0012-05

Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

In re: Hope High School

Decision and Order of Reconstitution

February 4, 2005

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Background/Travel of the Case 4
Findings of Fact 12
Progressive Support and Intervention 12
School District Oversight 13
Structure, Staffing and Scheduling 16
Student Advisories 17
Curriculum and Instruction 17
Administration and Leadership 18
Outcome Measures 19
High School Regulations 19
Parent and Community Partnerships 20
Discussion and Conclusions of Law 22
ORDER OF RECONSTITUTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION 26
Appendix A: Consolidated Corrective Action Plan 29

Introduction

The R.I. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (RIDE) and the Providence Public Schools (PPS) have been working together for school improvement in the Providence School District since the formation of the "Providence Compact" in June 2000. This collaboration has focused in particular on Hope High School since June 2002, when RIDE and the PPS agreed that under the auspices of Progressive Support and Intervention, as defined in state law, Hope High School would be reorganized into three small, autonomous learning communities.

Since that time, progress has been made at Hope High School. The three small learning communities were in fact established in September 2003. Student outcomes have shown signs of improvement – test scores and the participation rate on state assessments have increased. Last year (2004) Hope High School met 19 of the 21 targets established by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. However, there is also continuing evidence of serious distress at Hope High School. The drop out rate has climbed to 52% in recent years and although many plans have been made for changes at the school the only aspect of the plans that has really been implemented is the reorganization of the school into the three Small Learning Communities.

At the time this hearing was scheduled the situation appeared grave. Although plans had been approved by the faculty in the Spring of 2004 those had not been accepted for implementation at the district level. Forward movement was stalled.

The three Small Learning Communities opened in September without student advisories in place – despite commitments in all planning documents to conduct advisories as the first step toward personalization. A fourth administrator, to work with the three Small Learning Community Directors for essential coordination of three Learning Communities on a single campus, could not be found. No universally approved plan was in place for operation during the 2004-2005 school year and beyond.

The creation of the Union-District Intervention Team and the expansion of central office capacity to support high school reform have created an opportunity for meaningful changes at Hope High School. This Decision, Order and Consolidated Plan, requires the continued operation of the school by the PPS under the terms and conditions drawn from the November 18, 2004 Plan and the several plans developed and approved by the school level administrators and faculty. In this new context it is responsible to order the continued operation of the school by the district, under very specific terms and conditions and with a Special Master in place to facilitate the implementation of the Consolidated Plan.

The findings in this Decision and Order are based on evidence presented at the five sessions of the hearing and on subsequent written submissions to RIDE. It was clear from the hearing that all parties agreed on the major principles that should guide the reconstitution of Hope High School:

- Three small, autonomous learning communities
- Authentic advisory structure and personalization for students
- Sufficient professional development for members of the staff
- Active community and parental involvement in decision-making as true partners, not guests
- Ongoing partnerships with outside institutions such as universities and community groups

The task before us has been to develop and implement a Consolidated Corrective Action Plan that would bring those principles to life at Hope High School.

This Decision contains three discreet elements:

- The Commissioner's **Decision** itself, which reviews the history of the reorganization of Hope High School, presents the Findings of Fact based on testimony and documentary evidence submitted at the Show Cause Hearing, and concludes with Commissioner's Discussion and Conclusions of Law
- The Commissioner's **Order** of Reconstitution and Corrective Action for Hope High School
- The Consolidated Corrective Action **Plan** for Hope High School

The Consolidated Corrective Action Plan itself is presented as an appendix to this Decision and is incorporated by reference in this Decision and Order. The plan has been constructed by the Commissioner based on the thinking in all of the planning documents presented to him since this intervention began and it particularly relies upon and accepts the key elements in the Corrective Action Plan presented to RIDE jointly by the PPS and the PTU subsequent to the announcement of the Show Cause Hearing. It is expected that this plan endorses all of the essential elements of the work conducted at the school and district level and will move to implementation what has been a too extended planning process. It is further expected that this Order and Consolidated Corrective Action Plan will lead to continued school improvement and student achievement at Hope High School while ensuring that higher student achievement applies to all students as the drop out rate is diminished. There is a consensus that the pace of change must be accelerated.

Background/Travel of the Case

Through the Providence Compact for Excellence in Education, executed in June of 2000, the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE), the Providence Public Schools, and the City of Providence formalized their commitment to the redesign and restructuring of the City's secondary schools. In June of 2002, the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education intervened in Providence's Hope High School, pursuant to his authority under R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5 to intervene in schools that fail to improve student results for three years or more. Section 16-7.1-5 provides in full as follows:

> Intervention and support for failing schools. – The board of regents shall implement a series of progressive support and intervention strategies consistent with the Comprehensive Education Strategy and the principles of the "School Accountability for Learning and Teaching" (SALT) of the board of regents for those schools and school districts that continue to fall short of performance goals outlines in the district strategic plans. These strategies shall initially focus on: (1) technical assistance in improvement planning, curriculum alignment, school assessment, instruction, and family and community improvement; (2) policy support; (3) resource oversight to assess and recommend that each school has adequate resources necessary to meet performance goal; and (4) creating supportive partnerships with education institutions, business, governmental, or other appropriate nonprofit agencies. **If after a three (3) year period of support there has not been improvement in the education of students as determined by objective criteria to be developed by the board of regents, there**

> **shall be progressive levels of control by the department of elementary and secondary education over the school and /or district budget, program, and/or personnel.** This control by the department of elementary and secondary education may be exercised in collaboration with the school district and the municipality. **If further needed, the school shall be reconstituted. Reconstitution responsibility is delegated to the board of regents and may range from restructuring the school's governance, budget, program, personnel, and/or may include decisions regarding the continued operation of the school.** The board of regents shall assess the district's capacity and may recommend the provision of additional district, municipal, and/or state resources. If a school or school district is under the board of regents control as a result of actions taken by the board pursuant to this section, the local school committee shall be responsible for funding that school or school district at the same level as in the prior academic year increased by the same percentage as the state total of school aid is increased. (Emphasis added).

Underlying the Commissioner's intervention at Hope High School were two findings: (1) student performance was steadily declining as measured by state assessments; and (2) the school was stalled in its efforts to implement an ongoing, multi-year redesign process.

Despite these two major problems, there was one positive aspect of the situation at Hope High School. The Commissioner determined that the articulated goals of the school's own multi-year redesign process were the same as the goals of the intervention: to break down a large, unresponsive, and unsuccessful comprehensive high school into three self-governing, autonomous, and responsive Small Learning Communities fully focused on student learning needs, standards-based instruction, and student results.

The "Rhode Island Department of Education, School Performance Categories, Face-to-Face Meeting Report: Providence Public Schools," dated June 9, 2002, acknowledges "several years" of engagement by Hope High School (HHS) in a comprehensive redesign process. (Exhibit No. 26) However, these years of work had yet to produce an actionable plan for achieving autonomous small learning communities within the larger Hope High School complex. The Commissioner applauded the PPS decision to install Nancy Mullen as the new principal at Hope High School, and further required that "the entire leadership team be immediately reconstituted at Hope High School" and that the new administrators "become the administrative heads of the three to four small learning communities already envisioned in the Hope High School redesign." (Exhibit No. 26)

Based on the elements of the school's own preexisting and ongoing redesign efforts, the Commissioner imposed specific requirements for changes at Hope High School, and ordered that the school district provide him with a plan that met his stated requirements. The "plan for the implementation of small learning communities as site-based managed schools" was required to include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- Provisions that ensure that those teachers who choose to remain at Hope High School for the implementation of the plan in the 2003-2004 school year would do so based on acceptance of the specific elements of the design of the small learning communities;
- A mechanism to enable willing teachers to remain at Hope High School and within their small learning community for the 2003-2004 school year;
- Mechanisms to provide flexibility in scheduling of students and teachers so that there could be genuine grade level "teacher teams" in each of the small learning communities;
- Mechanisms to ensure that teachers participate in the necessary professional development to support best practices in standards-based instruction;
- Three to four small learning communities with each learning community having integrity as a site-based unit; and,
- Student, family, and community participation in the redesign process;

(Exhibit 26)

The June 9, 2002 Report and Order further set forth a series of expectations for HHS faculty, including a "meaningful opportunity to participate in the redesign process," faculty participation in bimonthly meetings held outside the school day, participation in "at least 20 hours of professional development, outside the context of the school day," during ensuing school years. The Report and Order further holds the PPS, the Providence School Board and the Providence Teachers' Union "collectively responsible for creating mechanisms that will ensure" faculty participation in these offerings. Speaking specifically to the requirement of professional development outside the school day, the Report states that the PPS, School Board and Teachers' Union "are expected to work together to create a mechanism that would permit faculty who cannot meaningfully participate in the professional development to seek another teaching assignment." (Exhibit 26)

The June 9, 2002 Report and Order concludes by stating that, "Should the [PPS], Board and Provide Teachers' Union be unable to collectively meet the requirements set forth in this Face-to-Face report, based upon the review of progress by the RIDE during regular meetings held during the 2003-2004 school year, the Commissioner will implement the requirements through the authorities granted him under Title XVI." (Exhibit 26)

In addition to the specific requirements imposed on Hope High School through the intervention authorities of the Commissioner, Hope High School is subject to the statewide requirements of the *Regulations of the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education regarding Public High Schools (January 2003)*. At the district level, these regulations require the development of performance- based graduation requirements pursuant to a plan submitted at the end of the 2003-2004 school year. At the school level, these "High School Regulations" require personalization (planning based on each student's social/emotional, academic, and career needs); professional development (no fewer than 15 hours of professional development a year focused on priority areas of literacy, graduation by proficiency, and personalization); common planning time (to occur at least weekly, organized around students, especially those with the highest needs); and student advisory (the assignment of each student to a responsible adult who is knowledgeable about that student and tracks his or her progress).

