighborhood with high needs without a secondary educational facility. Lastly, the Evidence-Based, Whole-School Reform Model isn't a viable option because we believe the new administration has begun to put practices in place that will support increased outcomes for students.

The school is a Title I school that does not meet the 40% poverty threshold and is applying for a waiver to implement a schoolwide plan.

No

Project#: 142-15-0340

Agency: Pittsburgh SD

AUN: 102027451

Appendix B

SIG 1003g Cohort 5-School Level

Page 22 of 53

Turnaround Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will be implementing the Turnaround Model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

No

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Turnaround model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal(s), Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of evaluation, Estimated 5-year cost, and the Priority goal these actions will address.

In the tables below, list a single goal per row. Add as many rows as necessary. Complete the text boxes below with the information as requested.

Replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the transformation model (If the principal was replaced in the 2012-13 school year or after as part of a reform effort, the principal does NOT need to be replaced. The circumstances of the principal replacement must be explained within the SIG application.). A new principal must be in place for the start of the 2015-16 school year. **SIG funds may not be used to pay the salary/benefits of the principal.**

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students, and 1) screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent and 2) select new staff.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a turnaround school.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Adopt a new governance structure which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA, hire a new "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically-aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with Pennsylvania Core Standards.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Provide staff ongoing, high-quality job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

OPTIONAL:

For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of the title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

Element Modifying	Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Describe how the modification of one element of the Turnaround model meets the intent and purpose of the element.

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Transformation Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will implement the Transformation model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

Yes

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Transformation model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal, Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of evaluation, Estimated 5-year cost, and the Priority Goal these actions will address.

In the tables below, list a single goal per row. Add as many rows as necessary. Complete the text boxes below with the information as requested.

Replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the Transformation model. (If the principal was replaced in the 2012-13 or after as part of a reform effort, the principal does NOT need to be replaced.) The circumstances of the principal replacement must be explained with the SIG application. A new principal must be in place for the start of the 2015-16 school year.

SIG funds may not be used to pay the salary/benefits of the principal.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Hire an effective leader who is a transformational change agent and has a proven record of turning a low-performing school around.	The current principal has been in place since July 1, 2014	This action has been completed. The current principal was placed at this school on July 1, 2014.	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

The previous principal was replaced effective July 1, 2014. The current principal has successfully led the turnaround effort at an elementary school in the same neighborhood for the previous three years. During those years, the school's Value Added Measures moved from 11 to 82, suspensions decreased from over 475 incidents to under 40 incidents and attendance increased from 91.12% to 93.33%. The school was also named a 2013-14 Students and Teachers Achieving Results (STAR) school for being in the top 20% of schools showing growth in the state.

Action(s) to be Taken:

Create bi-weekly SIG data meetings. These will included the administration, program manager, counselor, social worker, Instructional Teacher Leaders (math, English, science and social studies), Special Education Lead Teacher. The group would collectively decide what was to be the current focus, based on the data, (attendance, behavior, pass rates in math/English, etc.). We will then each take an action that must be completed by the next meeting.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Once named, the principal held several large and small meetings with the families, community members,

and neighbor leaders such as the neighborhood churches. During these events, the vision of the principal was shared including plans for how the community would be involved. The principal had a PSCC, PTO and a Leadership team meetings within the first month of being hired.

Method of Evaluation:

PULSE 2 (Pittsburgh Urban Leadership System for Excellence) is the school leader evaluation model in the Pittsburgh Public Schools. PULSE 2 includes locally-developed elements, is aligned to state requirements, and includes the use of the PA Framework for Leadership. The evaluation system includes student growth information through school-level value-added measures, the PA School Performance Profile, and beginning in 2015-16, Student Learning Objectives; as well as teacher correlation data.

Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that 1) take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates; and 2) are designed and developed with principal and teacher involvement.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Growth and evaluation system for teachers and school leaders	Components of the tchr & princ eval systems have been in place since 2010 & 2007, respectively. Full implementation that looks at effectiveness thru multiple lenses began 13-14 & 14-15, respectively.	Ongoing	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

PPS growth and evaluation systems in place for teachers and school leaders look at teaching and leadership through multiple lenses. The teacher evaluation model was locally developed and is aligned to new state requirements for teacher evaluation. It includes the use of a Danielson-based observation rubric, student growth information through value-added measures or Student Learning Objectives, and student feedback on teacher effectiveness. Similarly, the evaluation model in place for school leaders includes locally-developed elements and is aligned to state requirements. It includes the use of the PA Framework for Leadership observation rubric adapted for use in Pittsburgh; student growth information through school-level value-added measures, the PA School Performance Profile, and Student Learning Objectives (beginning in 2015-16); and teacher correlation data. Both models for evaluation establish a higher standard of performance than the rest of the state.

