INFORMATION ONLY: PERSONNEL REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT   **September 12, 2022**

RETIREMENT – Executive Administrator:

Name	Assignment:	Effective
Dr. Iline Tracey	Superintendent of Schools Superintendent Office (Gateway) **General Funds** **19040000-50110**	06/30/2023

RETIREMENT – Teachers:

Name	Assignment:	Effective Date
Christopher Cozzi	Visual Arts COOP Arts & Humanities **Inter-District Funds** **27042164-50115**	06/30/2022
Wendy Decter	Science Hill Regional Career High School **General Funds** **19041463-50115**	09/01/2022

RETIREMENT – Paraprofessional Staff:

Name	Assignment:	Effective Date
Maria Bonilla	Bilingual Assistant Teacher – Grade 1 Hill Central School **Title 1 Schools** **25315256-07-50128**	06/30/2022
Rhonda Rawlins-Stewart	Assistant Teacher Beecher Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041003-50128**	09/01/2022

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

RESIGNATION – Administrator:

Name	Assignment:	Effective Date
Catherine Harvey	Project Director of Head Start Gateway **East Rock Pre-K** **25236098-443-50118**	09/01/2022

RESIGNATION – Teachers:

Name	Assignment:	Effective Date
Arlene Alava	School Psychologist Clinton Ave **General Funds** **19049198-50115**	06/30/2022
Amber-Michelle Awusah	Special Education Wilbur Cross High School **General Funds** **19049061-50115**	08/23/2022
Savannah Beecher	Special Education Benjamin Jepson Magnet School **General Funds** **19041098-50115**	06/30/2022
Oscaima Berrios	Bilingual Barack Obama Magnet School **General Funds** **19041228-50115**	06/30/2022
Meaghan Choisnet	English Mauro/Sheridan Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041619-50115**	06/30/2022
Elisia Collins	English Wilbur Cross High School **General Funds** **19041661-50115**	06/30/2022

Sophia Corey	Grade 4 Ross/Woodward Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041010-50115**	08/16/2022
Allison Daly	Grade 3 Bishop Woods Executive Academy **General Funds** **19041043-50115**	06/30/2022
Babajide Davis	Special Education Hill Regional Career High School **General Funds** **19049062-50115**	06/30/2022
Michael Defelice	Physical Education Bishop Woods Executive Academy **General Funds** **19040343-50115**	06/30/2022
Mindi Englart	English COOP Arts & Humanities **Inter-District Funds** **27041664-50115**	09/12/2022
Ian Farrell	History/Social Studies Beecher Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041503-50115**	06/30/2022
Larissa Giordano	Grade 5/6 Nathan Hale School **General Funds** **19041014-50115**	06/30/2022
LaNita Holmes	Special Education Brennan Rogers Magnet School **General Funds** **19049021-50115**	09/27/2022
Jeremy Jamison	Behavioral Specialist John C. Daniels **ECS Alliance- Culture & Climate** **25476108-13-50124**	09/16/2022

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Darla Lank

Grade 4
Mauro/Sheridan Magnet School
General Funds
19041019-50115

08/31/2022

Justin Lawrence

Science
Wilbur Cross High School
General Funds
19041461-50115

06/30/2022

Sean Laydon

Math
Truman School
General Funds
19041129-50115

06/30/2022

Amanda Lemoult

Grade 1
Lincoln Bassett School
General Funds
19041020-50115

06/30/2022

Jennifer Lipinsky

Music
Clinton Ave School
General Funds
19042206-50115

09/09/2022

Rachel Lourenco

Grade 6
Barnard Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041002-50115

09/06/2022

Danielle Love

Grade 2
Ross/Woodward Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041010-50115

06/30/2022

Julie Luppino

Music
Roberto Clemente Leadership Academy
General Funds
19042242-50115

08/22/2022

Jade Maddox

Science
King/Robinson Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041430-50115

06/30/2022

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Angela Markiewicz Pre-K   06/30/2022
         Benjamin Jepson Magnet School
         Inter-District Funds
         27041018-50115

Amita Marwah   Math   06/30/2022
         Wilbur Cross High School
         General Funds
         19041161-50115

Katelyn Milliken   Music   09/23/2022
         Brennan Rogers Magnet School
         General Funds
         19042221-50115

Charles O'Donnell Science   06/30/2022
         Engineering & Science University Magnet School
         Inter-District Funds
         27041417-50115

Michelle Opalenik Physical Education   06/30/2022
         Clinton Ave
         General Funds
         19040306-50115

James Pechette   Guidance Counselor   06/30/2022
         Hill Regional Career High School
         General Funds
         19046163-50115

Carla Perone   Grade 2   06/30/2022
         Roberto Clemente Leadership Academy
         General Funds
         19041042-50115

Glory Reyes   7/8 Social Studies   09/02/2022
         Beecher Magnet School
         Inter-District Funds
         27041503-50115

Kristen Rodriguez Grade 3   09/02/2022
         Brennan Rogers Magnet School
         General Funds
         19041021-50115

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Robert Schwartz

English
COOP Arts & Humanities
Inter-District Funds
27041664-50115

09/13/2022

Amy Shaver

Speech and Hearing
Celentano Magnet School
General Funds
19049298-50115

06/30/2022

Kelly Squeglia

Grade 5
Wexler/Grant School
General Funds
19042032-50115

06/30/2022

Jessica Savo

Special Education
Dr. Reginald Mayo Early Learning Center
General Funds
19049081-50115

06/30/2022

Kyla Sead

Grade 2
Wexler/Grant School
ESSER II Funds
25526363-32-50115

06/30/2022

Gregory Stone

Physical Education
Worthington Hooker School
General Funds
19040338-50115

06/30/2022

Alex Bordonaro-Styles

Grade 2
Nathan Hale School
General Funds
19041014-50115

06/30/2022

Whittney Teague

Language Arts
Ross/Woodward Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041310-50115

06/30/2022

Joseph Trapani

Social Studies
Wexler-Grant School
General Funds
19041532-50115

09/07/2022

Hayley Walker | School Psychologist | 06/30/2022
Celentano Magnet School
General Funds
19049148-50115

Heather Wachter | Instructional Literacy Coach | 09/02/2022
Barnard Magnet School
Title 1 Schools
25315256-02-50115

Christine Wright | Set for Success | 06/30/2022
Brennan Rogers Magnet School
ESSER II Funds
25526363-21-50115

Tyler Zielinski | Grade 4 | 06/30/2022
Brennan Rogers Magnet School
General Funds
19041021-50115

RESIGNATION – Paraprofessional Staff:

Name	**Assignment:**	**Effective Date**

Neviene Attalla | Assistant Teacher -Pre-K | 08/22/2022
Mauro/Sheridan Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041019-50128

Brandon Fredlaw | Assistant Teacher | 08/29/2022
Lincoln Bassett School
General Funds
19049020-50128

Shana Gaither | Head Teacher | 06/30/2022
Nathan Hale School
School Readiness Nathan Hale
25235808-14-50128

Ashia Gibbs | Assistant Teacher – Special Education | 09/09/2022
Brennan Rogers Magnet School
General Funds
19049021-50128

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

Charles Gore   Assistant Teacher   06/30/2022
Brennan Rogers Magnet School
General Funds
19049021-50128

Chandra Johnson   Special Education Assistant Teacher   09/07/2022
James Hillhouse High School
General Funds
19049062-50128

Karen King   Assistant Teacher   09/07/2022
East Rock Magnet School
General Funds
19049846-50128

Kyra Lawrence   Assistant Teacher – Kindergarten   06/30/2022
Benjamin Jepson Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041018-50128

Marilyn Rodriguez   Assistant Teacher – Pre-K   06/30/2022
Barnard Magnet School
Inter-District Funds
27041002-50128

Tamia Scott   Assistant Teacher   07/15/2022
Dr. Reginald Mayo Early Learning Center
Head Start PA 22 Basic
25325279-81-50128

Kimberly Smart   Assistant Teacher   08/29/2022
Engineering & Science University Magnet School
Idea Part B Entitlement
25045034-17-50128

Maria Zullo   Assistant Teacher   09/13/2022
Brennan Rogers Magnet School
General Funds
19049021-50128

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

TRANSFERS: Teachers:

Name	From	To	Effective Date
Lisa Finch	Grade 6 Mauro/Sheridan Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041019-50115**	Grade 5 Ross/Woodward Magnet School **General Funds** **27041010-50115**	08/29/2022
Cary Kendrick-Holmes	Grade 2 ESSER Edgewood Magnet School **ESSER II Funds** **25526363-12-50115**	Grade 1 Edgewood Magnet School **General Funds** **19041012-50115**	08/24/2022
Gilberto Lopez	Grade 3 F.A.M.E **ESSER II Funds** **25526363-41-50115**	Grade 3-Spanish Component F.A.M.E **General Funds** **19041041-50115**	08/24/2022
Jessica Light	Grade 3 Worthington/Hooker School **General Funds** **19041038-50115**	Grade 2 Ross/Woodward **Inter-District Funds** **27041010-50115**	08/29/2022
Aaron Moody	Drop Out Prevention Specialist King/Robinson Magnet School **Priority Schools** **25795319-30-50119**	In-House Suspension Worker Conte West Hills Magnet School **General Funds** **19041031-50120**	08/24/2022
Paola Suero-Lora	Pre- K Dr. Reginald Mayo Learning Center **General Funds** **19044381-50115**	Grade 2 Bilingual Barack Obama Magnet School **ESSER II Funds** **25526363-28-50115**	08/24/2022
Jaime Sirico	Library Media Specialist Bishop Woods Executive Academy **General Funds** **19042043-50115**	STEM Bishop Woods Executive Academy **General Funds** **19041443-50115**	08/24/2022

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

RETURN LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Administrators:

Name	Assignment	Effective Date
Melanie Rodriguez Thomas	Assistant Principal Barack Obama Magnet School **General Funds** **19044028-50113**	08/18/2022
David Diah	Principal Wexler Grant School **General Funds** **19044032-50113**	06/13/2022

RETURN LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Teacher:

Name	Assignment	Effective Date
Victoria Craig	Pre-K Dr. Reginald Mayo Early Learning Center **General Funds** **19049881-50115**	08/24/2022
Sheri Smith	Pre-K John C. Daniels **General Funds** **19041013-50115**	08/24/2022

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

RETURN LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Non-Instructional Staff:

Name	Assignment	Effective Date
Nereida Feliciano	General Worker Clinton Ave School **Food Service** **25215200-06-50126**	08/22/2022
Robin Graham	General Worker Mauro/Sheridan Magnet School **Food Service** **25215200-19-50126**	08/22/2022
Maria Villanueva	General Worker Wilbur Cross High School **Food Service** **25215200-61-50126**	08/22/2022

CORRECTION/CHANGE ITEMS:
The following items are previous Board Actions approved. The action items below represent all the necessary changes and/or corrections.