The Hope High School Redesign Plan, submitted to RIDE by the school system on January 31, 2003, set forth a plan for the development, during the 2003-2004 school year, of three specific site-based management proposals for the three Small Learning Communities. On February 13, 2003, the Commissioner forwarded to the PPS his endorsement of the January 31, 2003 plan for Hope High School, with a series of specific caveats required to address deficiencies in the submitted plan:

- Each small learning community, as a site-based-managed unit, must have specific site-based authority to hire and assign teachers and all other staff within that small learning community and across the Hope Complex;
- There must be curricular instructional opportunities, not just enrichment and student support activities, offered beyond the traditional school day in order to meet students' needs;
- The proposed Learning Center must function as a true advisory with students matched to a specific teacher who provide case management as envisioned in the Regents' High School Regulations;
- Teachers must be provided with substantial professional development opportunities and common planning time; and
- Increase participation by parents, students, and community partners on the Hope Complex Improvement Team and the three respective small learning environment school improvement teams.

(Exhibit 50)

During the 2003-2004 school year, the Commissioner and his staff met monthly with the newly established leadership team at Hope High School. Cognizant of the requirements and deadlines imposed by the Commissioner's intervention, the three Directors of the Small Learning Communities, along with other administrators from the school and district, as well as members of the faculty and the teachers' union, worked diligently within the constraints imposed upon them

to develop plans for faculty vote and approval as part of a district site-based management application process. These educators worked long hours – planning and re-planning – devoting many hours during nights and weekends at several critical junctures when decisions had to be made.

Through the extraordinary efforts of many committed individuals, three plans were ultimately developed. However, a variety of bureaucratic, budgetary, and political barriers have prevented the implementation of the Commissioner's directives. As a result no approvable plans have been submitted to the Commissioner for the operation of three Small Learning Communities during the 2004-2005 school year and beyond. The plans that were developed never secured the school district and union approvals necessary for the plans to be submitted to the Commissioner for approval. There are many mandatory elements in the requirements detailed above that the Plans would not have been able to meet even if they had been submitted to the Commissioner. Most important, there is little evidence that instructional practices at the school have changed significantly.

On April 24, 2003 the Commissioner set forth additional specifications for the implementation of the 2003-2004 HHS redesign plan. He emphasized the need for action, requiring that the redesign plan as submitted be implemented forthwith in order to enroll students into three small learning communities by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. The Commissioner further required greater specificity and clarity in regard to the following issues:

- The process for reconstituting the school into three small learning communities, as well as definition of the resultant governance structures;
- How each small learning community would significantly increase the extent and depth of parent and student involvement in these governance and redesign processes;
- How each small learning community would be developing its own thematic content and curricula;
- Assurances that the substance and process for teacher assignment to the small learning communities would reflect student needs and interests; and,
- The manner in which each small learning community would provide for established professional development needs, as well as common planning time with the school schedule.

Finally, the Commissioner required the submission of monthly restructuring reports from each burgeoning new community. (Exhibit No. 53)

Specific site-based management plans for three small learning communities (Leadership, Information Technology, and the Arts) were developed over this period, approved by the HHS faculty, and submitted to the Commissioner on March 31, 2004. (Exhibits Nos. 105, 106, 107) These plans were never fully appraised by the Commissioner, as the Union-District Intervention Team voted

against the adoption of the three site-based management plans, thereby negating them. By early June of 2004, HHS faculty in each of the three Small Learning Communities had voted on and rejected the revised site-based management plans as revised in accordance with the Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team recommendations. (Exhibit 134)

On June 28, 2004, the Commissioner responded to the news of the lack of faculty approval and admission of non-compliance by directing that his prior Order dated June 9, 2002 be instituted in full. He specifically instructed that vacant faculty positions were not to be posted at the upcoming Providence job fair, but rather that each SLC be granted the authority to interview and hire new faculty in compliance with his prior Order. (Exhibit No. 125)

On July 12, 2004, the Commissioner entered the Order of Reconstitution and the Order to Show Cause, which form the basis for the instant hearing and decision. The Order for Reconstitution states in full as follows:

1. Hope High School is hereby reconstituted pursuant to R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5.
2. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, each Small Learning Community at Hope High School is required to have the authority to interview and hire staff. Therefore, positions vacant at Hope High School shall not be posted at the Providence Job Fair.
3. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, each Small Learning Community will operate during the 2004-2005 school year on a schedule to be approved by the Commissioner that ensures common planning time and advisory time focused on student needs and standards-based instruction.
4. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, the district is hereby ordered to submit a Corrective Action Plan to the Commissioner for approval no later than August 10, 2004, setting forth a specific, detailed response and plan to address each deficiency and requirement set forth in this document.
5. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, the district is hereby ordered to immediately submit to the Commissioner a detailed operating budget for the entire Hope High School complex – showing all proposed school-level expenditures for the 2004-2005 school year. The expenditure of the $600,000 in state general-revenue intervention funds designated for Hope High School is hereby frozen contingent upon the Commissioner's review and approval of said budget for school-level expenditures.

(Exhibit No. 127)

The July 12, 2004, Order to Show Cause re: Discontinuation of Operation 2005-2006 School Year states in full as follows:

1. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, the district is hereby ordered to appear before the Commissioner, at a date and time to be designated once the District's Corrective Action Plan has been reviewed and the 2003-2004 assessment and accountability results and rankings are available, to show cause as to why the operation of Hope High School should not be discontinued, effective September 2005.

2. Depending upon the outcome of this show-cause hearing, the Commissioner hereby notifies the district that he may require the discontinuation of operation of the school in its present form effective September 2005.

3. The Commissioner hereby further notifies the district that, depending upon the outcome of the show-cause hearing, he may require that all personnel in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope High School be notified that their jobs have been consolidated prior to March 1, 2005, in order that the 2004-2005 school year can be used to establish and staff three new Small Schools, to be operated and staffed commencing with the 2005-2006 school year at the Hope High School facility, based upon criteria established by the Commissioner.

(Exhibit No. 127)

The PPS submitted a draft Corrective Action Plan for HHS to the Commissioner on August 10, 2004 (Exhibit No. 128) and submitted a second draft Corrective Action Plan on October 27, 2004. (Exhibit No. 131) The PPS submitted a final Corrective Action Plan to the Commissioner on November 18, 2004, the adequacy of which is the subject of the instant hearing and decision. (Exhibit No. 134)

In addition to the statutory grant of authority for implementing progressive support and intervention, including reconstitution of targeted schools and districts as set forth in RIGL § 16-7.1-5, the Commissioner further relies upon the following statutory grants of authority in hearing and deciding the specific interventions to be implemented at Hope High School, given its continued status as a school in need of improvement, corrective action, restructuring, and reconstitution: 20 USC 1116 (b)(14), (c)(10) (authorizing the state education agency to take corrective action to ensure that the responsible LEA "substantially and directly responds to the consistent academic failure that caused the state to take [corrective action] designed to meet the goal of having all students... achieve at the proficient and advanced student achievement levels); RIGL § 16-1-8 (authorizing and directing the Commissioner to inspect schools and direct improvements in the administration of the school system); RIGL §§ 16-1-10, 16-1-11, 16-5-30 (withholding of aid by the Commissioner); RIGL § 16-7.1-16 (authorizing the Commissioner to require a school district to reserve a potion of targeted aid for intervention remedies); RIGL §§ 16-60-4, 16-60-6, 16-60-9 (authorizing investigation of all transactions and matters relating to public

elementary and secondary education including subpoena power); and RIGL § 45-13-1.1 (authorizing the impounding of state aid equal to an amount required to be paid by state law)

Findings of Fact

Five days of testimony and a rich administrative record supplied by the state allows for a wide and deep range of factual findings related to the state and school district interventions into the restructuring of Hope High School (HHS). Great care has been taken in recognizing, and relying upon, only that evidence that has been presented or introduced within the four corners of this hearing.

Progressive Support and Intervention

Accountability oversight by the Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) in the Providence Public Schools (PPS) was initiated in the 1999-2000 school year. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, p.16) *The Providence Compact for Excellence in Education*, as approved by the Providence City Council, the Mayor of Providence, and the Providence School Board on June 22, 2000, commits the Providence Superintendent and the Providence School Board to the "redesign and restructure of its middle and high schools in a timely and effective manner." (Exhibit No.1) It is therefore clear that PPS and Hope High School (HHS) began their mutual efforts to "redesign and restructure" HHS no later than June 22, 2000, the date of the Providence Compact. (Exhibit No. 1)

Significant resources have been devoted to the implementation of school improvement and reform activities at HHS in the years following the adoption of the *Providence Compact*. The Rhode Island Department of Education (RIDE) provided $3.7 Million in state Progressive Support and Intervention (PSI) funds to the Providence Public Schools over the 2000-2001, 2001-2002, and 2002-2003 school years to implement the *Providence Compact*. (Transcript, 12/7/04, p.9) On July 31, 2003, upon the expiration of the $3.7 Million grant, the Commissioner authorized $600,000 annually in state PSI funds for the hiring of three assistant administrators and four additional teachers to enable the three small learning communities to meet their scheduling and structural needs. (Exhibit No. 69) The PPS estimates the cost of its intervention at HHS to run between $2.1 Million and $2.4 Million in each of the 2004-2005, 2005-2006, and 2006-2007 school years. Of that amount, $1.2 Million each year is devoted to providing common planning time. The remaining funds devoted to reform efforts at Hope are provided through a series of grant funds from RIDE, the Gates Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and the federal Department of Education. (Transcript, 12/9/04, M.Dunham, pp. 108-116)

During the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years, RIDE and the PPS met on a periodic basis in a series of Face-to-Face meetings, as contemplated by RIDE Progressive Support & Intervention guidance documents. The content of these meetings, as well as monthly reports from the nascent small learning communities, is memorialized in a series of meeting minutes as documented by