Action(s) to be Taken:

PPS received state approval for its teacher and school leader evaluation models through the end of 2016-17. The District will need to discuss, evaluate, and plan for how to seek re-approval, inclusive of any improvements made to the models since the original approval in 2014.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Community members played a critical role in obtaining state approval of the growth and evaluation

systems for staff. Pittsburgh Public Schools engaged faith-based leaders, civil rights advocates, families, business and foundation leaders, elected officials, and non-profit organizations in advocating for equitable access to great teaching. Community members took more than 600 actions in 2013-14 in support of this work including house parties, press conferences, op-eds, and more. Additionally, the entire Pittsburgh community was invited to a November 2014 event to celebrate teachers and schools open their doors to families when they celebrate their STAR awards. During its twice annual meetings with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, community partners have been invited to learn more about the District's work to ensure all students have an effective teacher in their classroom and how those teachers are being recognized with both financial rewards and leadership opportunities.

Method of Evaluation:

The District has worked with an independent evaluator, Westat, to evaluate the impact of the Promise-Readiness Corps on student outcomes. Additionally, Westat conducts both qualitative and quantitative research on knowledge and perceptions of the teacher growth and evaluation system, rewards and recognition programs, and promotional opportunities for teachers. There is also a significant amount of analysis and research that has been conducted about the District's human capital systems, including reports by the National Center on Teacher Quality, A+ Schools, and by the United States Department of Education. The District also works with many research partners (e.g., Strategic Data Project, RAND, New Teacher Center, Mathematica Policy Research) and its own internal data team to learn more about the effectiveness of its teachers, teacher impact on student outcomes, perception and usefulness of professional development, teacher leadership, and more.

Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improving student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Provide Principals with Operational flexibility to support their efforts towards improving student achievement outcomes	Many of the flexibilities listed below have been in place for some time in our District. The additional flexibility around staffing began in the Spring 2015 for the 2015-16 school year	Ongoing	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

As the building and instructional leader, Principals have the following flexibility to fully leverage the Transformation Model to substantially improve student outcomes. - Design the master schedule in a way that best support the needs of students; - Partner with community service providers that can best augment and support their programs and student populations; - Plan PD around the needs of their staff; and - Pilot supplemental programs once they have gone through the vetting process. Additionally, budgeting for schools is site-based, which allows the principals to make decisions that are in accordance with program design on an on-going basis, including the selection of some key staff. Beginning in the 2015-16 SY, schools are allocated a lump sum for non-teaching staff based on school size and teaching staff based on the number of rounds per grade. Principals have the flexibility to then determine what staff is necessary to ensure all student needs are met.

Action(s) to be Taken:

There are no actions to take for this requirement. Principals will continue to have flexibility to implement school reform that will impact student outcomes.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Parents and community members have been a part of our school improvement planning since February, 2015. Their input was solicited during PSCC meetings and PTO meetings. Parents, students and community members will be a part of the PBIS Culturally Responsive Education and restorative justice teams. This team meets monthly to review data facilitated PATTAN. During monthly PSCC and PTO meetings, we will introduce standards based education by showing parents what a standard looks like and how they can help their child(ren) at home.

Method of Evaluation:

School master schedule, student schedules, submitted budgets, and through the principal's Pittsburgh Urban Leadership System for Excellence (PULSE) evaluation. Timeline: August: PULSE beginning of Year Completed student schedules Completed master schedule January: PULSE Mid Year June: PULSE end of year

Identify and reward school leaders, teachers and other staff who, in implementing this model, increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Reward school leaders, teachers and other staff	Efforts to identify and recognize highly effective teachers began in August 2013. These efforts are ongoing.	Ongoing. Add'l compensation for teachers based on performance was awarded for the 1st time during the 2011-12 SY. Teachers have earned this each year since.	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

In November 2014, PPS hosted its first reception to honor nearly 400 teachers performing at the Distinguished level in the teacher evaluation system. For the first time, performance information based on multiple measures for school leaders and non-teaching professionals will be available at the end of this school year. In addition to recognizing effective performance, the district is also rewarding it. Since 2012-13, the district has awarded \$3.7 million to staff in schools whose contributions to student growth place them in the top 25% in the state through the STAR program. Since 2011-12, members of the Promise-Readiness Corps have earned over \$700,000 in bonuses based on achieving better than expected student outcomes. Staff performing at the lowest two levels of performance in the evaluation system are required to participate in intensive support. If improvement is not evident, staff receiving two consecutive unsatisfactory ratings are eligible for dismissal.