CORRECTION CHANGE IN TITLE —Teacher:

Name	From	To	Effective Date
Angelo Vessichio	Appointment	Post Retirement Reemployment	08/24/2022

TRANSFER RESCINDED —Teacher:

Name	From	To
Erika Koch	Literacy Media Specialist Worthington/Hooker School **General Funds** **19042098-50115**	Rescinded

OFFER RESCINDED —Teacher:

Name	From	To
Jennifer Dowson	Grade 3 ESSER Worthington/Hooker School **ESSER II Funds** **25526363-38-50115**	Rescinded

RESIGNATION RESCINDED —Teacher:

Name	From	To
Keisha Hogan	Grade 3 L.W. Beecher Magnet School **Inter-District Funds** **27041003-50115**	Rescinded

OFFER RESCINDED —Paraprofessional Staff:

Name	From	To
Marjolie Fernandez	Bilingual Assistant Teacher – Grade 1 John C. Daniels **Inter-District Funds** **27041013-50128**	Rescinded

Dr. Iline Tracey, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

NEW HAVEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

NEW HAVEN BOARD OF EDUCATION FINANCE & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, September 6, 2022

ACTION ITEMS

A. INFORMATION ONLY:

1. Agreement with Richard DelVecchio, DDS, to provide oversight and clinical consultation of two Registered Dental Hygienists who provide preventive dental clinics at Barnard, King Robinson, Troup, Hill Central, Truman and Brennan Rogers schools, from September 20, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,000.00.
   Funding Source: Medicaid Program   **Acct. #**2534-5408-56694-0000

2. Agreement with Employer's Reference Source, (ERS), to conduct national criminal background screening for volunteers in New Haven Public Schools, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,000.00.
   Funding Source: School Volunteer Program   **Acct. #** 2528-6028-56694-0000

3. Agreement with Excel Academy, LLC, to provide CNA instruction to 20 Wilbur Cross High School students, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $18,000.00.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0061

4. Amendment #1 to Agreement # 96398007 with Common Ground School, change the funding account number from ARP ESSER III Program, acct. #2553-6398-56694-0038 to ARP ESSER III Carryover Program, acct. # 2553-6399-56694-0038 with no change in funding amount of $6,537.50.00.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0038

5. Agreement with Common Ground School, to provide outdoor learning space and professional development at Celentano School, from September 20, 2022 to June 20, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $17,000.00.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0048

6. Agreement with Common Ground School to provide outdoor learning space and professional development at Bishop Woods School, from September 13, 2022 to June 17, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $15,000.00.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #** 2553-6399-56694-0043

7. Agreement with Common Ground School to provide outdoor activities for PreK-6th grade students in the John C. Daniels School outdoor learning space, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $20, 000.00.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56697-0013

8. Agreement with Mystic Aquarium to provide the Traveling Outreach Program to Mauro Sheridan students, grades 3 to 5, from October 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $7,200.00.

Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56697-0019

9. Agreement with Center for Collaborative Classroom to provide professional development for staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to May 31, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,300.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                          Acct. #2531-6392-56694-0032

10. Agreement with Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company to provide a professional development program to staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to June 14, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $14,280.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                          Acct. #2531-6392-56694-0032

11. Agreement with Curriculum Associates LLC, to provide professional development i-Ready Classroom and i-Ready Math Core tailored support sessions for staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to June 14, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $3,500.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                          Acct. #2547-6293-56694-0032

NEW HAVEN BOARD OF EDUCATION FINANCE & OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

Tuesday, September 6, 2022

Present:	Mr. Matthew Wilcox, Dr. Orlando Yarborough, Ms. Yesenia Rivera

Staff: Dr. Ilene Tracey, Dr. Finley, Dr. Whyte, Ms. Patricia DeMaio, Ms. Typhanie Jackson, Ms. Viviana Conner, Ms. Cari Strand, Ms. Keisha Hannans, Ms. Linda Hannans, Ms. Michele Bonanno, Ms. Ann Brillante, Ms. Florence Crisci, Ms. Margaret Mary Gethings, Ms. YolandA Generette, Ms. Sue Peters, Ms. Rebecca Hunt, Ms. Shubhra Gupta, Mr. Marc Potocksky, Ms, Carol Ryan, Mr. Jeffrey McGrath, Ms. Rosalyn Ortiz, Mr. Justin Harmon, Attorney Elias Alexiades,

Call to Order: Mr. Wilcox called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.

Summary of Motions:

Summary of Motions:
#1: Motion to Recommend Approval of Action Items: A motion by Mr. Wilcox, seconded by Dr. Yarborough, to Recommend Approval of 6 Abstracts, 37 Agreements, 5 Contracts and 5 Change Order, passed unanimously by Roll Call Vote: Ms. Rivera, Yes; Dr. Yarborough, Yes; Mr. Wilcox, Yes.

#2: Motion to Adjourn: A motion by Ms. Rivera, seconded by Dr. Yarborough, to adjourn the meeting at 5:22 p.m., passed unanimously by Roll Call Vote: Ms. Rivera, Yes; Dr. Yarborough, Yes; Mr. Wilcox, Yes.

I.   INFORMATION ONLY & ACTION ITEMS:

A. INFORMATION ONLY: Mr. Wilcox requested a listing, to date, of Agreements approved for Common Ground School. Ms. DeMaio will provide. There were no other questions or discussion regarding the following Information Only items approved by the Superintendent. :

1. Agreement with Richard DelVecchio, DDS, to provide oversight and clinical consultation of two Registered Dental Hygienists who provide preventive dental clinics at Barnard, King Robinson, Troup, Hill Central, Truman and Brennan Rogers schools, from September 20, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,000.00.
   Funding Source: Medicaid Program   **Acct. #**2534-5408-56694-0000

2. Agreement with Employer's Reference Source, (ERS), to conduct national criminal background screening for volunteers in New Haven Public Schools, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,000.00.
   Funding Source: School Volunteer Program   **Acct. #** 2528-6028-56694-0000

3. Agreement with Excel Academy, LLC, to provide CNA instruction to 20 Wilbur Cross High School students, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $18,000.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0061

4. Amendment #1 to Agreement # 96398007 with Common Ground School, change the funding account number from ARP ESSER III Program, acct. #2553-6398-56694-0038 to ARP ESSER III Carryover Program, acct. # 2553-6399-56694-0038 with no change in funding amount of $6,537.50.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0038

5. Agreement with Common Ground School, to provide outdoor learning space and professional development at Celentano School, from September 20, 2022 to June 20, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $17,000.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0048

6. Agreement with Common Ground School to provide outdoor learning space and professional development at Bishop Woods School, from September 13, 2022 to June 17, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $15,000.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #** 2553-6399-56694-0043

7. Agreement with Common Ground School to provide outdoor activities for PreK-6th grade students in the John C. Daniels School outdoor learning space, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $20, 000.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56697-0013

8. Agreement with Mystic Aquarium to provide the Traveling Outreach Program to Mauro Sheridan students, grades 3 to 5, from October 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $7,200.00.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56697-0019

9. Agreement with Center for Collaborative Classroom to provide professional development for staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to May 31, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $10,300.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                   Acct. #2531-6392-56694-0032

10. Agreement with Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company to provide a professional development program to staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to June 14, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $14,280.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                   Acct. #2531-6392-56694-0032

11. Agreement with Curriculum Associates LLC, to provide professional development i-Ready Classroom and i-Ready Math Core tailored support sessions for staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to June 14, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $3,500.00.
    Funding Source: Commissioner's Network Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                   Acct. #2547-6293-56694-0032

B. ABSTRACTS:

1. Commissioners Network – Wexler – Grant, Year 5, in the amount of $344,000.00 for September 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. Viviana Conner on behalf of Mr. David Diah.
   Funding Source: Connecticut State Department of Education   **Document Link**: CommWexler

2. School Volunteer Program Endowment, in the amount of $27,798.00 for July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. DeMaio.
   Funding Source: Community Foundation for Greater New Haven

3. State After-School Grant in the amount of $200,000.00 for July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
   Funding Source: Connecticut State Department of Education

4. 21st Century Community Learning Center – Barnard, Brennan, Celentano – Grant, in the amount of $200,000.00 for July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
   Funding Source: Connecticut State Department of Education

5. 21st Century Community Learning Center – Hill Central, FAME, Nathan Hale – Grant, in the amount of $200,000.00 for July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
   Funding Source: Connecticut State Department of Education

6. 21st Century Community Learning Center – Troup, Wexler – Grant, in the amount of $200,000 for July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
   Funding Source: Connecticut State Department of Education

C. AGREEMENTS:

1. Agreement with American Evaluation Services, Inc., to provide program evaluation and professional services for year 5 of the Magnet School Assistance Program Grant at East Rock, Edgewood, Davis, HSC and King/Robinson schools, from September 13, 2022 to December 31, 2022 in an amount not to exceed $70,619.00 was presented by Ms. Bonanno who explained that the evaluation is required by the U.S. Department of Education.
   Funding Source: Magnet 17-22 Magnet Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2517-6258-56680-0000

2. Agreement with Foundation for the Arts and Trauma, Inc., to provide trauma informed counseling services to Sound School students, from August 29, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.00 was presented by Mr. Potocsky.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0067

3. Agreement with Foundation for Arts and Trauma Inc., to provide trauma informed counseling services for Bishop Woods School students from September 13, 2022 to June 17, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $25,000.00 was presented by Ms. Crisci.
   Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0043

4. Agreement with Higher Heights Youth Empowerment Program, Inc., to provide a college access program to HSC juniors and seniors, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $34,000.00 was presented by Ms. Strand.

Funding Source: SIG Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2531-6425-56694-0066

5. Agreement with Foundation for the Arts and Trauma, Inc., to provide stress reduction sessions, counseling and related services to Wilbur Cross High School students, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $85,000.00 was presented by Ms. Brillante.
    Funding Source: ARP ESSER III Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2553-6399-56694-0061

6. Agreement with Laura Goldblum to supervise a team of 8 social work interns to provide wraparound services to Wilbur Cross High School students, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $22,000.00 was presented by Ms. Brillante.
    Funding Source: 2022-23 Operating Budget   **Acct. #**190-433-61-50136

7. Agreement with Area Cooperative Education Services, to provide ARTEL, an advanced educator preparation program for certification in bilingual and TESOL education, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.00 was presented by Ms. Ortiz on behalf of Mr. Pedro Mendia.
    Funding Source: English Language Acquisition Program (Pending Receipt of Funds)
                                  Acct. #2518-5679-56694-0412

8. Agreement with TaJu Educational Solutions, LLC, to provide professional development on bi-literacy and English language instruction to 20 teachers and administrators, from September 13, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $45,000.00 was presented by Ms. Ortiz on behalf of Mr. Pedro Mendia.
    Funding Source: ESSER II Program   **Acct. #**2552-6363-56694-0412
    Discussion: Mr. Wilcox noted that the contractor was identified as Sole Source in the Agreement Memo but no documentation was attached. He asked for a copy of the Sole Source letter.

9. Agreement with Hill for Literacy, Inc to provide professional development and consultation in the area of data informed instructional practices and knowledge building for staff at Wexler Grant School, from September 14, 2022 to June 14, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $41,502.00 was presented by Ms. Conner on behalf of Mr. David Diah.
    Funding Source: SIG Carryover Program   **Acct. #**2531-6424-56694-0032

10. Agreement with Area Cooperative Education Services, (ACES), to provide behavior management programming and support for students with autism, from August 29, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $553,320.00 was presented by Ms. Jackson.
    Funding Source: IDEA Program   ($353,320.00) Pending Receipt of Funds
                            Acct. #2504-5034-56903-0000
                            ESSER II – ARP IDEA Program ($200,000.00) Pending Receipt of Funds
                            Acct. # 2554-6404-56903-0490

11. Agreement with Highville Charter School to provide Special Education services for New Haven students attending Highville Charter School and to comply with their IEPs, from August 20, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $104,638.00 was presented by Ms. Jackson who explained that the cost increased due to increase in the number of students served.
    Funding Source: 2022-2023 Operating Budget   **Acct. #**190-494-56694-0490

12. Agreement with Lexia Learning Systems, LLC. to provide LexiaCore 5 Reading/PowerUp literacy student subscription from September 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $60,000.00 was presented by Ms. Jackson.
    Funding Source: 2022-2023 Operating Budget   **Acct. #**19047200-52260

13. Amendment #1 to Agreement #9636029 with The Monk Center for Academic Enrichment and Performing Arts, to expand the scope of services to provide after school programming for 75 students at Davis, Wexler and Barnard schools, from September 13, 2022 to September 30, 2022, and, to increase funding of $32,497.92 by $13,000.00 to $45,497.92 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
    Funding Sources: ESSER II Program
                                 Acct. #2552-6363-56694-SS34 ($32,497.92)
                                 21st Century Carryover Program
                                 Acct. #2579-6417-56694-0009   ($5,200.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6420-56694-0032   ($5,200.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6418-56694-0002   ($2,600.00)

14. Agreement with Care 4 Your Own Tree LLC, to provide afterschool programs for 100 students from Davis, Bishop Woods, Wexler, Troup and East Schools, from September 13, 2022 to September 30, 2022, in an amount not to exceed $17,875.00 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
    Funding Source: 21st Century Carryover Program
                                 Acct. #2579-6417-56694-0009 ($3,575.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6417-56694-0043 ($3,575.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6420-56694-0032 ($3,575.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6419-56694-0046 ($3,575.00)