RIDE and shared with the PPS. (See, e.g., Exhibits Nos. 12, 19, 27, 35, 38, 43, 48, 49, 60-120)

The Providence Public Schools strongly support and endorse each of the requirements for reform at HHS as articulated by the Commissioner and feel that applicable research also supports the changes set forth in his series of Orders relevant to Hope High School. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 71) The specific content of the Commissioner's Orders over a period of years have been addressed in part, and ignored in part, by the PPS and HHS faculty and administration. As a result of conflicting directives, lack of collective will, and dwindling resources, faculty at HHS are frustrated by an interminable cycle of planning and continuous change; they seek consistency and structure in order to move forward with the Commissioner's Orders. (Transcript, 12/8/04, B.Baldizar, p. 180; K.Lueker, 12/9/04, p.65; M.Davidson, 12/9/04, p. 71)

School District Oversight

The Providence Public Schools have developed a comprehensive district strategic plan entitled the Performance Management Plan, which focuses on three broad goals that form the foundation for all school improvement plans within the district: increasing student achievement, building school and district capacity to implement reforms, and engaging parents and the community in the education process. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, pp. 10-11) The school district has embraced a series of action plans that encompass the ideals of small learning communities, coordinated curricula relevant to students' real-life context, articulated scope and sequence of instruction, use of consistent texts and graduation requirements across schools, principles and practices of youth development, disciplinary literacy, the development of high-quality instructional practices through embedded professional development, teaming and common planning time, instructional structures that connect leadership and learning through leadership training and school improvement processes, using data to differentiate instructional practices to raise specific student performance, and meaningful opportunities for public participation in redesign and reform efforts. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, pp. 14-15, 17, 23-24, 27) Personalization of instruction, as evidenced by the adoption of personalized literacy and individualized learning plans, is intended to be a core element of the education experience in Providence schools. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, pp. 21-22) PPS commitments to school reforms have been hindered by severe budget constraints, which have necessitated the laying off of 280 educators across the district, impacting the provision of music, art, library, social work, and guidance services to students. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 99)

Yet, there have been a number of positive developments in regard to the district's ability to oversee and manage school improvement efforts at Hope High school and other schools within the district. The PPS central office has developed significant new capacities to aid its high schools over the past five years, adding a Division of Drop-out Prevention, Intervention and Recovery, a Division of High

Schools including a youth development facilitator and design coaches; and a Division of Parent and Public Engagement, all of which are fully staffed and operational. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, pp. 31, 36)

The PPS and the Providence Teachers' Union have created a powerful opportunity to implement site-based school improvement initiatives by their formation of a Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team, which is authorized to waive or draft contractual agreements needed to implement school reforms necessary to raise student achievement. (Transcript, 12/9/04, M.Johnson, p.108) This body is absolutely essential to the creation of fully realized small learning communities, with the attendant infrastructure and faculty buy-in necessary to achieve continuous improvement of student investment and achievement at Hope High School.

The PPS adopted the three Small Learning Community plans as submitted to the Commissioner on November 18, 2004, despite the acknowledgement that at least some elements of those plans are not acceptable. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 150, 160) As a result, the district corrective action plan for HHS is insufficient as a guide for managing reforms within the three small learning communities without the preparation of adequate site-based management plans from each learning community. (Transcript, 12/8/04, F.Gallo, p. 158) The need for fully actualized management structures within each Small Learning Community, supported and resourced by the Joint Intervention Team and the central office, is abundantly clear – and clearly less than fully realized. As one example, although PPS views the development of a workable schedule as a school-level activity, final approval of the HHS schedule for the 2005-2006 rests with the Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 214-215) A workable schedule for the HHS complex, which meets the mandates set forth by the Commissioner, has yet to be realized.

Redesign Efforts at Hope High School

In 2002 the Commissioner acknowledged "several years" of engagement by Hope High School in a comprehensive redesign process, culminating in the school district's efforts to "reorganize all four grades at Hope into 'houses' during the 2000-2001 school year. (Exhibit No. 26) The Commissioner's June 9, 2002, Report and Order mandates that the "plan for these site-based managed small learning communities, with all local approvals in place, must be submitted to the Commissioner for his approval no later than January 31, 2003. The fully approved plan must be put in place no later than September 2003." The plan to be submitted was subject to a specific set of requirements, as set forth by the Commissioner. (Exhibit No. 26)

On January 31, 2003, the PPS transmitted to RIDE a plan that set forth three autonomous small learning communities, each with a block schedule containing common planning time and opportunities for embedded professional development. This plan contemplated the creation of learning opportunities

beyond the school day and beyond the boundaries of the campus. Administratively, the plan contemplated the change from a "master principal" to a less directive, more facilitative "chief operations officer," along with the addition of three assistant principals to support the directors of the three small learning communities. (Exhibit No. 45)

The January 31, 2003 plan also commits to student personalization in three powerful ways:

- The creation of ninth grade teams that would stay with an assigned group of students over a period of years;
- New intensive ramp-up summer programs for students entering the ninth grade;
- A daily 45 minute learning center combining instruction and student support services; and,
- The implementation of Individual Learning Plans to foster differentiation and personalization of instruction across grades and content areas.

(Exhibit No. 45)

On March 17, 2003 80% of the then-current HHS faculty endorsed the plan submitted to the Commissioner on January 31, 2003 with certain modifications designed to add specificity in regard to the transition to a new governance structure, the schedule of implementation, and the ability of each small learning community to build its own pool of substitute teachers, in accordance with the Commissioner's directive dated February 13, 2003. (Exhibit Nos. 50, 51) Specific site-based management plans for three small learning communities (Leadership, Information Technology, and the Arts) were developed over this same period, approved by the HHS faculty, and submitted to the Commissioner on March 31, 2004. (Exhibits Nos. 105, 106, 107)

The Commissioner measured the three site-based plans against his earlier directives and found several elements to be less than fully compliant with his vision for three autonomous learning communities built upon strong ties to community partners, students, and parents. On April 24, 2003 the Commissioner set forth additional specifications for the implementation of the 2003-2004 HHS redesign plan. (Exhibit No. 53)

In June of 2004, the Providence Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team voted against the adoption of the three site-based management plans due to concerns about the costs of ninth grade planning time, the design for a cooperative learning center for students, and other issues with budgetary and staffing implications.

In response to feedback from the Providence Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team, the three small learning communities amended their plans to eliminate the learning center as a discrete activity, retain a "four-by-four" block schedule and student load cap as originally proposed, and

incorporate a daily advisor period into an existing class period. (Exhibits Nos. 120, 121, 134) HHS faculty thereafter voted on and rejected the site-based management plans as revised in accordance with Providence Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team recommendations. (Exhibit 134)

Successful conversion of large high schools into smaller learning communities requires coordination of operations by a single campus director, coupled with autonomy within each community to select staff, place students, and make student-based scheduling decisions. (Transcript, 12/8/04, A.Pope, pp. 45-46) Conversion of existing schools into smaller units is more difficult than building new learning communities from the ground up because of the challenges of changing faculty culture to adapt to new circumstances. (Transcript, 12/8/04, A.Pope, pp. 47-48)

According to national models embraced by the PPS, it takes three years to plan a conversion to small learning communities, develop curricula, and devise workable student selection and scheduling. It is reasonable to expect full implementation of small learning communities by the fourth and fifth years after embarking on a plan to move to small learning communities. (Transcript, 12/8/04, A.Pope, pp. 53-55; M.Johnson, p.63) Counting conservatively, Hope High School is quickly approaching the fifth year in its current cycle of planning and restructuring, which began before Superintendent Johnson assumed her current position. Reform efforts at Hope High School are clearly not on track with the national model espoused by the school district.

Structure, Staffing and Scheduling

There have been positive changes at HHS over the past few years in regards to the learning environment, efficacy of leadership, common planning teams, and use of student data to drive decision-making. (Transcript, 12/9/04, R.Millican, pp. 39-41)

At Hope School, and at other high schools in Providence and assuredly across the country, there are teachers who are substantially more motivated, more inventive, and closer to their students then are other teachers, and there would be a benefit to retaining only those teachers at HHS who are willing and able to implement needed changes required to bring consistency, personalization, and quality to instructional practices. (Transcript, 12/15/04, K.Jackson, p.15; M.S.Harrison, pp. 29, 38-39; S.Lee, pp. 66-69, 71-72; D.D.Rivera, pp. 89-91, 93); A.Massotti, p.84; D.Langley, pp. 94-95; E.House, p. 111; M.Francisco, pp. 118-119; T.Mitchel, p.131) In fact, an "opt out" opportunity was provided to HHS faculty in February of 2003. (Exhibit 46)

Hope High School experienced significant difficulties in formulating a master schedule for classes beginning in September of 2003. (Exhibits Nos. 66, 67, 72, 73) The overall structure for student scheduling remains in a state of flux; there is

currently no agreement on the nature of class schedules for HHS for the 2005-2006 school year. (Transcript, 12/8/04, B.Baldizar, pp.171-172; Exhibit No. 134) Despite an acknowledgement of significant problems with a rotating block schedule as is currently in place at HHS, PPS has proposed its continuation for the 2005-2006 school year. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 175)

Student Advisories

Personalization of the educational experience, as most often actualized through the instrumentation of student advisories, is mandated by the *Regulations of the Board Of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education Regarding Public High Schools and Ensuring Literacy for Students Entering High School.* Implementation of a meaningful and productive advisory structure at HHS has been hampered, and indeed impermissibly halted, at the three small learning communities within the Hope High School complex. Professional development in the area of creating and maintaining student advisories was provided to all HHS faculty by the Education Alliance at Brown University in the summer of 2003, but no more than 45 teachers, about 40% of the faculty, participated in the training. No professional development on student advisories has been offered the faculty since then. (Transcript, 12/8/04, B.Baldizar, pp.190-191; 12/9/04, R.Millican, p.43) Student advisors need to be familiar with both the content and individual students' aspirations in order to be truly effective. (Transcript, 12/9/04, P.Sproll, p. 25) What is required for full implementation of a meaningful advisory structure is consistently caring and dedicated faculty who accept as their professional responsibility the caring role exhibited by the typical elementary teacher.