Action(s) to be Taken:

The District has benefitted from funding from local, national, and federal grants to achieve the goals

outlined in its Empowering Effective Teachers plan. The majority of this funding will expire by summer 2016 and currently covers some or all costs associated with rewards and recognition programs and promotional roles for teachers. When the District received these funds, it planned for how to continue the financial support of these programs beyond the funding period; however, the degree to which these programs continue will be the subject of continuous improvement conversations as the district learns from these efforts and better understands how to most effectively leverage them. Westinghouse will receive an add'l 15 career ladder positions, with 12 eligible for the bonus for increasing graduation rates.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

The entire Pittsburgh community was invited to a November 2014 event to celebrate teachers and schools open their doors to families when they celebrate their STAR awards. During its twice annual meetings with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, community partners have been invited to learn more about the District's work to ensure all students have an effective teacher in their classroom and how those teachers are being recognized with both financial rewards and leadership opportunities.

Method of Evaluation:

The District has worked with an independent evaluator, Westat, to evaluate the impact of the Promise-Readiness Corps on student outcomes. Additionally, Westat conducts both qualitative and quantitative research on knowledge and perceptions of the teacher growth and evaluation system, rewards and recognition programs, and promotional opportunities for teachers. There is also a significant amount of analysis and research that has been conducted about the District's human capital systems, including reports by the National Center on Teacher Quality, A+ Schools, and by the United States Department of Education. The District also works with many research partners (e.g., Strategic Data Project, RAND, New Teacher Center, Mathematica Policy Research) and its own internal data team to learn more about the effectiveness of its teachers, teacher impact on student outcomes, perception and usefulness of professional development, teacher leadership, and more.

Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Professional Learning Communities with a focus on Data Teams	August 2015	Ongoing	\$80,000.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

This goal aligns with my school improvement plan goal: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching. PLCs will allow the principal, instructional director, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), ITL2s and/or other teacher leaders to facilitate learning and learning processes using the data teams process to embed teacher learning into daily actions with students. The data team process will allow teachers to collaboratively set goals using common assessments based on prioritized needs and standards, identify effective instructional strategies based on student progress, and collaboratively monitor and adjust based on predetermined indicators of success.

Action(s) to be Taken:

Teachers will build an understanding of the PA Core Standards led by teacher leaders, including the ITL2s during PD periods. • Unwrapping Standards • Prioritizing Standards • Developing a continuous cycle of improvement through the use of student learning outcomes Teachers will be introduced to the concept of PLCs as data teams to be held during TIPT and PD periods. Based on student learning as measured and monitored thru diagnostic, benchmark, and formative assessment data, teachers will collectively identify and implement instructional strategies, then measure the effectiveness through student learning. These data teams will also be used to measure the student social growth using the same cycle. Teachers will be learn strategies about PBIS Culturally Responsive Education as well as restorative justice practices so that they will be able to implement equitable lessons and practices based on their learning. To create a regular PD calendar

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Parents, students and community members will be a part of the PBIS Culturally Responsive Education and restorative justice teams. During PSCC and PTO meetings, we will introduce standards based education by showing parents what a standard looks like and how they can help their child(ren) at home. Sharing of progress reports with parents every 4 weeks for a clear understanding of student progress.