15. Agreement with The Green Peacock Corporation, to provide after school programming for 100 students from Davis, Troup, Wexler and Brennan Rogers schools, from September 13, 2022 to September 30, 2022, in an amount not to exceed $9,100.00 was presented by Ms. Joseph Lumpkin.
    Funding Source: 21st Century Carryover Program
                                 Acct. #2579-6417-56694-0009 ($2,275.00)
                                 Acct. # 2579-6420-56694-0015 ($2,275.00)
                                 Acct.# 2579-6420-56694-0032 ($2,275.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6418-56694-0018 ($2,275.00)

16. Amendment #1 to Agreement #96363035 with ARTE, Inc., to expand the scope of service to provide after school programming at Daniels, Bishop Woods and Troup schools, from September 13, 2022 to September 30, 2022, and to increase funding of $47,963.79 by $4,000.00 to $51,963.79 was presented by Ms. Joseph-Lumpkin.
    Funding Source: ESSER II Program
                                 Acct. #2552-6363-56694   (47,963.79)
                                 21st Century Carryover Program
                                 Acct. #2579-6419-56694-0013 ($2,000.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6417-56694-0043 ($1,000.00)
                                 Acct. #2579-6420-56694-0015 ($1,000.00)

Amendments # 17 to 35 were presented by Ms. Gupta who explained that the State awarded Cost of Living increases to the School Readiness programs previously approved by the Board of Education:

17. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384014 with All Our Children Academy to increase funding of $89,240.00 by $7,793.33 to $97,033.33 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits..
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

18. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384015 with Auntie Rose Child Care and Development Center to increase funding of $330,188.00 by $28,835.32 to $359,023.32 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

19. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384047 with Calvin Hill Day Care Center, to increase funding of $60,000.00 by $5,239.80 to $65,239.80 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

20. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384016 with Catholic Charities, to increase funding of $1,463,536.00 by $127,810.60 to $1,463,536.00 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

21. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384028 with Central CT Coast YMCA, to increase funding of $285,568.00 by $24,938.65 to $310,506.65 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

22. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384048 with Creating Kids at the Connecticut Children's Museum, to increase funding of $54,000.00 by $4,715.82 to $58,715.82 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

23. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384017 with Creative ME, to increase funding of $196,328.00 by $17,145.32 to $213,473.32 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

24. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384018 wit Clifford W. Beers Child Guidance Clinic, Inc., for Farnam Nursery School, to increase funding of 392,656.00 by $34,290.65 to $426,946.65 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

25. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384019 with First Step Child Care and Learning Center, to increase funding of $142,784.00 by $12,469.33 to $155,253.33 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
    Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

26. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384020 with Friends Center for Children, to increase funding of $535,440.00 by $46,759.98 to $582,199.88, to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living

Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

27. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384049 with Leila Day Nurseries, to increase funding of $126,000.00 by $11,003.58 to $137,003.58 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

28. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384022 with LULAC Head Start, to increase funding of $1,053,032.00 by $91,961.25 to $1,144,993.28 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

29. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384023 with Montessori on Edgewood, to increase funding of $276,644.00 by $24,159.32 to $300,803.22 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

30. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384024 with Morning Glory Early Learning Center, to increase funding of $267,720.00 by $23,379.99 to $291,099.99 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

31. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384025 with St. Aedan Preschool, to increase funding of $615,756.00 by $53,773.97 to $669,529.97 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

32. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384026 with St. Andrew Child Care Center, to increase funding of $321,264.00 by $28,055.99 to $349,319.99 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

33. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384021 with The Little Schoolhouse to increase funding of $160,632.00 by $14,027.99 to $174,659.99 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

34. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384050 with Westville Community Nursery School to increase funding of $63,000.00 by $5,501.79 to $68,501.79 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.
Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

35. Amendment #1 to Agreement #95384027 with Yale New Haven Hospital Day Care Center to increase funding of $196,328.00 by $17,145.32 to $213,473.32 to reflect State of CT Office of Early Childhood Cost of Living Adjustment for salary and benefits.

Funding Source: School Readiness Priority COLA Program   **Acct. #**2523-6428-56697-0442

36. Agreement with Gateway Partners for lease of 1st Floor of 54 Meadow St, from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $20,362.75 was presented by Mr. McGrath who explained that the space is needed until new suitable space is identified for the Registration Office. He explained that the cost increased by 8%, the first increase since 2016.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Operating Budget   **Acct. #**190-47000-56652

37. Agreement with Innovative Engineering Solutions to provide plans and specs for multiple boilers, chillers, hot water tanks, etc. as needed from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $50,000.00 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C20-2074-58101

D. CONTRACTS:

1. Award of Contract with J&A Baked Goods, Inc. to provide Bread and Bakery Products from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $175,000.00 was reviewed by Committee in the absence of a presenter.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Food Service Budget   **Acct. #**25215200-55587

2. Award of Contract #50535-B-3-4 with Tim's Enterprises to provide Snow plowing services from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $60,000.00 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Operating Budget   **Acct. #**190-47400-56662

3. Award of Contract with Lior Excavating to provide sidewalk repair services from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 in an amount not to exceed $25,000.00 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

4. Award of Contract to Amazon Landscaping and Design for Painting Services from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $33,000.00 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

5. Award of Contract to White Owl Construction LLC to provide sidewalk repair services from July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023, in an amount not to exceed $25,000.00 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

E. CHANGE ORDERS:

1. Change Order #1 for Contract 21706-2-4 with Pasquariello Electric Corp to increase contract amount from $150,000.00 by $7,379.78 for a total amount of $157,379.78, to cover costs incurred for work performed at Celentano was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

2. Change Order #1 for Contract 50544R-2-4 with Select Fence and Guardrail LLC to change funding source, from 3C20-2083-58702 to 3C22-2261-58101 with no change in funding amount was presented by Ms. Hunt.
   Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

3. Change Order #1 for Contract with Eagle Rivet to change funding source, from 3C20-2071-58101 to 3C22-2261-58101 with no change in funding amount was presented by Ms. Hunt.
    Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

4. Change Order #1 for Contract 21781-2-4 with J Witkowsky and Sons Tree Services to increase funding amount from $37,500.00 by $12,500.00 for a total amount of $50,000.00 to cover costs incurred for the year was presented by Ms. Hunt.
    Funding Source: 2022-2023 Capital Projects   **Acct. #**3C22-2261-58101

5. Change Order #1 to Contract with Filter Sales and Service Inc. to change funding account from 3C22-2261-58101 to ESSER Acct. # 2553-6399-56697 was presented by Ms. Hunt.
    Funding Source: ESSER Program   **Acc.#**2553-6399-56697

II.   **DISCUSSION**: No discussion items

Adjournment: A motion by Ms. Rivera, seconded by Dr. Yarborough, to adjourn the meeting at 5:22 p.m., passed unanimously by Roll Call Vote: Ms. Rivera, Yes; Dr. Yarborough, Yes; Mr. Wilcox, Yes.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. DeMaio

Time for Learning

Dr. J. Howard Johnston

The amount of time allocated for learning and the way that time is used is one of the few variables that can be influenced rather directly by school leaders. Fortunately, it is also a variable that has shown consistent links to student performance.

Now that schools are focused directly, and in some cases exclusively, on student achievement, there is a renewed interest on the ways that time can be found, allocated, organized, and modified to enhance learning opportunities for students. Ron Williamson, Professor of Educational Leadership at Eastern Michigan University and author of several books on scheduling, says, "Time is one of the things that principals can influence quite significantly – and the most important tool at their disposal is the daily schedule." Building a schedule, says Williamson, should not be seen just as an administrative responsibility but as an opportunity for school leaders to "intervene pretty directly in the instructional program of the school. It's the one place where 'instructional leadership' can make a real difference in the amount and quality of learning that goes on in the building." The secret, he continues, is to "treat time as a resource – just like money or personnel – that has to be allocated and managed to fulfill the school's core mission."

According to a recent Education Week article (Gerwertz, 2008), the consensus on time and learning is building, but like most things in education, the issue is somewhat more complex than it may appear at first glance. More than 30 years ago, the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study sponsored by the State of California and the National Institutes of Education reported classroom-based research that established the link between time and learning. Since then, multiple studies have affirmed these early results and elaborated on that complex relationship. David Berliner's 1990 summary of time/learning research is an excellent summary of the work done up to that point. In it, he describes several types of time which, to differing degrees, fall under the control of school leaders and may affect student achievement outcomes:

• Allocated time is the time that the state, district, school, or teacher provides the student for instruction. For example a school may require that reading and language arts be taught 90 minutes every day… Allocated time is the time block set aside for that instruction–90 minutes a day, or 7 .5 hours a week or 300 hours a school year. Sometimes this is called scheduled time,

to distinguish it from the time actually allocated by teachers. In earlier studies, allocated time was called "opportunity to learn."

• Engaged time is usually defined as the time that students appear to be paying attention to materials or presentations that have instructional goals. A synonym for engaged time is "attention."

• Time-on-task is engaged time on particular learning tasks. The concept is not synonymous with engaged time, because it deals with engagement in planned learning experiences. A student may be deeply engaged in math homework or reading a comic book during a time period allocated to science, but that is not time on the desired task.

• Academic learning time (ALT) is that part of allocated time in a subject-matter area (physical education, science, or mathematics, for example) in which a student is engaged successfully in the activities or with the materials to which he or she is exposed, and for which those activities and materials are related to valued educational outcomes. This is a complex concept made up of a number of other concepts, such as allocated time (the amount of time provided for the task); time-on-task (engagement in tasks that are related to outcome measures or evaluation instruments in use); and success rate (the percent of engaged time that a student is experiencing a high success experience in class).

• Transition time is the non-instructional time before and after some instructional activity, such as when a teacher takes roll or gives back homework at the beginning of an instructional activity.

• Waiting time usually defined as the time that a student must wait to receive some instructional help. The time spent waiting to receive new assignments from the teacher, on a line to have the teacher check work, or waiting for the teacher's attention after raising one's hand in class are examples of waiting time.

• Pace, usually defined as the amount of content covered during some time period. For example, the number of vocabulary words covered by Christmas, or the number of mastery units covered in a semester will differ from classroom to classroom. In educational systems where standardized tests are used as outcomes, and where those tests sample items from a broad curriculum, students whose teacher exposes them to the most content ordinarily have a better chance of answering the test questions. As the pace of instruction increases, however, depth of coverage usually decreases.

All of these types of time affect student learning to some extent, so it is important for school leaders to consider all of them in planning for effective time use in their schools. To begin, principals should think about several broad initiatives to focus the school's staff on time and how to use this valuable resource to full advantage. A large body of literature on the subject can be distilled into three big ideas:

Consider the Whole Day. Many schools described in the reports listed under Resources have found that they can provide extended services, including tutorials, academic enrichments, and other "opportunity boosters," by planning to use the entire day rather than just the hours allocated for academics. Youth-serving agencies, foundations, business partners, and other community groups have been willing to support before and after school initiatives that help kids succeed through a variety of activities. These include academic supports ranging from "homework clubs" to additional class time for struggling students, adult mentorships that help students stay focused on academic goals and school work, and community service or work related programs that help students link school to personal achievement goals. Some schools have secured support for such basics as after school transportation so that students can participate fully in many school-sponsored activities they might not otherwise be able to attend.

Protect the Academic Day. Many schools have created a core academic day at least 5-6 hours long that cannot be interrupted for any reason. Others have used block schedules, rotating schedules, or other innovations to minimize transition time and keep the focus on core subjects for extended periods of time.

Eliminate Time Wasters. Teachers and students can probably identify school practices that actually waste instructional time or contribute to a culture that does not value time as a resource. Some school leaders have created a "time task force" to monitor how schools use time and what they can do to eliminate wasteful practices. In some districts, formal time audits are used to determine if time is being used to its maximum advantage, and the results of these audits become the standards by which school management practices are evaluated. But such elaborate measures are probably not necessary at the outset; it's enough to get people talking about time and how it can be saved, allocated and used to maximize student learning.

Consider Technology. Think about the ways that technology can take over routine tasks that consume valuable academic time or actually create disruptions that must be managed before time can be used productively. Some schools have adopted "card scan" technology so that students "log in" to every class as they enter the room, thus eliminating the need for teachers to take attendance. Principals who use text messaging or other new communication technologies can make announcements or locate students without disturbing classes. Even if the principal can't imagine how technology might make time use more efficient, a gathering of students and tech-savvy teachers will generate dozens of ideas in short order. (For more on using e-communication to improve school management, see Don Bott's article on The Principals' Partnership website: http://www.principalspartnership.com/feature1008.pdf.)