The November 18, 2004, Plan for HHS as submitted to the Commissioner changes the student advisory opportunity from one full period a day to 30 minutes a week, with a teacher to student ratio of 1:15. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 82) In direct contravention of the Commissioner's prior orders, there is currently no student advisory opportunity built into the 2004-2005 schedule at HHS. Professional development for advisories was not provided during the summer of 2004, due to the central office's "understanding" that advisories "would not be implemented at HHS during the 2004-2005 school year." (Transcript, 12/8/04, B.Baldizar, p.191) The design and content of student advisories for 2005-2006 has yet to be determined. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 176, 202-204)

Curriculum and Instruction

In order to improve their instructional practices and ability to personalize instruction, teachers at HHS require meaningful and collaborative time on task, training and professional development, adequate resources, and a network of supports. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 132, 140; 12/15/04, T.Adelman, p. 43) PPS is just getting to the point of being able to focus on the content,

consistency, and quality of instructional practices in its high schools, including HHS. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 129-130) The small learning communities at HHS have not yet developed their own curricula. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 82, 146)

An extended and flexible student day allowing for instruction beyond the typical school day, although contemplated in the Commissioner's June 9, 2002, Order, remains on the drawing board. The Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team has negotiated the beginning of this practice for the 2006-2007 school year. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 93)

Of the professional development opportunities currently offered to HHS faculty, 20 hours is devoted to disciplinary literacy, 5 hours is devoted to parent conference activities, with 5 hours left to the discretion of each small learning community. (Transcript, 12/8/04, F.Gallo, p.195, M.Johnson, pp. 196-198)

Administration and Leadership

There is clearly a need for a single campus coordinator to make scheduling and administrative decisions that affect all three academies, thereby enabling the three Small Learning Community Directors to work directly with teachers and students on educational issues. (Transcript, 12/8/04, A.Pope, pp. 45-46; 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 69; 12/9/04, M.Davidson, pp. 62-64; 12/15/04, W.Jackson, p. 9-10; A.Huckman, p.79, 81; E.House, p.113) The principalship, or campus coordinator position, has remained unfilled since the end of the 2003-2004 school year. The PPS central office budgeted for the allowance of an empty campus coordinator position for at least one half of the 2004-2005 school year, a decision that has had a deleterious effect on scheduled reform efforts at HHS. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 167)

The three Small Learning Community directors at HHS are not part of the Joint Union-District School Improvement Intervention Team, nor were they present for any part of this show cause hearing. (Transcript, 12/9/04, M.Johnson, p.69) There is no single campus coordinator in place, and it is unclear how often the three Directors meet to resolve common issues. (Transcript, 12/9/04, M.Davidson, p.63)

PPS proposes to change the traditional department head role at HHS to one of "master teacher leader." However these positions are being filled as department heads currently and department heads hired now will become the future "teacher leaders." (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 79; Transcript, 12/9/04, M.Davidson, p. 94)

Outcome Measures

The "Rhode Island Department of Education, School Performance Categories, Face-to-Face Meeting Report: Providence Public Schools," dated June 9, 2002, comments on contemporaneous student achievement scores for HHS, noting that significantly fewer than 10% of its students achieved proficiency in either Mathematics or English Language Arts and that the proficiency of students, as well as students' participation in the state assessment was in a state of steady decline. (Exhibit No.26)

On May 1, 2003, Hope High School was given an Accreditation Warning Notice in response to a NEASC Accreditation Visit. Specific concerns leading to the warning included an absence of a documented mission statement and clear expectations for learning, the absence of a "well-written, formal, coherent curriculum plan," no indication of even an attempt to personalize instruction, limited use of assessment strategies to guide instruction, "insufficient opportunities students have to practice and achieve the school's academic expectations," inadequate parent engagement activities, and teacher supervision and evaluation procedures which do not focus on improving instruction." (Exhibit No. 54)

Student achievement at Hope High School, as measured by state assessments, has improved. By 2004 students had made progress toward 19 of 21 annual measurable objectives. Participation in the state assessment also improved dramatically. In 2000, the percentage of students actually taking the state assessment was about 68%. In 2004 that number had risen to almost 95%, a significant increase. (Exhibit Nos. 139, 141)

While the number of targets met has increased dramatically, overall proficiency remains low – although gains have been made. In 2001, only 4% of HHS students tested achieved the proficiency standard in English language arts (ELA); only 2% met the standard in Mathematics. In 2004, the percentage of students achieving proficiency in ELA had risen to 21%; fewer than 10% of HHS students achieved proficiency in Mathematics however. (Exhibits Nos. 138, 141)

Though HHS has clearly done a better job of educating the students who remain in school, too many drop out. 52% of the students who enter HHS fail to stay on to graduate; the drop-out rate at Hope High School in the 1999-2000 school year was 23%. (Exhibits Nos. 135, 141)

High School Regulations

The Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education promulgated the *Regulations of the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education regarding Public High Schools* in January of 2003. Said Regulations set forth specific requirements for high schools to adopt strategies to achieve a high

degree of student personalization, identification, and remediation of below grade-level performance in reading, and the development of proficiency-based graduation requirements.

On June 20, 2004, the three Small Learning Community Directors wrote to the Commissioner informing him that they were unable to comply with the Board of Regents High School Regulations because of the many demands placed on them and their staffs by ongoing restructuring efforts. (Exhibit No. 124) Although said communication speaks to a "delay" in their ability to comply with the Regulations, to date there is no evidence of such compliance within the HHS complex.

Parent and Community Partnerships

Two RIDE staff members were assigned to assist HHS over the summer of 2003 in its efforts to engage parents and community members in the redesign and governance processes at the school. (Exhibit No. 67, 72, 73)

PPS has cultivated a number of partnerships with the educational and human services communities, including the Educational Alliance at Brown University, the Center for Resource Management, the UPenn Institute for Learning, Providence Plan, University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island Scholars, Rhode Island Children's Crusade, RIDE, Dorcas Place, the Rhode Island School of Design (RISD), and Volunteers in Providence Schools. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M. Sorum, pp. 24, 33-35, 41)

Yet, the necessary relationships with community and education partners, including their roles in supporting the governance and curricular structures within the three small learning communities, are currently inadequate to meet the needs of students. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 146; 12/9/04, P.Sproll, pp. 14, 17-20, 30)

The Campus Coordinating Council exists on paper, but membership and precise authorities have yet to be defined. (Transcript, 12/8/04, K.Blanchard, p. 162)

Advisory councils, which are designed to provide community members, education partners, and parents with a voice on school reforms and operations, are largely dormant in two of the three learning communities. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, pp. 89-90; 12/9/04, P.Sproll, pp. 18, 20, 30)

The actual current membership and role of the advisory council for each small learning community is ill-defined and, to a large extent, inconsistent or non-existent. As an example, only the IT community has developed by-laws that discuss membership and roles. (Transcript, 12/8/04, M.Johnson, p. 151, B.Baldizar, pp.152-157) RISD participation in school planning, governance, and scheduling was described as "happenstance" or nonexistent. (Transcript, 12/9/04, P.Sproll, pp. 27, 32)

The Arts academy does have a memorandum of understanding with the Rhode Island School of Design, but that partnership is far from reaching its full potential for developing curriculum or sharing in other programming decisions. (Transcript, 12/9/04, P.Sproll, pp. 9, 18-20)

Dr. Paul Sproll, the head of art and design education at the Rhode Island School of Design, has articulated a clear vision for the Arts small learning community at HHS. It reflects a desire to build a school "where the arts are disciplined in their own right and are also vehicles for learning other subjects. . . It is a school where the teaching environment supports and nurtures the development of creativity across the entire spectrum of student learning. It is a school that retains its students for a full four years, and its students leave possessing the knowledge, skills, and values that will provide them with multiple opportunities upon graduation." (Transcript, 12/9/04, P.Sproll, p. 15)

Achieving Dr. Sproll's vision for an integrated and meaningful partnership between outside providers such as RISD and HHS requires "a serious conversation about content and ...instructional strategies..." and a seat at the management table to have input on curricular and scheduling decisions to allow students to take full advantage of outside contributions in order that the partner be more than a "trophy." (Transcript, 12/9/04, P.Sproll, pp. 16, 18, 20)

Discussion and Conclusions of Law

This department has been extremely consistent in regard to what it has asked from Hope High School. All prior orders have been based on a combination of existent planning at Hope High and the strategic direction provided by the PPS central office. Both HHS and the district as a whole are currently in corrective action because of several years of failure to meet state requirements for student performance. That is not to say that the situation at HHS has not improved. Student performance has improved, as has participation in the state assessments. What has not improved, and in fact has declined significantly, is the graduation rate. This indicator is the single most accurate measure of how well a high school connects with its students.

The three Small Learning Communities at HHS can be viable and effective learning environments. The PPS central office has done admirable work in increasing its capacity to improve student performance across schools and grade levels. The mechanisms for improvement are in place. What is needed is a clear and coherent statement of expectations and an implementation timeline. Faculty, families and students at HHS demand and deserve a clear picture of what is expected of them. This Decision and Order is designed to provide that clarity.