Method of Evaluation:

The leadership will be reviewing benchmark data four times a year, diagnostic data three times a year, and formative assessment data every six weeks. Teachers will evaluate PD sessions quarterly as well as submitting exit tickets after PD sessions. Summatively, we should see: - Improvement in our PVASS - Recruit and retain staff through financial incentives and opportunities for career growth

Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of students in a transformation model.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Recruit and retain staff through financial incentives and opportunities for career growth	See "Description of Goal" for start date of teacher system. The performance-based compensation system for principals has been in place since the 2007-08 SY. Both of these systems are ongoing.	Teachers began serving in new promotional roles during the 2011-12 SY, and each year since. These roles are ongoing.	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

In addition to the financial reward programs detailed in a previous goal, PPS has other performance-based compensation programs. Teachers hired after July 2010 are placed on a salary schedule that ties their compensation to performance. Teachers consistently performing at the highest level in the evaluation system can earn a six-figure salary within 10 years. Additionally, principal compensation is tied to performance on their observation rubric and to school-level student outcomes. District leadership also

participates in a performance-based compensation system. PPS also provides promotional opportunities to teachers based on effectiveness information. At the start of the 2015-16 school year, nearly 200 educators will be working in these promotional roles, designed to support student learning and peer professional growth. Teachers in these roles earn up to an additional \$13,000 in annual compensation for their participation.

Action(s) to be Taken:

The District has benefited from funding from local, national, and federal grants to achieve the goals outlined in its Empowering Effective Teachers plan. The majority of this funding will expire by summer 2016 and currently covers some or all costs associated with rewards and recognition programs and promotional roles for teachers. When the District received these funds, it planned for how to continue the financial support of these programs beyond the funding period; however, the degree to which these programs continue will be the subject of continuous improvement conversations as the district learns from these efforts and better understands how to most effectively leverage them.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

The District has informed stakeholders about financial incentives earned by principals and teachers through local media. Additionally, local media has shared progress and impact of promotional opportunities for teachers since their start in Pittsburgh Public Schools.

Method of Evaluation:

The District has worked with an independent evaluator, Westat, to evaluate the impact of the Promise-Readiness Corps on student outcomes. Additionally, Westat conducts both qualitative and quantitative research on knowledge and perceptions of the teacher growth and evaluation system, rewards and recognition programs, and promotional opportunities for teachers. There is also a significant amount of analysis and research that has been conducted about the District's human capital systems, including reports by the National Center on Teacher Quality, A+ Schools, and by the United States Department of Education. The District also works with many research partners (e.g., Strategic Data Project, RAND, New Teacher Center, Mathematica Policy Research) and its own internal data team to learn more about the effectiveness of its teachers, teacher impact on student outcomes, perception and usefulness of professional development, teacher leadership, and more.

Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Academic & Social enrichment After-School; Credit Recovery	July 2015	Ongoing	\$210,000.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

A menu of effective after-school community partners will be given to all families that will provide all students learning opportunities for academic remediation as well as social enrichment.

Action(s) to be Taken:

Hire an additional counselor and social worker to identify student needs and necessary services. Counselor will ensure students are receiving services to include but not limited to: mental health, drug

and alcohol, career readiness. Social Worker will insure students are receiving services. The student services team will identify an intake process for all new students that will identify student's academic, mental health and behavior needs so that we offer necessary services/programs. The program manager will create a matrix for partnered programs that references purpose and frequency; assist in enrolling students into programs based on student needs as communicated by the student services team and design leverage reports that measure the effectiveness of partnered programs. All core content teachers will be assigned content specific PD period each day to allow them to collaborate with their respective PLC.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

In addition to the information solicited by families previously, we also complete an intake with every newly enrolled student. Based on the information gleaned from these interviews, we seek out programs that meet the needs of the family. We also invite community agencies and organization to our PSCC meetings to present how they can support Westinghouse.

Method of Evaluation:

The effectiveness of this process will be evaluated by measuring the number of students needs being serviced as well as the progress of the students. This evaluation will occur monthly during our Student Assistance Program (SAP) meetings and our Program for Students with Exceptionalities Staffing Meetings. Partners and Programs will be evaluated bi-annually through leverage reports which will require them to show student progress on agreed upon indicators including but not limited to graduation rate, suspensions, attendance and academic performance.

Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Multi-Tiered System of Support	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2020	\$843,080.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

This goal aligns with my school improvement plan goal: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students. This will assist in creating our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)-defined as a comprehensive system of supports that includes standards-aligned, culturally responsive and high quality core instruction, universal screening, data-based decision-making, tiered services and supports, family engagement, central/building level leadership, RtII/SLD determination and professional learning. Simply put, a MTSS represents a broad set of evidence-based practices that may be implemented across a system to include Academics AND Behavior within a recursive and systematic problem-solving process. MTSS is relatively synonymous with RtII and is intended to help ALL students meet with continuous academic and behavioral success.