John Maxwell, author of dozens of leadership books, has said that you can tell a person's values by looking at his or her calendar and check book. In short, we spend our time and money on the things that we value the most. That is good advice for schools as well. The way we spend our time and our money conveys to our staff, our students and our community exactly what we think is important and what we are willing to do to preserve and protect it. As both an individual and as the visible representative of an institution, school leaders must be completely

aware of the messages they are sending every day about what is important and what is not. As Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say."

References and Resources

Berliner, D. C. (1990). What's All the Fuss About Instructional Time? From The Nature of Time in Schools Theoretical Concepts, Practitioner Perceptions (1990) New York and London: Teachers College Press; Teachers College, Columbia University. *http://courses.ed.asu.edu/berliner/readings/fuss/fuss.htm*

Fisher, C. W., Berliner, D. C., Fully, N. N., Marliave, R. S., Cahen, L. S., & Dishaw, M. M. (1980). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to learn (pp. 7-32). Washington, DC: National Institute. of Education.

Daniel, L. (2007). Research summary: Flexible scheduling. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Gerwertz, C. (September 24, 2008). Consensus on Time and Learning Builds. Education Week. *http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/09/24/05narmain_ep.h28.html*

Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative. http://www.mass2020.org/

National Education Commission on Time and Learning (April, 1994). Prisoners of Time: Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. Washington, DC: Author. *http://www.ed.gov/pubs/PrisonersOfTime/index.html*

Rocha, Elena (July, 2008). Expanded Learning Time in Action: Initiatives in High Poverty and High Minority Schools and Districts. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. *http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/07/pdf/elt1.pdf*

Silva, Elena (January, 2007). On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time, An Education Sector Report. Washington, DC: Education Sector. *http://www.educationsector.org/usr_doc/OntheClock.pdf*

Time, Learning and After School Task Force (January, 2007). A New Day for Learning. Edutopia. *http://www.edutopia.org/pdfs/ANewDayforLearning.pdf.*

Williamson, R. D. (1998). Scheduling middle level schools: Tools for improved student achievement. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Author: J. Howard Johnston, Ph. D. Department of Secondary Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL. Email: hojofl@aol.com.

January 2009

How Time is Spent in Elementary Classrooms

Barak V. Rosenshine

INTRODUCTION

The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study provides us with valuable information on how time is spent in elementary classrooms. Some of the major topics are: the average minutes per day which students spend engaged in reading and math activities, student engagement rates in different settings (that is, teacher-led settings versus seatwork) and suggestions on how student engagement rates might be raised. At the same time, BTES and similar studies also help us understand the limitations of increasing engaged minutes in classrooms.

Caution! The results should be read with caution to avoid misinterpretation. The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study was limited to the investigation of instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics in second and fifth grades. The students were within the average range - from the 25th to the 65th percentile on the pretests - brighter and very slow students were not included in this study. Although the focus in this study is on basic skills, one should not conclude that the entire day should be devoted to instruction in these skills. Although the focus is on academic engaged minutes, we do not know, as yet, how many minutes are necessary for adequate progress by average, below average, or above average students. These data are intended to describe cur rent practice; they are not intended to prescribe teaching methods.

The first suggestion that follows from these results is that teachers and administrators gather data on academic engaged minutes in their classrooms and compare t heir results with those obtained in the BTES study. If they wish to increase engaged minutes, they might use some of the suggestions in this paper. We are not sure, at this time, what methods will be most successful with different teachers and students, and much can be gained by the comparing results from different classrooms.

The following is a summary of the major BTES findings on student engagement:

1. The number of academically engaged minutes is moderately high. The number of minutes students spend actively engaged in academic activities is not as high as one might ardently wish nor as low as some feared. Typically, second-grade students spend 1 hour and 30 minutes and fifth-grade students spend l hour and 55 minutes engaged in relevant academic active ties in language arts and math each day (or about 40 percent

of the in-class time). The most efficient teachers (referred to as the "high teachers" in this report) raise this to 1 hour and 55 minutes in the second grade and 2 hours and 30 minutes in the fifth grade (or about 50 percent of the in-class time). Thus, as compared with the average, students of the high teachers are academically engaged about 25 minutes more per day in the second grade and about 35 min utes more in the fifth grade. If the high teachers are compared with the low, daily differences of an hour in engaged time appear.

It is possible to interpret the differences between the high and average teachers at least two ways. On one hand, in engaged minutes, the difference between the average and the best practice is no larger than 25 to 35 minutes per day. On the other hand, 25 minutes per day spread over 180 days equals 75 hours a year, and 35 minutes a day comes to 105 hours!

At present, it is impossible to say whether the average or high engaged minutes per day are adequate, particularly for low-achieving children. What is impressive is that this is the first time such extensive data on engaged time have been available, and these data can serve as a baseline for subsequent studies in different schools and with different types of students.

2. More allocated time does not lead to less engage ment. Many educators worry that if more time is allocated to an activity, students will tire and the overall engagement rate will decrease. The results do not support this fear. In reading, there was a positive correlation between allocated time and engagement rate; in math the correlations were about zero (In each grade, the three teachers who were highest in total engaged minutes were also above average in both allocated time and engagement rate).

3. Seatwork and students working alone is a dominant pattern. Overall, students spend about 66 percent of their time doing seatwork during reading, and 75 per cent of their time during math. Overall, students' engagement rate was 84 percent in teacher-led groups, and about 70 percent when doing seatwork. How ever, when a great deal of the allocated time is allot ted to seatwork (e.g., 90 percent), then engagement during seatwork drops, especially in mathematics. There was no evidence that the seatwork activities were trivial; indeed, the error rate during seatwork was only slightly lower than the error rate during teacher-led activities. At this time, the data have not been analyzed to determine the optimal distribution of seatwork and group work.

4. Some non-engaged activities seem inevitable. Most teachers were fairly similar in the amount of time spent on non-instructional activities such as transitions before and after breaks, housekeeping tasks, and waiting between activities. These activities took about 45 minutes per day.

Even during time allocated for reading and math, interim activities (turning in and passing out papers, getting books, and waiting for help) occupied about 8 or 9 minutes in all classrooms. All these activities may be necessary because of large classrooms and varied students.

The teachers with the highest engaged minutes were able to reduce student off-task time (daydreaming, socializing) from the average of 8 minutes per hour to 4 minutes per hour, but they were similar to the average teachers in all the above non-instructional and non-engaged activities.

5. Substantive interaction is related to higher engagement. Substantive interaction (i.e., questions, answers, feedback, and explanations) during group work was correlated both with higher overall engagement and higher engagement during seatwork, suggesting that the practice and corrections during groupwork led to more engagement during seatwork. Substantive interaction during seatwork was also related to increased

Table 1
Time Allocation in Grades 2 and 5

Category	Grade 2		Grade 5	
	Time	**Percent**	**Time**	**Percent**
Academic Activities	2'15"	57	2'50"	60
Nonacademic	55"	24	1'05"	23
Non-instructional	44"	19	45"	17

engagement during seatwork. It was not clear, however, whether this substantive interaction came from a teacher making rounds or from aides in the classroom.

6. "Break time" is negatively correlated with student engagement. Break time referred to all time spent in breaks - recess, lunch, and in-class breaks such as unscheduled physical education and leaving class to go to the bathroom. This time was negatively related to engagement. It was suggested in the BTES report that relatively long periods of "play" carry over and disrupt engagement during academic "work."

7. It may be difficult to find more time for academic instruction. These data give the impression that academic time is more constrained than we thought. If teachers wish to find more time for the academic instruction of low-achieving students, where is it to come from? The non-instructional time and the interim and wait time during instruction appear to be fairly constant - necessitated by the difficulty of dealing with diverse children and diverse activities. Many educators are reluctant to reduce the nonacademic time in music and art. One alternative may be increasing the school day, another may be diminishing the nonacademic activities for the less academically successful students. Although at present there is no evidence of "diminishing returns" from increasing allocated time and diminishing breaks (indeed, quite the opposite), the BTES study did not examine the limits of increasing allocated time for different types of students.

HOW TIME IS ALLOCATED IN ELEMENTARY CLASSROOMS

Let us begin with an overview of how time is allocated in elementary classrooms. Based on their observations, the BTES staff divided the daily classroom activities into three major parts:

- Academic activities (reading, mathematics, science, and social studies);
- "Nonacademic" activities (music, art, storytime, sharing);
- Non-instructional actitities (transitions, waiting between activities, class business).

The amount and percentage of time allocated in each major category are presented in Table 1. The percentages of time in each grade are quite similar. Academic and "nonacademic" activities occupy the major portion of the day. The surprising figure - but surprising only for those who are not elementary school teachers-is the large amount of non-instructional time. This non-instructional time, which did not vary much from

_____

* The average time allocated to each category varies a bit in the two grades because of the larger number of "split classes" in the sample of second grade classrooms. In the typical split classrooms, one group of students (e.g., second grade students) attends school from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. while the second group attends from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. This splitting does not appear to do any harm; a number of the highest classes in achievement gain were split classrooms. However, this splitting is somewhat atypical. The reader may wish to focus more on the descriptive statistics for the fifth grade, which represents the more typical situation - one where most students attend school between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. or the equivalent. (A single table summarizing all these data is presented in the Appendix to this chapter, together with the definition of each category.)

Table 2

Time Allocation in Academic Activities

Category	Grade 2		Grade 5	
	Time	**Percent**	**Time**	**Percent**
Reading and Language Arts	1'30"	38	1'50"	39
Mathematics	35"	16	45"	16
Other academic	8"	3	17"	6

teacher to teacher, appears to represent a constant in classrooms as they are currently constituted.

ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

In each grade, the largest amount of time is allocated to academic activities. A typical second-grade student spends 2 hours and 15 minutes of allocated time per day in academic activities, and a fifth-grade student spends 2 hours and 50 minutes. (See Table 2).

The largest activity is reading. A second-grade student spends about 1 hours daily in reading, and a fifth grade student spends 20 minutes more (1 hour and 50 minutes). Students spend less than half as much time in math as they do in reading and writing: 35 minutes in second grade and 45 minutes in fifth grade. Math activities that occur during science and social studies are included in this figure. Other academic activities, namely, discussion and manipulation in social studies and science, occur for 8 minutes a day in second grade and 17 minutes a day in the fifth grade. (Note that when reading or math occurred during social studies or science, the activity was coded as reading or math, not as other academic.)

"NONACADEMIC" ACTIVITIES

Almost 25 percent of the in-class time is devoted to "nonacademic" subjects such as music, art, and physical education. These activities occupy an average of 55 minutes per day for second-grade students and 65 minutes for fifth-grade students (breakdowns into separate categories were not available).

NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Almost 20 percent of the in-class time is spent in non instructional activities (wait ing after finishing an assignment, nonacademic class business, and transitions between activities, including going to and from lunch and recess). These activities take about 45 minutes per day. Relatively little time is spent waiting between major activities (4 minutes per day) or in nonacademic class business (6 minutes). The majority of this noninstruc tional time (35 minutes) is spent in transitions.

DISCUSSION

At present we do not know what amount of time is necessary for most students, particularly less academically successful students. This experimental question is a high priority for future study. But if educators wish to increase the amount of time all students or specific students spend engaged in reading, math, music, art, or science, where is this time to come from? One could take time from one activity and give it to another, but these interest groups already claim "their" time is insufficient. Another alternative - diminishing noninstructional time - appears to be difficult to implement because conducting a variety of activities with students who differ from each other in many ways takes a lot of instructional time. One alternative would be to help average teachers increase their allocated time and engaged time to that of the highest teachers in this sample. Yet we do not know if even that much time will be sufficent for the lower

achieving students. Another alternative, particularly for meeting the needs of the lowest achieving students, would be to increase the length of the school day.