Transformation of a large high school into small learning communities is not an easy task, and is more difficult than simply closing a high and starting fresh in a new structure. However, there was testimony that there are a great many dedicated, talented and caring teachers at Hope High School. A core group of dedicated and experienced teachers, who know and respect their students, and who embrace the hard work of school improvement, can actually put into practice what the state and the district put on paper. In the words of Dr. Paul Sproll, "[Y]ou don't have to build another school. You can actually transform your current school into something which is really powerful..." Realization of that vision requires "all partners to be an integrated component of decision-making at every level."

That is the vision pursued in this hearing, Decision and Order. It is a collective vision of innovation and excellence, but it is a vision that has proved very difficult to reach due to planning without movement into implementation, a lack of continuity of leadership in both the district office and at the building level, inconsistent commitment to change, a lack of parent and student involvement, an under-utilization of community-based education partners, and a lack of agreement and demonstrated ability to deliver on the simple ideal that every high school student will develop a real and ongoing relationship with at least one adult in his or her school.

There are now conditions in place that will assist these changes in becoming a reality. The district now has an engaged leadership team at the district level

focusing on middle and high schools. District and union leadership have partnered to establish a powerful mechanism for resolving barriers to change at the school level in the context of intervention – the Union-District Intervention Team. While there are some teachers who have not embraced reforms at Hope, there are many good people at Hope High School, talented teachers who have embraced the spirit of change and renewal.

The students who came forward and stated their opinions for the record were the most eloquent and relevant voices I heard during this hearing. I completely concur with the Superintendent of Providence schools, Dr. Melody Johnson, when she said, "those children spoke to me more than any others." (Transcript, 12/16/04, M.Johnson, p.22) Jill Benitez, who graduated from Hope High School in 2000, conveyed a vivid and troubling image of a student's eye view at the school. She said that, "the structure of the school changed, but the messages conveyed through the barred-up windows have stayed the same, Hope is for the hopeless."

This must change. We have an opportunity to give life to the requirements of the High School Regulations in direct service to the students, and an opportunity to discourage that which is ongoing, but not supportive of changes that will directly benefit students. In this particular legal proceeding, we are concerned with one school, one group of students, but we are also fighting for the futures of thousands of students in this state who give up on their education, because they do not see the relevance, or the reward, of pursuing excellence. That is a sad commentary on the institutions that serve this generation.

In many respects, the PPS has the capacity and vision to achieve a great deal of what HHS needs to do to meet the needs of all of its students. The academic performance and test participation of the students who stay in school is improving. However, the percentage of students who choose to stay with Hope High School to graduation has been steadily declining for a number of years. Among the factors affecting these trends is the lack of agreement, clarity and resolve in the tackling of the issues of program and curriculum development, instructional practices, staffing, external partnerships, student personalization, and parent engagement.

As Dr. Johnson acknowledged, schools undergoing change need a framework from which to operate, especially where capacity is in question given a current school performance rating as "in need of improvement." The various plans submitted by the PPS have not met the requirements set forth in the Commissioner's prior Orders and have not included active parent and community participation. It is therefore my intent to provide that clear and definitive plan for these three Small Learning Communities based on all of the materials submitted by the school and district to date.

Planning has been going on for a long time at Hope High School. There has been progress, and there have been set-backs. It is clear to me that we can no longer afford to put so much of our collective energy into planning. For that reason this Decision and Order requires the implementation of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School that addresses the issues consistently set forth since June of 2002.

In adopting this approach, the work done to date to implement the Orders regarding the reconstitution and redesign of Hope High School is found to be promising, but inadequate as a matter of law to meet the needs of the students currently enrolled at Hope High School. The state needs to be more closely involved in the monitoring and facilitation of the implementation and follow through on the redesign plan at Hope High School in order to ensure that reforms are proceeding on schedule. It has never been clearer what Hope High School needs to do to move forward in term of meeting the needs of its students.

In order to monitor and facilitate the implementation of the attached Order, and the *Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School* it incorporates, I am hereby appointing a Special Master to have all of the powers and authorities of this office in furtherance of that directive.

There are a number of difficult issues addressed in the Order that follows. It must be noted that strong voices argued in this hearing for the takeover or shut down of Hope High School. By that I mean the termination of the entire teaching force in this complex and the operation of the school directly by the state. I have not chosen to take that step at this time. The Union-District Intervention Team presents a unique opportunity. This new partnership presents a mechanism to provide the flexibility and support for reform at the school site. In addition there is evidence that faculty are committed to change at the campus. As Melcris Franciso, currently a junior at Hope said, "I love the idea of keeping everything I like about school and just changing what isn't working."

Like many others who testified, Melcris wants to see teachers re-interviewed before they are allowed to remain at Hope. For this plan to go forward it is necessary to differentiate those within the current faculty who are willing and prepared to come back to implement these changes from those who are not. Students have eloquently addressed this dilemma in their testimony. They tell us that having a teacher who is tuned in to their needs can make all the difference for them. The point is that the students are at the center of this dilemma and must be part of the process for identifying professional standards that are most important from their own perspective. The Consolidated Corrective Action Plan sets forth a process for ensuring that only those faculty, administrators and staff who demonstrate an ability to adapt to a new design remain in place at Hope High School.

Based upon the testimony before me I am requiring the school and district to renew their efforts to connect with those community partners who are committed to assisting HHS in its development of highly personalized small learning communities. The record before me establishes the imperative that the participation of community partners, parents and students must be real and extend to program decisions. The testimony also establishes an immediate need for a single campus operations coordinator to oversee campus operations and resolve administrative issues common to the three small learning communities.

As Ron Millican noted in his testimony: "You can make all the structural changes in the world, but if things aren't happening in the classroom that is really advancing the needs of those students in a differentiated way, very little is going to result in your drop-out rates and your standardized test scores." For that reason, the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan also requires specific professional development opportunities, to which teachers and administrators who remain at the school must commit.

One of the primary areas to be addressed in this professional development is the manner in which personalization will be infused throughout the HHS complex. As Mary Silvia Harrison correctly observed: "Creating smaller schools alone does not automatically create a more personalized learning environment. The struggle around scheduling, professional development support, and the content of the advisory periods are symptoms of how the plan is seriously lacking in this respect, it lacks depth." The plans submitted by the district also do not comply with the *Regulations of the Board Of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education Regarding Public High Schools and Ensuring Literacy for Students Entering High School* in this regard.

Finally, the Order and the *Consolidated Corrective Action Plan* describe with greater specificity the nature and extent of parent involvement as an actual partner in the education of his/her student and community engagement expected from the three small learning communities.

This Decision, Order and Consolidated Corrective Action Plan will serve as the catalyst for moving closer to an educational experience at Hope High School that is truly built around the needs of students, not built around a structure that we as adults believe is expedient or comfortable. Some will read this Decision and say that it goes too far; others will say it does not go far enough. The fact remains that change will not occur unless those responsible at the building level desire and commit to those changes and are supported by district level authorizers. The goal of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan is to create a unique and fulfilling educational experience for every student who enters Hope High School.

ORDER OF RECONSTITUTION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION

Under the authority of R.I.G.L. § 16-7.1-5 Hope High School was reconstituted as part of this Department's intervention in June, 2002. At that time the school's administrative team was removed and replaced and the school was restructured, in cooperation with the Providence Public Schools administration, into three Small Learning Communities. Since that time specific orders have been entered by this Commissioner setting forth requirements relating to various alterations to be made to the "budget, program and personnel" at Hope High School. Based upon the record developed in this Show Cause hearing, Hope High School is hereby further reconstituted pursuant to R.I.G.L. § 16-7.1-5. This Order does not exercise the authority under R.I.G.L. § 16-7.1-5 to discontinue the operation of the school. Instead the school is further reconstituted to operate subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. There shall be appointed a Special Master, with all the powers and authorities of this office, subject to the oversight of the Office of the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, who shall oversee the implementation of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School. The Special Master shall be considered to be acting in the name of the Commissioner, and shall exercise the power to do all acts and take all measures necessary or proper upon all matters embraced by the Corrective Action Plan. The Special Master shall be considered to be an *ex officio* member of any and all governance structures as may be deemed necessary to carry out the duties described in this paragraph. The Special Master shall maintain a record of all proceedings undertaken in pursuit of this Order, and issue public reports on steps taken in pursuit of this Order on no less than a bi-monthly basis. The Special Master shall possess the special expertise sufficient to serve the purposes of implementing this Order and Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

2. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. § 16-7.1-5, each Small Learning Community shall operate during the 2004-2005 school year and beyond on a schedule to be approved by the Commissioner that ensures common planning time and advisory time focused on student needs and standards-based instruction. Student advisory initiatives will comply in full with the *Regulations of the Board Of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education Regarding Public High Schools and Ensuring Literacy for Students Entering High School.*

3. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, the district and its individual employees are hereby ordered to comply in full with the content and timelines set forth in the accompanying Consolidated

Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School. The implementation of this Order and the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan, which is hereby incorporated by reference in this Order, is to be monitored and facilitated by the Special Master appointed pursuant to this Order.

4. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. § 16-7.1-5, each Small Learning Community at Hope High School is required to have the authority to recruit, interview and select staff. Therefore, positions vacant at Hope High School shall not be posted at the Providence Job Fair.

5. Pursuant to the reconstitution authorities of R.I.G.L. 16-7.1-5, the district is hereby ordered to submit to the Commissioner no later than July 1, 2005, a detailed operating budget for the entire Hope High School complex – showing all proposed school-level expenditures for the 2005-2006 school year.

6. The $600,000 in state general-revenue intervention funds designated for Hope High School shall be expended in furtherance of the Corrective Action Plan with the oversight of the Special Master.

7. As more fully set forth in the accompanying Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School, the district shall immediately conduct the process for identifying those faculty members and administrators who have demonstrated the willingness and ability to implement personalized and rigorous educational experiences for all students enrolled in the Hope High School complex. Those teachers and administrators who are approved to remain at Hope High School through the recommitment process set forth in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School for the implementation of the plan in the 2005-2006 school year will do so based on acceptance of the specific elements of the terms and conditions of operation of the small learning communities as set forth in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

8. The substance and process for student and teacher assignments to the Small Learning Communities and to specific courses and program offerings shall be determined by student needs and interests and the program design of the three Small Learning Communities.