Action(s) to be Taken:

All core content teachers will be assigned content specific PD period each day to allow them to collaborate with their respective professional learning community. Provide PD that allows teachers to collaboratively unwrap and prioritize state standards. Teachers will ensure that the core curriculum is synchronized with the state standards. Build a school-wide assessment and data monitoring calendar.

Identify and implement a benchmark system, such as 4Sight, that will be scheduled to be administered four times within the school year. Teachers formatively assess and monitor student progress on priority standards then report out progress during monthly data team meeting with administration. Identify and implement diagnostic assessments for reading and math for students that perform below grade level on the Scholastic Reading and Math Inventories and/or PSSA.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

The mechanisms in place to solicit parent and community feedback is the PSCC and PTO meetings. Parents and community members have been included as part of our school improvement planning, which includes review of school data, since February, 2015. Parents, students and community members will be a part of the PBIS Culturally Responsive Education and restorative justice teams. During PSCC and PTO meetings, we will introduce standards based education by showing parents what a standard looks like and how they can help their child(ren) at home. We will also share progress reports with parents every 4 weeks to help them have a clear understanding of their student's progress. Lastly, we meet quarterly with parents of students with less than a 70% average in classes.

Method of Evaluation:

Teachers will evaluate PD sessions quarterly. Exit tickets will be used during every PD session. Teacher attendance log. Student data: Improvement in our PVASS Improvement in Student Achievement Data, Keystone and PSSA Six week data monitoring meetings around benchmark and formative assessment results and grades, first by teacher teams, then by the instructional cabinet. These data will include, 4Sight and GRADE.

Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically-aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with Pennsylvania Core Standards.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Establishing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018	\$0.00	23

Description of Goal(s):

This goal aligns with my school improvement plan goal: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards-aligned curriculum framework and consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all student across all classrooms. Westinghouse will be focusing on building a strong Tier 1 in our MTSS, described below, because our data has consistently shown that over 70% of our students are not performing at grade level. A MTSS is defined as a comprehensive system of supports, academic AND behavior that includes standards-aligned, culturally responsive and high quality core instruction, universal screening, data-based decision-making, tiered services and supports, family engagement, central/building level leadership, RtII/SLD determination and professional learning with a recursive and systematic problem-solving process.

Action(s) to be Taken:

- Hire an Instructional Director to create a Multi-tiered system of support. - Administration and teachers will implement the Reading Apprenticeship professional learning model and instructional framework by pa. All core content teachers will be assigned content specific professional development period each day

to allow them to collaborate with their respective professional learning community. - Provide PD that allows teachers to collaboratively unwrap and prioritize state standards. - Implement a benchmark system scheduled to be administered four times a year. - Implement the data teams process so that teachers collaboratively set goals using common assessments based on prioritized needs based on standards, identify effective instructional strategies based on student progress, and collaboratively monitor and adjust based on predetermined indicators of success. - Create an observation schedule for observation/feedback cycle aligned to teacher learning.

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Parents and community members have been a part of our school improvement planning since February, 2015. Their input was solicited during PSCC meetings and PTO meetings.

Method of Evaluation:

The leadership team will be reviewing benchmark data, such as 4Sight, four times a year, diagnostic data, GRADE, three times a year, and formative assessment data every six weeks. Teachers will evaluate PD sessions quarterly as well as submitting exit tickets after PD sessions. Summatively, we should see: - Improvement in our PVASS - Improvement in Student Achievement Data

Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Ongoing Family and Community Engagement	July 2015	Ongoing	\$75,000.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

As part of the school/community planning and implementation process, Westinghouse will design and execute a series of coordinated strategies to meaningfully engage families and members of the community. Becoming a Community School will provide the structures to help us achieve this goal. Community Schools is an integrated strategy that enhances academics, enrichment, health and social supports, family engagement, youth and community development. The model is enriched by having a site coordinator and providing expanded hours. This integrated strategy will lead to student success, strong families and a healthier community.