ACADEMIC ENGAGED MINUTES PER DAY

The major interest, however, is not allocated time but the minutes a student spends directly engaged in reading, math, and language arts. The BTES researchers called this time "engaged minutes" or "academic engaged minutes." There were two major findings in the BTES study:

> 1. The average daily academic engaged minutes is about 1 hour 30 minutes in second grade, and 1 hour 55 minutes in the fifth grade. In each case this is about 40 percent of the in-class time. The higher teachers were about 30 minutes above this figure; the low teachers were about 30 minutes below.
>
> 2. The high teachers in each grade not only allocated more time, but their classes also had a higher engagement rate than average teachers. Thus, within the limits of this study, allocating more time in academics did not lead to diminishing returns.

In coding academic engaged minutes, the BTES observers watched six students in each class throughout the day and coded a student as engaged in reading, math, or language arts when he or she was directly engaged in these activities. Engaged students might be attending to a teacher in a group, reading a book alone, writing a composition, or doing seatwork in reading or math. As we shall see in the next section, there were three types of nonengaged activities: interim activities (sharpening pencils, turning in and passing out papers, getting books); waiting for help from a teacher or waiting for a paper to be graded; and off-task activities (socializing, daydreaming, misbehaving). Thus, when students were putting their names on worksheets, or were waiting quietly for papers to be graded, they were not coded as engaged.

Table 3 presents information on the average allo cated time, engaged minutes, and engagement rate for the three teachers in each grade who obtained the highest total engaged minutes, for all the teachers, and for the three "lowest" teachers. (There were some teachers who had slightly higher engaged minutes in reading alone or mathematics alone, but the high teachers in this ta ble were for reading and mathematics combined.)

We do not know how representative these teachers are of all teachers. It is tempting to assume that the high teachers in these samples represent the best in current practice, but there may be other teachers who are even more effective in obtaining engaged minutes. Since this question cannot be answered until additional studies are conducted, we will assume that the high teachers in these samples are in the upper 10 percent of current practice, recognizing, of course, this assumption may be changed as future results are accumulated.

ENGAGED MINUTES IN SECOND GRADE

As Table 3 indicates, the average students in the second grade were engaged in reading activities for an average of 1 hour and 04 minutes per day and engaged in math for 26 minutes, for a total of 1 hour and 30 minutes of academic engaged time per day. The students in the classrooms of the three highest teachers were engaged about 20 minutes more in reading, about 4 minutes more in math, and about 25 minutes more overall. The high teachers obtained this extra 25 minutes in two ways: their allocated time was higher, and their engagement rate was higher (81 percent compared with 72 percent for average teachers).

The difference in engaged minutes between the aver age and the high teachers is 25 minutes per day. If this is spread out over 180 days, it comes to 75 hours! It would seem important to conduct experimental studies to help average and low teachers raise their engaged minutes and to determine the effect of this rise on student achievement. But the

Table 3
Daily engaged minutes in reading and math

	Reading			Mathematics			Total	
	Allocated	Engagement rate	Engaged minutes	Allocated	Engagement rate	Engaged Minutes	Allocated Time	Engaged Time
Second grade								
High 3	1'45"	81%	1'25"	35"	82%	30"	2'20"	1'55"
Average	1'30"	73%	1'04"	36"	71%	26"	2'06"	1'30"
Low 3	1'00"	72%	43"	30"	75%	22"	1'30"	1'05"
Fifth grade								
High 3	2'10"	80%	1'45"	53"	86%	45"	3'03"	2'30"
Average	1'50"	74%	1'20"	44"	74%	35"	2'25"	1'55"
Low 3	1'25"	63%	1'05"	38"	63%	22"	2'03"	1'25"

Table 4
Daily engaged minutes in reading and math

	Grade 2			Grade 5		
	Total Engaged minutes	Engagement rate	Percent of in-class time	Total engaged minutes	Engagement rate	Percent of in-class time
High 3	1'55"	82%	50%	2'30"	82%	53%
Average	1'30"	71%	39%	1'55"	79%	40%
Low 3	1'05"	72%	28%	1'20"	69%	28%

figure of 1 hour and 55 minutes of engaged time per day may be the upper bound for the most efficient teachers in current constructed second grade classrooms. At the same time, it does not appear that students in second grade are being overburdened by large amounts of engaged time in reading and math.

ENGAGED MINUTES IN FIFTH GRADE

The pattern in fifth grade is similar to second grade except that all times are larger because of the longer school day. There were no split classes in the fifth grade as there were in second grade, and there were fewer breaks.

As is shown in Table 3, the average students in the fifth grade were engaged in reading activities for I hour and 20 minutes per day and engaged in math for 35 minutes, for a total of 1 hour and 55 minutes of academic engaged time per day. The students in the classroom of the three highest teachers were engaged about 25 minutes more in reading and 10 minutes more in math, for a total of 2 hours and 30 minutes of academic engaged time per day. As in the second grade, the high teachers achieved this extra 35 minutes of engaged time in two ways: their allocated time was higher and their engagement rate was higher (83 percent to 74 percent).

Again, this figure of 2 hours and 30 minutes per day for the high teachers (or about 53 percent of the in-class time) may represent the current upward limit for engaged time in reading and mathematics activities. If the 35-minute difference between the high and average teachers is multi plied by 180 days, it comes to 105 hours. Again, we do not know how much engaged time is sufficient for different children, particularly for low achieving children.

SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC ENGAGED MINUTES

Because it is difficult to remember all the numbers in the preceding sections, a simplified summary is presented in Table 4.

A major problem in interpreting these results is that we do not know how much time below average, average, or above average students need to make reasonable progress in reading and math. It may be that for low achieving children 2 hours per day of engaged time is not adequate. Nor do we know whether we can use the actual engaged time more efficiently. These areas are high priority for future research.

One interpretation of the data in this section is that the average amount of academic engaged time per day is not particularly high. A fully engaged student could complete his daily reading and mathematics in 1-1.5 hours in second grade and 2 hours in fifth grade. Or, it could be said that students attend to reading and math activities for about 40 percent of a school day.

The three teachers with the highest number of engaged minutes are 25 minutes above the average in second grade and 35 minutes above the average in fifth grade. If these daily differences are aggregated across a school year, the differences are quite high; but we need experimental studies to determine the effect of helping average and low teachers raise their engaged minutes per day. At the same time, these highest teachers may be giving us the natural boundaries of the best of current practice. Additional studies could determine whether these teachers across the country are equaling or exceeding these levels.

DOES MORE ALLOCATED TIME LEAD TO LESS ENGAGEMENT?

As we see in the tables above, the engagement rates of the three high teachers - in both grades and in both subjects were higher than the engagement rates of the other teachers. Across the entire sample, the correlations between allocated time and engagement rate were about .23 for reading and about -.10 for math. Further, students of the high teachers spent less time in clearly off-task behaviors such as daydreaming or socializing. Thus, 2 hours of engaged time in the second grade and 2 hours and 30 minutes in the fifth grade did not lead to bored and restless students.

WHAT WERE STUDENTS DOING WHEN THEY WERE NOT ENGAGED?

During the allocated time for reading and math, what were students doing when they were not engaged? The BTES study coded three types of nonengaged activities during allocated time: interim activities (sharpening pencils, turning in and passing out papers, getting books); waiting for help from a teacher or waiting for a paper to be graded; and off-task activities (socializing, daydreaming, misbehaving). Table 5 gives information on how students spent their nonengaged time. For convenience, these are presented as minutes per hour.

Looking at the average, students were not engaged 16 to 17 minutes each hour allocated to academic activities; conversely, they were gainfully engaged 44 minutes of each hour (or 71 to 73 percent of the time).

Interim and Wait Activities. Looking at Table 5, we see that for almost all teachers, 7 to 9 minutes per hour of nonengaged time spent on interim activities and waiting appears to be a fact of current classroom life that applies to even the most efficient of classrooms. The correlations between wait time and engaged minutes or interim time and engaged minutes were quite low, averaging only -.10. In most second- and fifth-grade class rooms, it takes time to pass out and collect books and papers, and students have to wait for help, corrections, and instructions. Under the most efficient conditions these activities take 7 minutes per hour; under the least efficient conditions, they take 10 minutes an hour. There is little variation across classrooms.

The major difference among teachers is in the amount of student off-task behavior. In average classrooms, this occupies about 8 minutes each hour. The most efficient teachers reduce this by half, to about 4 minutes.

Conclusion. Nonengaged time seems inevitable. In average classrooms, students are not engaged about 16 minutes per hour of allocated time in reading and math; the three high teachers reduce this amount to 12 minutes per hour. In classrooms of both average and high teachers, students spend 8 to 9 minutes in interim and wait time. Thus, the difference between the teachers who had the highest academic engaged minutes and the aver age teacher was about 4 minutes of nonengaged minutes per hour, and most of this difference occurred because the high teachers reduced off-task time to about 4 minutes per hour. (Remember, however, that the high teachers also' had more allocated time.)

TIME WITH THE TEACHER AND TIME IN SEATWORK

What major activities occur during the allocated time? The BTES study gathered data on the amount of time a student spent in a teacher-led (or adult-led) group and the amount of time a student spent in seatwork (Table 6). Overall, students spent about 30

Table 5

Nonengaged time during reading and math in minutes per hour

	Reading			Mathematics		
	Interim and Wait Time	Off-Task	Total (%)	Interim and Wait Time	Off-Task	Total (%)
Second grade						
High 3	9"	3"	12" (20)	7"	4"	11" (18)
Average	9"	7"	16" (27)	9"	8"	17" (29)
Low 3	8"	9"	17" (28)	7"	8"	15" (25)
Fifth grade						
High 3	7"	5"	12" (20)	3"	5"	8" (45)
Average	8"	8"	16" (26)	7"	8"	15" (25)
Low 3	9"	13"	22" (37)	8"	14"	22" (37)

Table 6

Time Spent in Teacher-Led Settings and in Seatwork

Grade and Subject		Percent of time in setting	Engagement rate
2 reading	Teacher-led	36	84%
	Seatwork	63	68%
2 mathematics	Teacher-led	27	82%
	Seatwork	73	67%
5 reading	Teacher-led	31	84%
	Seatwork	70	70%
5 mathematics	Teacher-led	24	85%
	Seatwork	76	72%

percent of their time in a teacher-led setting and 70 percent of their time doing seatwork. This heavy amount of time in seatwork occurs because teachers frequently divide a class into three or more groups, and if there are three groups in a class, a student can only spend one-third of the allocated time in a teacher-led setting.

As is shown in Table 6, when students were in teacher-led groups their engagement rate was about 84 percent, whereas during seatwork it was about 70 percent. Although engagement during seatwork was slightly higher in the fifth grade than in second grade suggesting that older students are slightly better able to work alone - discrepancy between engagement during teacher-led activities and during seatwork is still large. Thus, although students spend most of their time in seatwork, their engagement rate is lowest in that setting.

These figures illustrate the difficulty teachers have in working with students of different achievement levels. Students' engagement rates are about 15 percent higher when they are in groups supervised by the teacher, but if the teacher only worked with the class as a whole, the lower achieving students would be behind and the higher achieving students might be bored.

Other studies (Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1974; Stallings et al., 1979; Soar, 1973) have also found that students are more engaged when they are instructed or supervised by a teacher than when they are working alone. Further, the Stallings and the Soar studies have found that teacher time spent working with groups of students is positively and consistently related to achievement gain, whereas teacher time spent working with one or two students is consistently negatively related to student gain in achievement. These negative results probably occur because, when a teacher is working with only one or two students, the remaining students have to work independently. As we have seen, independent work has lower engagement rate.

Currently, the need for students to spend 60 to 75 percent of their time working alone is a fact of classroom life. Whether this percentage can be reduced ,or whether instruction can be organized so students are more engaged when working alone, are major areas for future research.

ARE SEATWORK ACTIVITIES TRIVIAL?

The term "seatwork" frequently connotes trivial activities - students coloring the figures in a story, working on tasks far below their level of achievement, doing busywork. From two perspectives, the BTES research suggests that this negative picture is not true. In the BTES study, the specific content of material the students were working on was coded. A special category was created to code material or activities which were "below the level' of the test" used in the study. Only 6 percent of the time was material coded as below the level of the test, suggesting that meaningless busywork is a relatively rare event (i.e., the standard deviations were also small).