9. There will be curricular instructional opportunities, which shall further the thematic content and curricula of each small learning community, offered both within and beyond the traditional school day in order to meet students' needs and implement the program design of each of the three Small Learning Communities.

10. Teachers shall be provided with and required to attend the substantial professional development opportunities and common planning time

required to implement the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School.

11. There shall be a significant increase in the full and meaningful participation by parents, students, and community partners on the Hope Campus Coordinating Council and the three Small Learning Community School Improvement Teams. To accomplish this requirement the membership of the School Improvement Teams is set forth in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan. The sufficiency of parent, student and community partner participation shall be determined by the Special Master.

12. The district shall implement the district created protocol for individualized learning plans throughout the Hope High School campus and professional development to be provided to every teacher who elects and is approved to remain part of the faculty at Hope High School through the recommitment process.

Peter McWalters
Commissioner

2/7/05
Date

Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School

Introduction

Careful consideration had been given to the previously submitted plans for three Small Learning Communities at Hope High School as follows:

1. **January 31, 2003 Hope High School Redesign Plan**
   - Submitted to the Commissioner on January 31, 2003
   - Approved by a majority vote of the faculty at Hope High School
2. **March 17, 2003 Hope High School Site Based Management Plan**
   - Submitted to the Commissioner March 17, 2003
   - Approved by an 80% vote of all faculty at Hope High School
   - Approved by the district level Site Based Management Review Committee
3. **March 31, 2004 Three Small Learning Community Site Based Management Plans**
   - Submitted to the Commissioner March 31, 2004
   - Approved by over 80% of the faculty in each Small Learning Community at Hope High School
   - Rejected by the district level Site Based Management Review Committee
4. **October, 2004 Three Small Learning Community Site Based Management Plans**
   - Not approved by the faculty in each Small Learning Community at Hope High School
5. **November 18, 2004 District Three Year Plan for Hope High School**
   - Prepared by the Union-District Intervention Team
   - Incorporates the three March 31, 2004, and three October, 2004, Small Learning Community Site Based Management Plans

The Commissioner hereby accepts the common elements found in the November 18, 2004 District Plan for Hope High School and the Small Learning Community Site-Based Management Plans listed above. These plans demonstrate considerable effort by many dedicated people who have devoted themselves to the redesign process at Hope High School over a period of years. Substantial planning and redesign efforts have been made at Hope High School even in the years prior to the work reflected in the January 31, 2003, submission to the Commissioner.

The plans enumerated above include multiple variations on the required elements of a new design for Hope High School set forth in the Commissioner's succession of Orders entered from June, 2000 to July, 2004. Those variations are consolidated herein in a simplified Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Three Small Learning Communities at the Hope High School Complex. The requirements set forth in this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan have been drawn from the plans submitted by the school and district.

Consolidated Corrective Action Plan

Hope High School is reconstituted pursuant to the Commissioner's Decision and Order of Reconstitution. The authority for the mandated implementation of this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan flows from its incorporation into the Commissioner's Decision and Order of Reconstitution.

1. Site-based management

The Commissioner's Reconstitution recognizes the decision of the District Labor/Management Intervention Team to reestablish the Hope Complex, effectively immediately, as three autonomous site based managed Small Learning Communities. The following site-based management authorities are hereby conferred on each of the Small Learning Communities at the Hope Complex:

a. Recruitment, interviewing and selection of staff at site level:
The site-based managed Small Learning Communities have the authority to recruit, interview and select staff at the Small Learning Community level when staff vacancies exist.

b. Caseload and personalization:
Teaching caseload determinations shall be made based upon the needs of the students and program design requirements.

c. Student Advisory
Student advisories shall be reinstated for the final marking period of the current school year. For the balance of the 2004-2005 school year the advisory will be conducted within the context of a typical class rather than at the required student-teacher ratio of 15:1 for student advisory that shall be applicable to the 2005-2006 school year and beyond. The advisees for each advisor shall be drawn from the grade level team to whom the teacher is assigned in grades 9 and 10 and from the Small Learning Community team to which the teacher is assigned in grades 11 and 12. This requirement is discussed more fully in section 7 below.

d. Teacher meetings
Teacher meetings shall be held throughout the year. These shall include but not be limited to teacher availability for after school meetings with students once per week, teacher participation in subject matter department meetings once per month, teacher participation in Small Learning Community-wide faculty meetings as needed but not to exceed once per month and School Improvement Team or subcommittee meetings as appropriate.

e. Common Planning Time
Common Planning Time will remain in the schedule for the Three Small Learning Communities as set forth in this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

f. Schedule
The schedule for each of the three Small Learning Communities shall be a flexible, non-traditional schedule for students to accommodate additional programming opportunities for students with institutions of higher education, community partners, internship and service learning opportunities as well as other program offerings not compatible with the traditional school day.

g. Faculty assignment
Faculty assignment will be based on student need and program design. The best interest of students shall be the principal factor in making staff assignment decisions. Teacher preferences may be considered only if they are not contrary to student and programmatic needs.

h. Reconstitution of Current Administrative and Teaching Staff - Faculty Opt Out, Commitment Statement and Review

1. Based upon the Order of Reconstitution and Consolidated Corrective Action Plan, teachers are hereby provided the opportunity to opt out of returning to Hope High School for the 2005-2006 school year. Such decision to opt out shall be communicated in writing to the district administration no later than February 18th, 2005.

2. By February 18th, 2005 all current Hope faculty and administrators who wish to commit to working at the Hope Complex under the terms and conditions set forth in the Decision and Order of Reconstitution and this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan shall indicate this commitment by completing the Commitment Statement attached to this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan as Attachment A.

3. Each teacher who elects to make the commitment to remain a part of the Hope High School faculty shall submit his or her Commitment Statement in person to a Hope High School Teacher Review Team.

   The members of the Hope High School Teacher Review Team ("Teacher Review Team") shall be three administrators appointed by the management members of the Union-District Intervention Team, three teachers appointed by the union members of the Union-District Intervention Team and two representatives of community partners and/or institutions of high education involved at Hope High School, appointed by the Commissioner.

   The content of each teacher's Commitment Statement shall be reviewed by the Teacher Review Team and discussed in person with each teacher submitting the Commitment Statement. The discussion with the Teacher Review Team shall provide the teacher with an opportunity to offer his/her perspective about the implementation of the Plan for Hope High School

and provide information about the content of his/her Commitment Statement.

Based upon the Commitment Statement submitted and the teacher's discussion of those commitments with the Teacher Review Team, the lead administrator appointed to the Teacher Review Team shall recommend to the Superintendent whether the teacher should continue to teach at Hope High School in the 2005-2006 school year or be reassigned to another teaching position.

The lead administrator appointed to the Teacher Review Team will only recommend that a teacher be reassigned to another teaching position if the lead administrator determines, after the discussion of the Commitment Statement with the teacher, that the teacher is not in a position to fulfill the commitments contained in the Commitment Statement.

4. Each school administrator shall submit a personal Commitment Statement in person to the Superintendent. The content of the Commitment Statement shall be reviewed by the Superintendent and discussed in person with each administrator. Based upon the Commitment Statement submitted and the administrator's discussion of those commitments with the Superintendent, the Superintendent may reassign the administrator to another post if the Superintendent determines that the administrator is not in a position to fulfill the commitments contained in the Commitment Statement.

5. All faculty vacancies in effect at the close of the Opt Out, Commitment and Review process discussed herein shall be filled through recruitment, interview and selection at the Small Learning Community level as set forth in paragraph 1(a). However six vacancies, two in each Small Learning Community, shall be maintained until student program selections have been acted on and these final vacancies shall be filled based upon student program preferences and the specialized programmatic needs of each of the three Small Learning Communities.

6. All administrator vacancies in effect at the close of the process shall be filled by the Superintendent. The Superintendent and the Commissioner shall meet and confer to agree upon qualifications for administrators in the reconstituted Hope High School Complex consistent with the requirements of this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

7. As the programs in the three Small Learning Communities become fully defined there shall at all times be sufficient faculty employed within them with appropriate expertise in areas of specialization related to the specific curricular and programmatic offerings of the Small Learning Communities.

i. Teacher Evaluation and Peer Review

1. Each Small Learning Community shall convene a subcommittee of the School Improvement Team expressly charged with determining expectations for professional staff who wish to continue to teach in the Small Learning Community. The subcommittee that determines standards for continued assignment to the faculty in the Small Learning Community shall include student, parent, and community partner participation.

2. Each of the three Small Learning Community subcommittees determining the expectations for continued assignment to the faculty of the respective Small Learning Community shall incorporate into those expectations the qualifications set forth in the draft rubric for teacher qualifications as developed by current Hope High School students.

3. A faculty committee, selected by the faculty of each Small Learning Community shall develop and implement a process for peer review. This process shall include opportunities for a year of mentoring and peer support, based upon a Personal Growth Plan approved by the Small Learning Community Director. If upon completion of a year of mentoring and peer support pursuant to a Personal Growth Plan, the faculty committee determines that the teacher is not able to fulfill the unique expectations for implementing the changes required by this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan then the teacher will designated for reassignment.

j. Site Based Management Budgetary Decision Making

Within the overall budgetary allocation made to the Hope High Complex by the school district the School Improvement Team for each Small Learning Community shall have the authority to allocate funds in support of the program of each Small Learning Community exclusive of those funds necessary to fund costs of operating the complex that are common to the three Small Learning Communities.