Action(s) to be Taken:

Partner with Los Angeles Education Partnership (LAEP) to develop a process for turning Westinghouse into a sustainable, comprehensive community school. Phase 1: Shared vision Review existing documents Create shared expectations, assess membership, & build 6 month plan. Phase 2: Community School Coordinator Develop job description to support shared understanding Assist with reviewing applicants Provide orientation, on-going support & 3 month work plan Phase 3: Facilitation & support Provide onsite facilitation support Create 6 month goals & work plan Oversee needs assessment Committee establish 2 priorities Assess use of work groups to achieve goals Phase 4: Building a trusting, transparent & inclusive environment Assess culture Create plan for learning & collaboration Phase 5: Building infrastructure Develop 2nd 6 month work plan for Committee & coordinator Phase 6: Project Wrap-Up Create work plan & goals for year 2

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Key components of the community school family and community engagement strategy: - Parent, student

and community representation will be included in decision-making - PIIN, and other organizations lead a strategy to engage parents and students in the planning process. - Structures and processes will be added to monthly Parent School Community Council meetings to engage parents and community members in the community school planning process - Institutionalization of a teacher/school staff home visit program - The community school coordinator, social worker and counselors will create leadership opportunities for students and volunteer opportunities for parents and community members in school-based community partner programs. - Partners and school staff will develop and implement an ongoing curriculum of parent workshops on topics identified by the school leadership body - Partners and school staff will provide student-led "Family Orientation" sessions for incoming students

Method of Evaluation:

The community school steering committee and later the community school leadership body will establish a system of benchmarking family and community engagement goals and evaluating progress. However, we already meet monthly as a steering team to evaluate our progress. We are currently in the process of identifying a rubric that will assist in measuring the implementation process and effectiveness. Ultimately, our community school will be evaluated quarterly by the steering committee. The school will also be monitoring graduation rates, suspensions, attendance and academic performance.

OPTIONAL:

For an LEA eligible for services under subpart 1 or 2 of part B of the title VI of the ESEA (Rural Education Assistance Program) that chooses to modify one element of the turnaround model, the LEA must describe how it will meet the intent and purpose of that element.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Restart Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will implement the Restart model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

No

LEAs are required to implement a rigorous review process for choosing the Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Education Management Organization (EMO). The rigorous review process must include a determination by the LEA that the selected charter school operator, CMO, or EMO is likely to produce strong results for the school. The LEA must consider the extent to which the schools currently operated or managed by the selected charter school operator, CMO, or EMO, if any, have produced strong results over the past three years (or over the life of the school, if the school has been open for fewer than three years), including:

- Significant improvement in academic achievement for all of the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA;
- Success in closing achievement gaps, either within schools or relative to all public elementary school and secondary school students statewide, for all of the groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA;
- High school graduation rates, where applicable, that are above the average rate in the State for the groups of students described in 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA; and
- No significant compliance issues, including in the areas of civil rights, financial management, and student safety.

Describe the rigorous review process implemented by the LEA to choose the Charter Management Organization (CMO) or the Education Management Organization (EMO).

List the selected charter school operator, CMO, or EMO or pool of potential providers that will restart school.

Will the school to be "restarted" retain its original grade configuration? If no, describe the plan for students to be moved to a new school.

Describe the implementation plan to ensure a smooth start for the first year of the restarted school.

Early Learning Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will implement the Early Learning Model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

No

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Early Learning Model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal(s), Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of evaluation, Estimated 5-year cost, and the Priority goal these actions will address.

In the tables below, list a single goal per row. Add as many rows as necessary. Complete the text boxes below with the information as requested.

An elementary school implementing the Early Learning Model must:

- Offer full-day kindergarten
- Establish or expand a high-quality preschool program
- Provide educators, including preschool teachers, with time for joint planning across grades to facilitate effective teaching and learning and positive teacher-student interactions.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Replace the principal who led the school prior to the commencement of the transformation model (If the principal was replaced in the 2012-13 school year or after as part of a reform effort, the principal does NOT need to be replaced. The circumstances of the principal replacement must be explained within the SIG application.). A new principal must be in place for the start of the 2015-16 school year. **SIG funds may not be used to pay the salary/benefits of the principal.**

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that:

- Take into account data on student growth as a significant factor as well as other factors, such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement; and
- Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Identify and reward school leaders, teachers and other staff who, in implementing this model, increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Reward school leaders, teachers and other staff	Efforts to identify and recognize highly effective teachers began in August 2013. These efforts are ongoing.	Ongoing. Add'l compensation for teachers based on performance was awarded for the 1st time during the 2011-12 SY. Teachers have earned this each year since.	\$0.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in an Early Learning Model.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically-aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with Pennsylvania Core Standards.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Establishing a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2018	\$0.00	23

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Multi-Tiered System of Support	July 1, 2015	June 30, 2020	\$843,080.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal
Professional Learning Communities with a focus on Data Teams	August 2015	Ongoing	\$80,000.00	123

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Evidence-Based Whole School Reform Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will implement the evidence-based whole-school reform model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

No

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Evidence-Based Whole-School Reform model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal(s), Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of evaluation, Estimated 5-year cost, and the Priority Goal these actions will address.