Another way the BTES study looked at seatwork was by coding the error rate of student during seatwork. It might be expected that the error rate during seatwork would be lower than the error rate during teacher-led activities; that is, most teachers might place students at their "independent" level during seatwork and their "instructional" level during groupwork. In second-grade reading and in fifth-grade math, the error rate was the same in teacher-led settings and in seatwork; in second grade math and in fifth-grade reading, the error rate was only slightly lower in seatwork settings. Overall, there was no evidence that the seatwork was particularly easier than work in teacher-led groups.

Thus, although the allocation of a high percentage of time to seatwork is a necessity in current classrooms, the results suggest that seatwork activities are an integral and contributing part of classroom instruction, rather than trivial busywork.

INFLUENCING ENGAGEMENT DURING SEATWORK

The nature of heterogeneous classrooms and current instruction requires that students spend a large amount of time working alone at seatwork. Yet, as was shown in this study and in many others, students are less engaged when they are doing seatwork than when they are working with a teacher. At least three suggestions for increasing engagement during seatwork emerged from this study:

1. Increase substantive interaction during groupwork.
2. Increase substantive interaction during seatwork.
3. Keep seatwork time as low as possible.

SUBTANTIVE INTERACTION DURING GROUPWORK

Given the higher engagement during groupwork, it is not surprising that the amount of time students spent in groupwork had a correlation of .31 with their overall engagement. But the substantive interaction which took place - explanations, questions and answers, and feedback - was an even stronger predictor of overall engagement, yielding a correlation of .45. In other words, although having students in teacher-led groups is positively related to student engagement, it is even better to use this group time for asking questions and giving feedback.

Other studies have shown that the frequent use of short, factual questions is positively correlated with gain in achievement, whereas other types of questions are often uncorrelated or negatively correlated with gain in achievement. It is thus suggested that explanation, ask ing frequent, short, factual questions, and giving feed back is the type of substantive interaction which is related to overall engagement.

The momentum of substantive interaction. Substantive interaction during groupwork not only is correlated with higher engagement during teacher-led activities, but it is also positively correlated with student engagement during seatwork, particularly in reading. The BTES authors suggest that using most of the time during group lessons for substantive interactions creates a sense of purposefulness, and studen ts then apply this same momentum and efficiency to their seatwork.

Other studies (Rosenshine, 1978) have found that teachers with a strong academic focus in their classroom had students with higher gain in achievement. An emphasis on substantive interactions during groupwork may be another illustration of a strong academic focus.

SUBTANTIVE INTERACTION DURING SEATWORK

The data on second- and fifth-grade reading and math can be thought of as falling into four quadrants. In three of the four quadrands, the amount of substantive inter-action a student received during seatwork was positively (although moderately) related to student engagement during seatwork. The BTES report presents one dramatic

illustration of this finding. In second-grade math, the researchers divided classes that had over 70 percent seatwork into two groups: one group had substantive interaction during 11 percent or more of the seatwork time, and the other group had substantive interaction about 5 percent of the seatwork time (note that even "high" amounts of substantive interaction during seat work are relatively small). The engagement rate in the high interaction classes averaged 71 percent, whereas the engagement rate in the low interaction classes averaged 61 percent.

Unfortunately, the current analyses of the data did not answer a number of questions about seatwork, although these questions will be explored in the forthcoming secondary analyses of the data. Thus, we do not know the optimum proportions of seatwork and groupwork. The amount of time in seatwork may be dependent on the number of instructional groups a teacher has. In this study, the minimum amount of time spent in seatwork was about 35 percent of allocated time. This 35 percent might be seen as the natural lower limit, although we do not know if it is the optimal percentage.

SUBTANTIVE DECREASING TIME IN SEATWORK

The BTES results suggest that in mathematics, increased time in seatwork tends to be negatively associated with engagement. That is, a class with 90 percent allocated time in seatwork frequently has a lower engagement rate than a mathematics class with 60 per cent allocated time in seatwork. This may occur because seatwork in mathematics frequently consists of doing a large number of computational problems without immediate feedback, and the longer this goes on the more restless students (and adults) become.

Overall, substantive interaction during groupwork and during seatwork is related to higher engagement during seatwork, and in mathematics increased allocated time to seatwork is associated with diminishing returns. One caution, however; these are correlational results and need to be replicated in experimental studies.

HOW DO BREAKS AND TRANSITIONS AFFECT ENGAGEMENT?

We have sometimes thought that if students had more breaks, they would be more engaged the rest of the time, and engaged minutes would increase. Unfortunately, the current correlational data do not support this argument.

One of the categories, "wait time," refers to time between instructional activities; it can also include time when a teacher is working wit h a few students and the others have finished one activity and are waiting for a new activity to begin. Although student wait time averaged only about 4 minutes a day, in the second grade, wait time was negatively correlated wit h stud ent engagement rate in both reading and math. The negative correlations suggest that for second-grade students such waits do not constitute a refreshing break, and that the distraction which occurs du ring a wait transfers to less engagement during subsequent reading and math periods. These negative correlations did not occur for t he older, fifth-grade students.

"Break time" was negatively correlated with engagement in both second and fifth grades. Breaks include recess, lunch, and in-class breaks such as unscheduled physical education and leaving class to use the restroom. The BTES staff believes that this suggests that relatively long and/or frequent breaks may establish a pattern of student "play" that carries over into periods of academic "work," resulting in lower rates of work engagement. This finding seems similar to the previous one on substantive interaction: those teachers who emphasized an atmosphere of work obtained more student engagement during allocated academic time than those who were concerned that students have enough "play." Of course, this does not suggest that effective classrooms were hard hearted sweatshops. Quite the contrary - even in the classrooms with the highest engaged minutes, students were engaged in reading and math activites no more than 50 percent of the in-class time.

SUMMARY

1. Time allocations. About 58 percent of the school day is allocated to academic activities, about 23 percent to nonacademic activities (e.g., music, art, physical education), and about 19 percent to noninstructional activities such as transitions between activities and class business.

2. Engaged time. On the average, students spent 1 hour and 30 minutes (second grade) and 1 hour and 55 minutes (fifth grade) actively engaged in reading and math activities. In the highest classrooms the engaged time was about 30 minutes longer, and in the lowest classrooms it was about 30 minutes less than the average.

3. On the average, students were engaged about 73 percent of the allocated time in reading and math. Teachers with the highest allocated time also had the highest engagement rates (about 82 percent). Thus, within the limits of this study, increasing allocated time did not lead to dimishing returns; quite the opposite, teachers who had more allocated time also had higher engagement rates.

4. During allocated time for academics; students were not engaged about 16 minutes an hour, on the aver age. Half of this nonengaged time was taken up with interim activities (e.g., passing out and collecting papers) or waiting for help, and the other 8 minutes were when students were clearly off task. Classrooms were fairly similar in interim and wait time, whereas the most efficient teachers reduced off-task time to 4 minutes per hour.

5. Seatwork. Overall; students spent about two-thirds of the allocated academic time in seatwork (or self-paced activities) and about one-third of their time working with an adult. Engagement was higher in teacher-led settings (about 84 percent) than in seat work settings (about 70 percent). An inevitable fact of classroom life is that if a teacher working alone divides a class into three groups, students will be working alone two-thirds of the time.

6. There was no evidence that seatwork activities were trivial. Seatwork activities were coded as "below the level of the test" only about 6 percent of the time.

7. Increasing engagement during seatwork. The amount of time teachers spent in substantive interaction - explanation, questions, student answers, and teacher feedback - was positively correlated with engage ment during teacher-led activities. In addition, substantive interaction during groupwork was positively correlated with engagement during seatwork, suggesting that this substantive interaction creates a sense of purposefulness that students then apply to their seatwork.

8. Student engagement during seatwork increased when there was substantive interaction between teacher and student during seatwork. Such substantive interac tion consisted of a teacher (or aide) monitoring seat work and holding students accountable by asking questions. Such substantive interaction was most effective when it occurred 11 percent or more of the seatwork time.

9. Break time. Break time (recess, lunch, in-class breaks, leaving class to use the restroom) was negatiely correlated with engagement in both second and fifth grades. This suggests that teachers who emphasized an atmosphere of work obtained higher engagement than teachers who were concerned that students have enough "play." ∎

REFERENCES

Rosenshine, B. Academic Engaged Time, Content Covered and Direct I nstruction. Champagne-Urbana: University of Illinois, 1978.

Soar, R. S. Follow-Through Classroom Process Measurement and Pupil Growth, 1970-71: Final Report. Gainesville: College of Education, University of Florida, 1973.

Stallings, J. & Kaskowitz, D. Follow-Through Classroom Observation Evaluation, 1972-72. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1974.

Stallings, J., Neede, M., & Stayrook, N. How To Change The Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools: Phase II & JI!. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute. 1979.

APPENDIX 1
General time categories

Reading and Language Arts

Reading and language arts refers to all time allocated to read ing and language arts any time during the day, including reading and language arts activities in science, social studies, art, and music.

Mathematics

Mathematics refers to all mathematics activities during the day, in all subject areas.

Other Academic

Other academic instruction refers to academic instruction other than reading and mathematics. This includes social studies and science (where there is no reading or mathematics content).

Nonacademic

Nonacademic instruction includes music, art, structured physical education, flag salutes, sharing, and storytime.

Wait

Wait refers to periods of no activity or no movement between activities. This would occur when a student finishes his/her work early and no other activity is initiated. However, waiting for help during reading or mathematics is counted as time in reading or mathematics.

Transition

Transition refers to periods of change from one activity to another. This includes lining up, taking seats, or quieting down before the next activity. However, time spent passing out read ing or mathematics materials is counted as time in reading or mathematics.

Class Business

Class business refers to conduct of nonacademic class business such as distribution of notices, collection of milk money, or making arrangements for a field trip.

Break

Break includes any recreational or free period. It primarily refers to lunch and recess breaks, but also includes milk breaks, unstructured physical education, and leaving class to use the restroom.

APPENDIX 2
Average allocated time per day in different activities

Time category	Grade 2			Grade 5		
	Minutes per day	Combined minutes	Combined %	Minutes per day	Combined minutes	Combined %
Academic activities		2'12"	57%	1'50"	2'51"	60%
Reading and language arts	1'28"			1'50"		
Mathematics	36"			44"		
Other academic	8"			47"		
Nonacademic activities	55"	55"	24%	1'05"	1'05"	23%
Noninstructional activities		44"	19%		47"	17%
Transition	34"			34"		
Wait	4"			4"		
Housekeeping	6"			9"		
Major in-class time	3'51"	3'51"		4'44"	4'44"	
Lunch, recess, breaks	1'15"	1'15"		1'17"	1'17"	

Yale School Development Program
Reference: RF 99032 #111

Final Report for January – December, 2002

Summary

I. The School Development Program—a nationally recognized school reform model

Building the SDP organization, with Rockefeller Foundation support
A staff of scholar-activists
A national network of Comer-trained leaders
Harnessing university partnerships
Serving rural areas
Structural connections: the need for systemic thinking and planning
Child and adolescent development at the core

II. Progress Review, January-December 2002

Research evidence on achievement effects in comprehensive school reform
Dialogue with education policy makers
Formative evaluation and planning for self-improvement
Strengthening teaching and learning
Professional development and consultation
New materials for professional development
Strategic Plan for 2003
Resource development

III. Attachments

School Development Program, 2003 Strategic Plan (excerpt): *Introduction and Context Analysis*

Newsline, School Development Program, Vol. 10, No. 2 *See especially, "2001 Summer Policy Institute Brings Together Educators and Public Officials" and related articles: "The SDP Policy Agenda"; "Child Development and Education: Influencing the Legislative Process".*

SDP National Advisory Board, *Membership List, October 2002*

School Development Program, Profile of Revenues, three fiscal years (2001-2003)

From the Self Study, April 2002: *"Approach to the OERI Capacity Building Self Study", "Introduction to the Four Service Contexts of the School Development Program," and "Category Summary Form"*

Comer, James P., "Making Schools of Education Bridges to Better Learning," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 24, 2003.

Maholmes, Valerie, "What School is All About", *Education Week*, October 23, 2002

Summary

Following a decade of generous support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Yale School Development Program (SDP) received a final grant award of $1,838,636 in April, 2000, to be extended over a period of 33 months, to sustain and deepen the implementation of the program in school districts across the country, and ensure the continued dissemination of critical SDP knowledge and experience among practitioners and policymakers.