2. Ninth Grade Academies

Commencing with the Fall 2005 Semester, all ninth grade students entering Hope High School shall be enrolled in ninth grade academies. Each ninth grade academy shall be organized with a specifically assigned faculty and an Assistant Director primarily responsible for developing the program for these ninth graders over the ensuing four years.

Each of the three ninth grade academies shall have an assigned faculty team that will work with these ninth grade students throughout the year and will loop to the tenth grade with these same students during the 2006-2007 school year. The faculty advisors for these ninth graders shall be drawn from the respective faculty teams assigned to the ninth

graders in the three ninth grade academies at Hope High School. The faculty serving as advisors to the tenth graders in the 2006-2007 school year shall loop back to serving as faculty advisors to incoming ninth graders in the 2007-2008 school year; this pattern of a 9th and 10th grade advisor looping shall continue beyond the 2007-2008 school year.

As noted in the plans for the three Small Learning Communities, listed above, faculty shall be assigned to the ninth grade academies based on the identified learning needs of the ninth graders enrolled in each of the three Small Learning Communities, as well as the thematic curricular content of each Academy, not upon teacher preferences. Teacher preferences may be considered in making faculty assignments, but the fundamental basis for teacher assignment to the Ninth Grade Academies shall be the formation of core faculty teams capable of providing a comprehensive instructional program in each of the three ninth grade academies.

Each of the Ninth Grade Academies shall be linked to one of the themed Small Learning Communities so that eighth grade students who have already formed a specific plan to select their theme or concentration for their sophomore, junior and senior years will be able to do so upon entry in the ninth grade. However, because many eighth grade students may not yet have access to sufficient information to make such a designation, opportunities for exposure to all three themed curricula shall be made available as electives to all ninth and tenth graders -- with the expectation that all students will declare a concentration no later than May 1 of their sophomore year, and, if necessary, be reassigned to a different Small Learning Community, consistent with their designated concentration.

The three Small Learning Communities shall not be limited to enrolling 1/3 of the students enrolled in each grade at the Hope High School Complex. Each Small Learning Community must be able to flex in size in response to fluctuations in student demand from year to year for enrollment in any one of the three Small Learning Communities.

The Ninth Grade Academies shall form the basis for building the program and culture of the three Small Learning Communities from the bottom up as the ninth graders enrolled in the 2005-2006 school year advance through four years of a redesigned program in the respective Small Learning Communities at Hope.

3. Curriculum and Instruction

a. Curriculum and Instruction Committees

Each Small Learning Community at Hope High School shall, by March 15th, 2005, convene a Curriculum and Instruction Committee, which shall be a sub-committee of the School Improvement Team and shall report to the School Improvement Team for that Small Learning Community. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee for each Small Learning Community shall include no less than two community partners and/or representatives of higher education institutions. The initial charge to Curriculum and

Instruction Committee for each Small Learning Community shall be to work throughout the Spring and Summer 2005 to develop a specific curricular program for the ninth grade in each Small Learning Community for initial implementation in September of 2005.

The charge for this Committee beyond September 2005 shall be to: (1) develop plans for implementing the High School Regulations within the Small Learning Community including the new performance based graduation diploma system; and (2) be responsible for continuous improvement and refinement of curriculum, instruction, and program in the Small Learning Community. Curriculum shall be differentiated for the upper grades of each of the Small Learning Communities based on the theme of the Small Learning Community. The content of the themed curriculum for the upper grades of each Small Learning Community shall be developed with documented input from community partners and higher education participants.

Students in grades 9 and 10 in each of the three Small Learning Communities shall have an opportunity to access specialized curricular offerings across the Small Learning Communities to accommodate student exploration and support student decision making for purposes of the declaration of a concentration for grades 11 and 12.

b. Accountability and Improvement

Improvements in student progress shall be monitored by the School Improvement Team in each Small Learning Community using the data and assessment systems available to the School Improvement Teams through the district and the state. Careful monitoring and reporting of progress shall be maintained by the Special Master utilizing the multiple measures of school improvement that are part of the existing state accountability system: student performance data, annual yearly progress in assessments, SALT survey data, drop out and graduation data, suspension and attendance statistics and other existing accountability measures recognized by the district and state.

c. Networks of Support for Curricular and Instructional Reform

The Curriculum and Instruction Committee for each Small Learning Community shall implement activities for faculty and administrators in each Small Learning Community so as to benefit from access to networks of educators within and beyond Rhode Island in schools and districts where models of high school reform are being successfully implemented. Networks ranging from the Rhode Island Skills Commission to senior project networks and groups of secondary educators working on the development of student portfolios shall provide the basis for examination of the best methods to achieve implementation of the High School regulations and should be sought out for technical assistance and support.

d. Departmental Teacher Leaders

Departmental Teacher Leader positions shall be immediately posted and filled after staffing decisions are made for each of the Small Learning Communities for the 2005-2006 school year. Departmental Teacher Leader positions shall be established (as replacements for the existing Department Head positions) in each of the following areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Special Populations, Art,

Technology, and Foreign Languages. Specific qualifications for each of these positions shall be developed and filed with the Commissioner. Duties for these positions will include, but not be limited to:

- Instructing in model classrooms fully open to colleagues for study and support;
- Providing support in other teachers' classrooms;
- Developing strategies to improve instruction and increase student achievement;
- Assessing professional development needs;
- Assisting in planning and providing ongoing professional development;
- Convening department meetings;
- Participating in the budget process;
- Providing overall departmental leadership; and
- Serving as student advisors within the advisory structure of the Small Learning Communities

Assignment of faculty to Departmental Teacher Leader positions shall be based on the individual's ability to fulfill the duties outlined above.

4. Governance

a. Campus Coordinating Council

The Hope Complex shall have a Campus Coordinating Council composed of three representatives from each of the School Improvement Teams for the three Small Learning Communities. The delegation from each Small Learning Community School Improvement Team to the Campus Coordinating Council shall be: (1) the Small Learning Community Director; (2) a representative of a community partner that is working with the Small Learning Community, and (3) a faculty member who serves on the Small Learning Community School Improvement Team.

The Campus Coordinating Council shall meet bi-weekly and be chaired by the Campus Director, who shall be a non-voting member of the Campus Coordinating Council. All disagreements, scheduling conflicts, and logistical dilemmas confronting the three Small Learning Community Directors shall be resolved at the Campus Coordinating Council.

The Campus Coordinating Council, as its name suggests, is not a School Improvement Team making programmatic decisions for each of the three Small Learning Communities. It instead fulfills a coordinating function to resolve issues that arise when three Small Learning Communities are operating within a single building with shared facilities, resources and necessary coordination of faculty resources.

b. Campus Chief Operating Officer

A Campus Chief Operating Officer shall be appointed no later than the close of the current school year, to assist the three Small Learning Community Directors in all logistical and operational issues common to the three Small Learning Communities at the Hope Complex. The Campus Chief Operating Officer shall serve as a convener and manager of operations for the Hope Complex.

c. Directors' Cabinet
The three Small Learning Community Directors, the Assistant Directors and the Campus Chief Operating Officer shall meet as a Directors' Cabinet weekly to address logistical, behavioral, budgetary, physical plant and scheduling coordination for the Hope Complex.

d. School Improvement Teams
Each of the **School Improvement Teams for the** three Small Learning Communities at Hope shall be comprised of no less than:

- Two faculty members
- Two students
- Two parents
- The Small Learning Community Director and Assistant Administrator

Two representatives of actively involved community partners such as a community-based organizations or institutions of higher education that are working with the Small Learning Community, its students and families. The School Improvement Team shall meet as needed but not less than monthly and shall designate committees with additional membership as needed. The standing committees for each Small Learning Community School Improvement Team shall include the Curriculum and Instruction Committee and the Teacher Evaluation and Peer Review Committee. Other committees shall be formed based upon the identified needs of each Small Learning Community.

e. Student Government
Each Small Learning Community at the Hope Complex shall have its own elected student government body and the student members of the School Improvement Team shall be drawn from the duly elected student government members.

5. Community Partners

Community partners are those institutions, agencies and community groups that have made and will make specific commitments to support the work of the Campus Coordinating Council, the Curriculum and Instruction Committee and the School Improvement Teams.

- The Rhode Island School of Design (RISD) has demonstrated a long-term commitment to the success of the Arts Small Learning Community at Hope. Professor Paul Sproll has been designated by President Mandel to be assigned full time to Hope High School for the 2005-2006 school year to participate in the development of the curriculum and program for the Arts Ninth Grade Academy, as well as the ongoing implementation of curriculum and programs for the upper grades in the Arts Small Learning Community.

- The Providence Educational Excellence Coalition (PEEC) has made a commitment to providing technical assistance, training and support to Hope students and their parents in order that students and parents can participate in the School Improvement Teams in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope as well as in all aspects of the redesign and reform activities at the Hope Complex.

- The Tech Collective, a business and technology collaborative, has made a commitment to working in support of the Technology Small Learning Community at Hope.

- ROTC and CCRI are engaged in partnership activities with the Leadership Small Learning Community at Hope.

- The Rhode Island Federation of Teachers and Health Professionals has worked with Hope High school staff and administrators as providers of technical assistance in seeking out models of high school reform in New York and elsewhere. They have committed to the continuation of this work, and access to additional technical assistance regarding high school reform.

- President Nazarian of Rhode Island College has made a specific commitment to devote staff and resources to the support and development of at least one Small Learning Community at the Hope Complex.

- The Rhode Island Commodores (a group of business leaders) has been working with the Hope High School Leadership Small Learning Community on internships and job readiness. They have expressed a commitment to continue and expand internship and summer externship opportunities for Hope students.

- Brown University, through its Department of Education, Annenberg Institute for School Reform, Education Alliance, Swearer Center for Public Service, and the volunteer efforts of faculty, students and staff, has had a long standing relationship with Hope High School. As the stakeholders at Hope work to identify strategies to improve educational programming, Brown University looks forward to identifying further meaningful, constructive opportunities to collaborate that will draw upon the University's strengths and benefit Providence students.