In the tables below, list a single goal per row. Add as many rows as necessary. Complete the text boxes below with the information as requested.

The model is evidence-based and contains at least one study meeting the What Works Clearinghouse evidence standards and has statistically favorable impact on academic achievement or attainment.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Model chosen is a whole-school reform model.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated 5-year cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

Closure Model - Description of Reform Plan

This school will implement the Closure model.

If yes, fill out each section below.

If no, skip the rest of the questions in this section.

No

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Closure reform model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal, Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of evaluation, Estimated cost, and the Priority goal these actions will address.

In the table below, list a single goal per row. Add as many rows as necessary. Complete the text boxes below with the information as requested.

Closure model schools may apply for a maximum award of \$200,000.

The LEA has a plan to enroll students in new higher-performing schools or LEAs.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

The LEA has an implementation plan to ensure a smooth school closure occurs by the beginning of the 2015-16 school year.

Goal Name	Anticipated Implementation Start Date	Anticipated Completion Date	Estimated cost	Priority Goal

Description of Goal(s):

Action(s) to be Taken:

Demonstration of Family/Community Input:

Method of Evaluation:

School Level Budget Information

For each required action outlined in the Description of Reform Plan section of the application, up to 5-year cost estimates were required. Provide a breakdown below of each of these estimated costs. Breakdowns must be by year, by category, and by unit and a description must be provided. A description of the plan for sustainability is also required for each budgeted item. The total amount entered in this section of the application should equal the amount estimated in the Description of Reform Plan section.

If Other is selected under Category, a description is mandatory.

Year	Category	Number to be Purchased	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Description of Budgeted Items
Year 1	Professional Development	1	50000	50000	Westinghouse Data Team professional development Sustainability: Internal capacity will be built
Year 1	Contracted Services	1	75000	75000	Westinghouse Los Angeles Education Partnership contract - Community school Sustainability: Internal capacity built
Year 1	Staff Salary	1	24586	24586	Westinghouse Credit recovery staff salaries
Year 1	Staff Benefits	1	5414	5414	Westinghouse Credit recovery staff benefits
Year 1	Contracted Services	1	40000	40000	Westinghouse Kingsley Center summer partnership
Year 2	Staff Salary	1	24586	24586	Westinghouse Credit recovery staff salaries
Year 2	Staff Benefits	1	5414	5414	Westinghouse Credit recovery staff benefits
Year 2	Contracted Services	1	40000	40000	Westinghouse Kingsley Center summer partnership
Year 3	Staff Salary	1	24586	24586	Westinghouse Credit recovery staff salaries Sustainability: Internal capacity built
Year 3	Staff Benefits	1	5414	5414	

					Westinghouse Credit recovery staff benefits Sustainability: Internal capacity built
Year 3	Contracted Services	1	40000	40000	Westinghouse Kingsley Center summer partnership Sustainability: Capacity built within community partner
Year 2	Staff Salary	2	88505	177010	Westinghouse 1.0 FTE Counselor and 1.0 FTE Social Worker
Year 2	Staff Benefits	2	41066	82132	Westinghouse Benefits for 1.0 Counselor and 1.0 Social Worker
Year 3	Staff Salary	2	90275	180550	Westinghouse 1.0 FTE Counselor and 1.0 FTE Social Worker
Year 3	Staff Benefits	2	41888	83776	Westinghouse Benefits for 1.0 Counselor and 1.0 Social Worker
Year 4	Staff Salary	2	92080	184160	Westinghouse 1.0 FTE Counselor and 1.0 FTE Social Worker Sustainability: Internal capacity built with systems, processes and community partners
Year 4	Staff Benefits	2	42726	85452	

					Westinghouse benefits for 1.0 Counselor and 1.0 Social Worker Sustainability: Internal capacity built with systems, processes and community partners
Year 2	Professional Development	1	30000	30000	Westinghouse Professional development for community schools Sustainability: Internal capacity built
Year 5	Staff Salary	1	40977	40977	Westinghouse Staff salaries to monitor sustainability. Internal capacity built.
Year 5	Staff Benefits	1	9023	9023	Westinghouse Benefits for staff to monitor sustainability. Internal capacity built.