This final award has sustained core professional and support staff during a unique period of project expansion and strengthening. Supplemented by federal grant support, we have implemented a systemic reform initiative in four districts, built capacity in our instructional services unit, and expanded our policy outreach and university partnerships with schools of education. At the same time, to maintain program effectiveness, we have adapted to new federal requirements for comprehensive school reform and given attention to resource diversification, organizational restructuring, and strategic planning.

Since expenditures in the final year supported selected core staff only, in Part I of this report we have chosen to reflect on the key role of the Rockefeller Foundation not only in supporting the organizational growth of the School Development Program, but also in creating a national network of education leaders and teachers who are carrying the child development message into an increasing number of schools and districts. The generosity of the Foundation's long-term support allowed us to put our energies fully into building the program and establishing a creative and qualified professional team of scholar-activists.

Part II of the report describes the major activities in the January-December 2002 reporting period that have directly or indirectly benefited from Rockefeller Foundation funding support. While there has been no significant alteration in the overall program as previously described,[1] there have been three major review and planning exercises as well as some new developments in direction, all of which are described in the Progress Review. In addition, we discuss the financial challenges that we face in the coming year.

---

[1] For a program overview, please refer to the Annual Report for April 1999-March 2000, and the Overall Program Review presented in our extension proposal submitted in November, 2001.

Part I. <u>The School Development Program—a nationally recognized school reform model</u>

The School Development Program (SDP) has been a major force in school reform for over three decades, and was recently cited in a review by an independent panel of researchers as one of three school reform models (out of 29 studied) demonstrating the "strongest evidence of effectiveness"[2]. Over its 34-year history, the organization has evolved in structure and complexity while holding fast to its vision and commitment to helping parents, educators and policymakers create learning environments that support the total development of children and adolescents. Drawing on research findings and ongoing self-evaluations, the SDP has constantly refined its delivery of services, professional development offerings and educational practice to ensure that we follow "best practices" in helping schools and districts achieve their aims and purposes. At the same time, the organization has had to adjust—and must continue to adjust--to the shifting political, economic and social forces that affect schools, communities and families.

This endeavor, built on the ideas of Dr. James Comer, has required an organization of highly skilled educators and experienced reformers with an exceptionally broad scope. Without the dedication and expertise of truly outstanding professionals who have contributed both inside and outside the organization, the SDP would not have achieved the transformative impact on schools and districts which has led to nationwide recognition and influence.

Building the SDP organization, with Rockefeller Foundation support

After James Comer developed his ideas about reforming schools around the developmental needs of children and adolescents in the late sixties and early seventies, he felt that the next logical step would be to build an organization of highly intelligent, creative researchers and educators who were committed to helping schools build the capacity to prepare poor and/or minority children for success in school and in life. This presented several challenges and they included:

- Developing the fiscal resources to create an organization that could do research and clinical practice
- Recruiting and retaining staff that had a track record of success in disadvantaged schools and could also meet the standards for faculty appointments at Yale to work with researchers to continually improve the program
- Translating what he had learned in his research into a training and consultation model that would not require his presence in every school or district that adopted the program

The creation of this relatively new type of organization at one of the world's finest research institutions rested on the procurement of sufficient resources for at least five years and preferably ten. Foundations do not typically fund projects for more than five years and most restrict their education awards to research, evaluation, or demonstration projects. However, Comer wanted to build a permanent organization that could study poor schools and their communities, and provide them with the training and consultation to help them develop their own capacity to overcome the problems associated with poverty and discrimination. He wanted to initiate and sustain a school

---

[2] Borman, Geoffrey D., Hewes, Gina M., and Overman, Laura T., "Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement – A Meta-Analysis". Report No. 59, CRESPAR, Baltimore, MD, 2002. An on-line version of the report is available at *www.csos.jhu.edu*. See also Part II of this report under the subtitle, "Research evidence."

reform movement that would institutionalize a school governance model that engaged the collective energies and wisdom of parents, support staff and educators in creating a school where development in the six pathways (physical, cognitive, social, psychological, language, and ethical) would be the central focus of the school. The Rockefeller Foundation presented Comer with an unprecedented opportunity to make a major difference in poor schools with respect to culture, structure, focus, vision, and mission. It allowed him to build an organization that would be located within a Child Study Center that had an international reputation. And it allowed him to recruit and retain a staff of scholar-activists who could work effectively within the University and in some of our nation's most disadvantaged school districts.

A staff of scholar-activists

The staff at the School Development Program uses the term scholar-activist to describe the way they see themselves with respect to the work of school reform. Traditional college faculty in the social and behavioral sciences devote most of their time to research and teaching. There are few incentives for them to do extensive work in schools, social service agencies, or the community at large. Dr. Comer brought the scientific methods and techniques of the medical and public health fields to the social sciences by insisting that staff conduct action research. The action research model is built on the principle of "No action without research, and no research without action." Participants include program implementers and the recipients of the particular program. This method creates a learning community where knowledge is continually generated relative to what works, what does not work, and what modifications are necessary to produce best results. Such an undertaking requires staffs who are scholars in the various disciplines needed to insure conceptually sound program planning, execution, and evaluation. It also requires social activists who are willing to insert themselves in the actual schools and communities served by the program who can win the community's trust and be perceived as competent, empathetic, and nonjudgmental. This emphasis on scholarship or the generation of knowledge to address problems, and activism, the execution of solutions to eliminate problems, is at the heart of the organization's strength and has played a major role in its longevity.

A staff member's recent description of the organization captures this notion of scholarship coupled with activism: "The strength of the SDP is in generating powerful ideas and the cross fertilization of those ideas." More specifically, the organization is staffed by professionals who transform theories of child development into real and compelling strategies related to teaching and learning. Another major strength of the organization is that it has attracted a staff that is dedicated and passionate about school reform. This passion translates into the creation of a vision that inspires all that are associated with the SDP to continuously reflect on improving the connections between home, school, and the community.

A national network of Comer-trained leaders

Significantly, a number of former SDP program leaders and facilitators have risen to positions of leadership in school districts and universities around the country.

- Angelique Arrington, Assistant Professor and Field Experience Coordinator, Master of Arts in Teaching Program, Professional School of Business and Education, Johns Hopkins University
- Joanne Corbin, Associate Professor, Smith College School for Social Work

- Jonathan Gillette, Director, Teacher Preparation Program, Yale University
- Norris Haynes, Director of the Center for Community and School Action Research, Southern Connecticut University
- Sherrie Joseph, District Coordinator of Comer Schools, Detroit Public Schools
- Brian Perkins, Chair, Education Leadership at Southern Connecticut State University
- Lystra Richardson, Professor, Department of Educational Leadership, Southern Connecticut University
- Carol West, Associate Dean, Howard University
- Darren Woodruff, Senior Research Associate, American Institute for Research (AIR)

We continue to be able to recruit highly experienced educators for full time and consultant work. Their years of experience enrich our program and assure the quality of services provided to schools. Many of them have come to us from districts that have chosen to implement the Comer Process school reform model.

- Camille Cooper, former Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Dayton Public Schools
- Jeffrey German, former elementary, middle, and high school principal in Guilford County Public Schools
- Thelma Johnson, former Director of Staff and Organizational Development, New Haven Public Schools
- Gretchen Lofland, former Coordinator/Director, Comer School Development Program, Office of Chief Academic Officer, District of Columbia Public Schools
- Ann Levett-Lowe, former Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer, Dayton Public Schools and Chair, Master of Education Program, McGregor School, Antioch University
- Miriam McLaughlin, former education specialist, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
- Nora Martin, Professor of Special Education, Eastern Michigan University
- Jan Stocklinski, former Director of the Comer Program in Prince George's County, MD
- Jolene Wallace, former Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Dayton Public Schools

The SDP is unique among school reform programs in having worked developmentally with school district superintendents and their executive boards, and some of those individuals are carrying the SDP message into new positions of influence in their school districts.

- Jean Harper, former assistant superintendent in Dayton, OH, now Superintendent in Elyria, OH
- Jerry Weast, former superintendent in Guilford County (with 45 Comer schools), now Superintendent in Montgomery County, MD
- Jim Williams, former superintendent in Dayton, OH, now Deputy Superintendent in Montgomery County, MD
- Lester Young, lately Superintendent of Community School District 13 in Brooklyn (system-wide implementation of Comer Process), now appointed as Executive Director of Youth Programs in the New York City Schools

Harnessing university partnerships

The work with school boards, superintendents, central office staff, and community leaders is the result of what we see as the future direction of the SDP. We are in some districts where we have coupled this with university partnerships. If we can get significant numbers of universities to accept the concept of scholar-activism, we believe that we can make an even greater impact on the problems associated with poor schools. We have already gained the support of college presidents Dan Moore at Drury University in Springfield, Missouri and Dr. David Steinberg at C. W. Post/ Long Island University to work with their schools and communities to improve teaching, learning, and child and adolescent development. Deans at the following schools have made a commitment to infusing the ideas of the SDP in their coursework and have assigned professors to do direct work in schools and their surrounding communities:

University of Illinois at Chicago, Illinois
Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas
Southern University of New Orleans, Louisiana
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan
Drury University, Springfield, Missouri
C.W. Post, Long Island University, New York

Serving rural areas

Under funding from the Department of Education, the organization has increased its effort to reach schools in rural, underserved areas. Rural schools have, for the most part, been left out of the school reform movement. Since we go where we feel the need is greatest, we have identified several rural districts and are currently working in these communities to help them meet the challenge of educating and developing students with minimal resources. Four people with extensive experience in the field of public education and considerable expertise in guiding the implementation of the Comer Process have been identified to serve as Implementation Coordinators for these areas. Much of this work is being done in Alabama, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Lowndes County, Alabama is one of the poorest counties in America with a per annum pupil expenditure of $412.00 per student. Despite third world economic conditions, the residents in this county have a tremendous will to succeed, and they are led by a group of understanding educators. The Superintendent, Dr. John Covington, is the product of a rural community and he has managed to mobilize the will and the meager resources of the community around the needs of its students. We have discussed developing a partnership with Alabama State University, which is 20 miles away in Montgomery that will be modeled after our current partnerships. Alabama State produces the largest number of African American teachers in the state. A conference in January 2003 to be convened in Alabama will give both rural and systemically-implementing Comer districts an opportunity to develop strategies for faithful replication of the SDP model and the improvement of instructional services.

Structural connections: the need for systemic thinking and planning

We feel that these structural connections will synergize all the efforts of these various institutions and create an effect that none of them could achieve alone. Connecting structures allows for a collaborative assessment and planning process that contains and focuses efforts directed at group goals. Developing collaborative structures across a school district magnifies the output of all the groups involved in the improvement process. Systemic thinking and planning

are the wave of the future in education reform. Yet, it is clear that the disciplines associated with systemic thinking and planning are not well understood by educators and policymakers, as evidenced by the fragmented approaches that have been used to reform our nation's schools. What we have not understood well in American education reform is the need for a systemic approach that connects all the efforts of groups and individuals that influence the development of children and adolescents and the institutions that prepare staff to service children and their families.

Child and adolescent development at the core

We have also failed to see that student success in the classroom is dependent on physical, psychological, and social wellness; and that all classroom interactions are mediated by language and require that students, staff, and parents govern their behavior with common ethical principles. When these conditions are created, teachers can teach and students can learn. Cognitive functioning rests on these foundations, yet little is being done to reflect what is known by every expert in the field of brain research; *the cognition necessary to do well on academic tasks is an outcome of development in the physical, psycho-emotional, social, language, and ethical pathways*. It is the lack of psychological, emotional, and social development among young people and adults that is at the core of many of our most difficult social problems. America has a high level of intellectual capital but we are not infusing the next generation with the social and ethical capital that prevents a culture from destroying itself from within.

SDP's greatest challenge is in helping people with power to acquire and act on this wisdom---to see the connections between the various institutions that affect how children learn and develop and to understand all the developmental pathways and how they interact to produce an individual who can solve problems--- not create them. This is the essence of systems thinking and the focus of the School Development Program for the 21st century.

The current national policy context presents a challenge for our program because of the emphasis on a narrow view of how children learn, a quick fix mindset, and the inability to think systemically and strategically about harnessing the energies of communities, schools, colleges and universities, family service providers, and policy makers to insure student success in the school, home, and community. Leave no child behind is a wonderful rallying call, but it becomes an empty slogan unless we can apply our best thinking and considerably more resources to fortify the vessels that children will need to complete life's journey.

Part II. Progress Review, January-December 2002

Research evidence on achievement effects in comprehensive school reform:
Meta-analysis finds SDP has "strongest evidence of effectiveness"

A recent report[3] commissioned by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR), a center supported by the United States Department of Education, found only twenty-nine school reform programs in the country to have evidence to substantiate claims for improving student achievement. The meta-analysis done by CRESPAR yielded four categories of program classification based on the quality of the available evidence about program effects, the quantity of evidence regarding program effects, and evidence of statistically significant and positive results. Programs were grouped as follows:

1. Models with the strongest evidence of effectiveness
2. Models with highly promising evidence
3. Models with promising evidence of effectiveness
4. Models with the greatest need for additional research

The School Development Program was included in the highest category, along with Success for All and Direct Instruction. It should be noted that the SDP was the most cost-effective of the three top programs, the most comprehensive, and the program with the longest track record of working in urban, suburban, and rural schools and districts. It is also the only one that has the resources of a world class research university as well as several of the finest teacher preparation institutions in America. This four star rating by an independent panel of researchers provides solid evidence of the impact of the work of Dr. Comer and his staff over the past three decades.

Dialogue with education policy makers

In recent years the SDP has turned its attention to the legislative process and how to convey the importance of child development to education policy makers. In the summers of 2000 and 2001, SDP brought together policy makers, educators, parents, researchers and teachers in Washington, DC to generate ideas about how the SDP and other groups interested in educational reform and the overall well-being of children can play a greater role in the national discussion on education. Several articles in the Spring 2002 issue of the SDP *Newsline*[4] report on the presentations and discussions at the institute, and the Brookings Institute has expressed interest in publishing the institute proceedings.

SDP has continued to attend legislative sessions and to follow key educational issues, maintaining contact with the House Subcommittee on Education and the Work Force and the Congressional Black Caucus. Dr. Valerie Maholmes, the SDP Director of Policy, was invited to work with the Education Commission of the States, an advisory body to the National Governors Association, to help develop a community accountability plan for presentation to the governors.

---

[3] Borman, *op.cit.*
[4] Copy of *Spring 2002 Newsline* (Vol. 10, No. 2) attached to this report.

Formative evaluation and planning for self-improvement

The School Development Program has continually engaged in self-examination, reviewing internal operations and services on a regular basis to insure that we continue to help schools and districts achieve their aims and purposes. This year, the SDP was one of fifteen school reform models that were asked by the US Department of Education to participate in a major self-evaluation exercise. The process required full staff participation in assessing model implementation on several dimensions using collaboratively developed rubrics. Our review was complicated by changes in services and clientele that we have experienced over our 34-year history. We evaluated ourselves on quality of service to four different groups: systemic districts (implementing reform system-wide), "veteran" districts using the Comer Process in selected schools for five years or more, Abbott schools in New Jersey, and CSRD schools.[5] The University of Memphis review team examined our ratings for these assessments, and concluded, as we ourselves did, that a systemic approach to school reform gave the best chance of creating and sustaining change.

Based on the findings of the self-study, we formulated a self-improvement plan with five objectives that will work together to strengthen the definition and requirements of our program, culminating in a process of accreditation for Comer schools. Guided by the high ratings given to our established "systemic protocol", the improvement plan aims to develop a similarly detailed protocol for all schools that are implementing the Comer Process. The improvements include (1) defining quality standards for the program at the moment of intake; (2) refining and supplementing evaluation instruments to reflect these standards; (3) establishment of an accreditation process based on the standards; and (4) the establishment of a data department and system for accumulating relevant data for the accreditation process, as well as for monitoring program outcomes.

Strengthening teaching and learning

The Teaching and Learning Unit of SDP continues to expand and strengthen its curriculum work in order to more directly impact student achievement. Expert consultants and experienced reading educators are currently working with the director of the Essentials of Literacy program to support the schools. The Balanced Curriculum and Teachers Helping Teachers programs are also incorporating additional field support for program implementation.

Regional training sessions have been conducted for districts committed to program implementation. A national academy was held for district leaders in the School Development network. District Superintendents, curriculum directors, professional development directors, and Reading/Literacy/Language Arts directors examined each program to determine feasibility for district implementation. All three programs are revising training manuals and other written support materials are being developed in conjunction with the academies. The Essentials of Literacy program is in the editing phase of preparing a video series for professional development purposes.

---

[5] For a review of our approach to the Self-Study, see the following attachments: "Approach to the OERI Capacity Building Self Study," and "Introduction to the Four Service Contexts of the School Development Program." The ratings and improvement priorities appear in the "Category Summary Form."

Professional Development and Consultation

In the last year, our professional development and consultation work has experienced some important shifts, with both positive and negative impacts. In 2001, the SDP began regionalizing its 101 Leadership Academy, the first week of basic training in the Comer Process, to relieve the demand on headquarters staff and bring the training closer to participating schools in the Midwest. Our regional centers in Detroit and Chicago each offered two sessions, one in the fall and one in the spring, designed on the standard model developed at Yale. A high quality of training was sustained in both centers, thanks to the experienced regional staff and guest input from Yale faculty members. At the same time, the 102 Leadership Academy was redesigned to reduce training costs. These changes allowed us to realize a significant drop in the cost of sponsoring the 102 Academy, while preserving the integrity of the program content and overall quality of this professional experience.

Due to district budgetary constraints in the current fiscal year, since July 2002 the SDP has seen reductions in both training enrollments and requests for consultation. Several districts could not afford to continue their contractual arrangements with SDP, while many others contracted for fewer consultation services. As well, fewer districts and/or schools could budget for their teachers or district stakeholders to participate in training sessions. In anticipation of and response to these changes, the delivery format of consultation services was reshaped. Staffing assignments were adjusted as needed, and some full time positions were eliminated totally, while others were converted to part-time positions. Fewer consultants are now contracted to support work done in contracted schools.

One unfortunate side effect of the budgetary constraints is that SDP must reduce the extent of free, supplementary consultation services that it has provided to districts and/or schools that are struggling with budgetary issues but are demonstrating progress in SDP implementation. Our grants and increased service revenue have helped us do that in the past. We are also not able to provide scholarships or tuition remission for more of our districts that are in the same position. We do plan to continue to reorganize and reformat our training to meet the current needs of schools and school districts in regard to time, cost and location of these offerings. We will be scaling back on the number of training academies offered in New Haven and trying to regionalize more and customize or provide training on site, hoping that will allow schools to continue with SDP implementation. Even as we revamp professional development to ensure that it addresses the current context in which schools are operating, we are committed to preserving the integrity of our program content, recognizing that professional development is the most critical link to building capacity for school change.

New materials for professional development

SDP staff and colleagues in the field are collaborating on a third book about the Comer Process, this one to be a practical "field book" covering the core subjects addressed at the SDP Leadership Academies. Each chapter brings together the voices of practitioners in the field with those of the program leaders. The book reflects the wisdom of Dr. Comer himself, the staff at the Yale School Development Program, and many people in the hundreds of school communities that have embraced the SDP reform model. It is the collective representation of what we have learned from parents, children, teachers, administrators, community leaders, politicians, college professors, clergy and members of the helping professions. We expect the book to be published

by Corwin Press in early 2004. It will serve as a resource manual, complete with visuals, for basic training in the Comer process. New classroom-sized educational panels (visuals & text) that represent core ideas on the six pathways of child development (as proposed by James Comer) have been added to the SDP poster series depicting the principles of the Comer Process.

Strategic Plan for 2003

Our National Advisory Board[6] met in October, 2002 and requested an updated Strategic Plan that would address the current economic, political, social and educational stresses on school reform and their impact on SDP program implementation.[7] Board chairman Joseph Dionne worked with executive staff members in the following months to prepare the plan, which will be reviewed and discussed by the Board in February, 2003. The objectives and action strategies in the new Strategic Plan have been developed around three critical organizational goals:

- Maintain a stable yet adaptive organizational structure that allows us to achieve our organizational vision and mission and respond appropriately to the changing educational and political landscapes
- Foster a greater understanding of how child and adolescent development serves as the foundation for child rearing, educational practice, teacher education and policymaking
- Develop a fiscal strategy that will allow us to ensure our stability, facilitate our growth, and preserve our commitment to excellence while advancing our vision and mission

Resource development

Over the last few years we have worked continuously to diversify and strengthen our resource base, but renewal of support in 2003 has become critical, as can be seen from the profile of our income sources attached to this report. We were awarded two major federal grants from the Department of Education in 1998 and 2000 to support our systemic reform initiative and to build capacity in the teaching and learning aspects of the program. We benefited from an Earmark grant award from the Fund for Education in 2001, also intended to strengthen key elements of the program, particularly the development of a field manual and related learning technology. Most recently, in August 2002, we received a two-year MacArthur Foundation award to help sustain our educational extension service model.

However, all three federal grants are due to expire in 2003 and with one possible exception, various factors make it unlikely that supplemental extensions will be forthcoming. (For example, we have been advised that Yale University does not wish to be the further beneficiary of so-called "earmark" funds.) The government has shifted its funding focus toward research into the effectiveness of comprehensive school reform. Since our program has a significant body of internal and external research demonstrating its impact across a range of schools and districts, we have focused on strengthening implementation rather than on experimental research. We do wish to do impact research, but we have an interest in questions related to increasing the effects of the program when it is buttressed by instructional service components like Essentials of Literacy, Teachers Helping Teachers, and Balanced Curriculum.

---

[6] See list of Board members attached to this report.

[7] For a discussion of the past and current school reform environment, see the Introduction and Context Analysis for the 2003 SDP Strategic Plan, attached to this report.

The Ford Foundation has given us a modest grant to support the development of an evaluation design that will address the complexity of our multi-level reform model (this work to be carried out with the assistance of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation); this would be form the basis of a larger study proposal. While we are preparing proposals to adapt to this new direction of the federal government, we also need resources to continue implementing what we know works.

While we successfully increased service-generated revenues in the 2000-2002 period, significantly surpassing our original 30% goal, revenues from both training and consultation are expected to decline in the current fiscal year, due to severe budget cutbacks in many of the districts in which we work (New Jersey and Detroit, in particular). Revenues (as opposed to grants) supported 59% of the program in 2000-2001 but only 44% of the program in 2001-20002, due to a drop-off in training revenue and a short-term increase in grant funding. In 2000-2001 over two-thirds of our revenue came from professional development events, but this figure was nearly cut in half in 2001-2002 as a result of people's reluctance to travel after the 9/11 tragedy and our transfer of the 101 Leadership Academy sessions to regional training centers in Detroit and Chicago. (The transfer was made to better accommodate districts' budgetary and travel needs.)

Cost-cutting measures have been implemented accordingly, as discussed above in the section on *Professional development and consultation*. Several SDP staff are retired educators who have the experience, energy and commitment to do our work well. Their on-the-job "learning curve" is short, and they do not require benefits. We also conducted a cost benefit analysis of our professional development events, and redesigned these programs to reflect a leaner, more focused set of activities requiring less facilitating staff but generating the same results.

There is still much work to be done to assure continuation of the program into 2004 and beyond. Our dilemma is that we are primarily a "clinical" service embedded in a research institution, the Yale Child Study Center. While we have made some progress in the policy arena and will continue to do impact research, we require a staff of professionals who can be effective change agents in the most disadvantaged communities in America. This requires a level of logistical support that is unlike that of typical universities and a skill set that reflects authentic experiences working in schools like the ones we serve, as well as the level of scholarship needed to support the dissemination of our work in papers, journals, and books. We are working earnestly to insure the survival of our organization because we believe that we represent the only organized effort to infuse what we know about how children and adolescents develop with the improvement of teaching and learning. However, we are at a critical juncture and face some daunting challenges if we are to remain a significant player in the school reform movement. Our National Advisory Board is helping us to devise ways and means to address this looming crisis.