- Discussions are under way with other institutions of higher education and youth serving organizations regarding commitments for additional participation in the Small Learning Communities at Hope.

These partnerships shall be formalized in written agreements between the Small Learning Community, executed by the Small Learning Community Director, and an authorized representative of the community partner(s). These partners shall be seated on the School Improvement Team for their respective Small Learning Community, with participation on the Campus Coordinating Council as discussed above.

<u>The roles for these community partners are not to be advisory.</u> Instead, these partners shall be fully integrated into the decision-making bodies of the three Small Learning Communities through inclusion on the School Improvement Teams and Campus Coordinating Council. All advisory committees previously conceived are to be dissolved in favor of inclusion of former advisory committee members in full partner status on

School Improvement Teams and the topical subcommittees of the School Improvement Teams in the three Small Learning Communities.

The three Small Learning Community Directors are charged with working with these and other community partners and with exploring further partnership opportunities with the public and private institutions of higher education to inform and support the redesign and implementation of reform in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope.

6. Schedule

Effective in September 2005, the three Small Learning Communities at the Hope Complex shall adopt a fixed (non-rotating) four period per day block schedule. These extended instructional periods will provide meaningful opportunities for students to participate in internships, clinical experiences, enrollment in programs with higher education partners, service learning opportunities and other learning opportunities that call for stable periods in the day and week so that students are available for learning opportunities both on and off campus.

Although the instructional time obligation for any individual teacher will be consistent with the instructional day required by the Rhode Island Board of Regents Length of School Day regulations, the school day for a teacher may begin and end at non-traditional times based on program design in the Small Learning Community. Similarly, an individual student's day may substantially vary from the five and one half hour instructional time requirement and extend beyond that minimum requirement in order to encompass a variety of instructional opportunities that extend beyond the traditional school day.

Though the aggregate number of instructional minutes guaranteed in each student schedule shall comply with the regulatory minimum over the course of a week, students shall be released at 1:00 p.m. on Wednesdays to allow for campus-wide Small Learning Community common planning time on Wednesday afternoons.

Advisory periods shall also be a regular component of the schedule and shall also occur on Wednesdays for not less than 40 minutes during the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

Any changes to this schedule must be approved by the Campus Coordinating Council for the entire Hope Complex.

7. Personalization

a. Advisory

Effective with the beginning of the final marking period of the 2004-2005 school year, a reduced advisory of 20 minutes once per week shall be conducted with all students

enrolled at Hope High School. Due to the reinstitution of the advisory in the last marking period of the school year, the focus of the advisory for the balance of the 2004-2005 school year shall be the transition for students to the 2005-2006 school year, including course selection and decision making about a concentration for the 11th and 12th grade years.

Effective with the beginning of the final marking period of the 2004-2005 school year each faculty member shall be assigned to serve as the advisor to one of his/her existing classes and shall meet with those students for 20 minutes each week during class time to discuss student programs and progress and to develop plans for the 2005-2006 school year. The advisory shall be the primary point of contact for student, family and other faculty who teach the student.

Effective in September 2005 and beyond, an advisory of at least forty minutes shall be conducted on Wednesdays as discussed in section 6 herein regarding the common schedule for the Hope Complex. Each advisor will be assigned no more than 15 advisees with whom the advisor will meet weekly on Wednesdays. The focus and content of the advisory shall be determined by the School Improvement Team for each of the three Small Learning Communities, but shall always include a core focus on student progress and future plans. The advisory shall always be the primary point of contact for student and family. The advisor is also the primary point of contact for other faculty who teach the student in order to facilitate family communications regarding the student's progress.

Faculty advisors for the 2005-2006 Ninth Grade Academies shall be assigned in accordance with section 2 of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan. Advisors shall be designated for the current 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students for the 2005-2006 school year. The advisor for an upper year student shall be drawn from the faculty team assigned to the Small Learning Community in which the student is enrolled. Commencing with the 2006-2007 school year students entering the 11th grade at the Hope High School Complex shall be assigned an advisor who will loop with that student into the 12th grade year. Once established, this looping pattern will provide a consistent advisor for a student for grades 9 and 10 and a single hand-off to an advisor for that student who will serve as the student's advisor in grades 11 and 12.

b. Individual Learning Plans

Consistent with the Regents' High School Regulations and the protocol that the Providence Public Schools have created for implementation of Individual Learning Plans for students, each student enrolled at the Hope Complex shall have a completed Individual Learning Plan in place no later than October 30, 2005.

c. Comprehensive School Counseling

The three Small Learning Communities shall each implement the Comprehensive School Counseling model according to the Rhode Island School Counselors Association framework published by the Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

8. Family Connections

Family and student participation in decision-making, public engagement and the associations with community partners are discussed elsewhere in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan through governance and partnership mechanisms. However, the requirements for family involvement through governance contained in this Consolidated Corrective Action Plan does not address the requirement for a fundamental connection between school and family regarding the individual student.

Each faculty advisor is assigned no more than 15 students for advisory. Each faculty member is charged with being the primary point of contact with the family for each of the students assigned to his/her advisory, as discussed above. Further, it is a professional expectation of continued assignment to teach at Hope that each teacher: (1) communicate with the faculty advisors for students in his/her classes regarding students' overall academic progress, class work, and homework completion and (2) make him/herself available for consultation with family members on issues of academic progress based on family requests for consultation . These expectations shall be made part of the teacher evaluation and peer review process set forth in paragraph 1(h) above.

The expectation for family connections are above and beyond the regularly scheduled opportunities for communicating to families about the school and its programs such as occur at School Report Nights, open houses and parent-teacher conferences. The expectation is that the Small Learning Communities at Hope will build cultures that both treat each family as a partner in the education of each student and expect each family to partner in the education of the child.

9. Professional Development

a. High School Regulations

All teachers in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope shall fulfill all requirements for professional development contained within the High School regulations consistent with the Providence Public Schools professional development plan and offerings.

In addition to this requirement, due to the extraordinary challenges posed by implementing reform all teachers who are selected to teach in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope for the 2005-2006 school year shall attend a week-long Summer Professional Development Academy during the summer of 2005. This week-long Summer Professional Development Academy shall be funded by Rhode Island Department of Education intervention funds.

The mandatory Summer Professional Development Academies, one for each of the three Small Learning Communities, shall address topics designated by the School

Improvement Teams for the respective Small Learning Communities provided however that these topics shall include:

- Successful implementation of student advisory
- Themes of the High School Regulations
  - Personalization
  - Literacy
  - Performance based graduation requirements.

b. Implementation of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan

The individual professional development plans for teachers in the three Small Learning Communities at Hope shall reflect and include professional development in areas relevant to the implementation of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan including but not limited to, development of Individual Learning Plans for students, implementation of the Comprehensive School Counseling model, implementation of standards based instruction, conducting student advisory etc. The Commissioner reserves the right to review and approve professional development plans for Hope.

Attachment A1

Hope High School Commitment Statement
For Faculty

As a teacher who desires to remain at the new Hope High School for the 2005-2006 school year and commit to making it a success, I hereby commit to the following:

1. Commitment Process

I have completed this Commitment Statement and am submitting it to the Hope High School Recommitment Review Process Group. I understand that by completing and signing this Commitment Statement I am committing to all of the terms and conditions contained in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School including but not limited to those that are discussed specifically below. I also understand that after this Commitment Statement has been fully discussed with me by the Hope High School Teacher Review Team I may be recommended for reassignment to another teaching assignment if it is determined that I am not in a position to fulfill the commitments contained herein.

2. Evaluation and Peer Review

I commit to participating in the development of a system of evaluation and peer review for teachers to be implemented in my Small Learning Community which would include mentoring, support, development of Growth Plans and the potential for reassignment.

3. Student Advisory

I commit to conducting student advisory and participating in such professional development as may be necessary for me to be effective in this role.

4. Teacher Meetings

I commit to attend teacher meetings to be held throughout the year. These include at least:

a. Making myself available for students after school at least once per week;
b. Participating in department meetings once per month;
c. Participating in faculty meetings not more than once per month;
d. Participating in School Improvement Team meetings or committee meetings as appropriate.

5. Schedule

I commit to participating in a non traditional schedule and understand that this may mean that although my overall work day will be consistent with the current length of the work day, that these hours of work may be flexed to start earlier or later than the traditional high school schedule in Providence based on student need and program design.

6. Teaching Assignments
I commit to accept teaching assignments based on student need and program requirements and understand that teacher preference may only be considered when not in conflict with student need and program requirements.

7. Ninth Grade Academies
I commit to accept a teaching assignment to a ninth grade academy in the Small Learning Community to which I am assigned if it is determined by the School Improvement Team for my Small Learning Community that this assignment is appropriate based on student need and program design. I understand that if I am assigned to a ninth grade academy for the 2005-2006 school year I will loop to the tenth grade team with my students for the 2006-2007 school year and will again be assigned to a new ninth grade cohort in the 2007-2008 school year, absent the need for reassignment based on student need and program design.

8. Curriculum and Instruction
I commit to participate in committee work and professional development related to the development of curriculum and standards based instructional strategies in my Small Learning Community and in my classroom.

9. Departmental Teacher Leaders
I commit to accepting leadership from Departmental Teacher Leaders as described in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

10. School Improvement Team
I commit to participating in the work of the School Improvement Team as described in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan, even if only through committee work or through participation in professional development activities sponsored by the School Improvement Team.

11. Campus Coordinating Council
I understand that the Campus Coordinating Council will resolve all matters relating to the shared use of a single campus by three Small Learning Communities and I commit to abiding by the decisions of the Campus Coordinating Council.

12. Community Partners
I understand that community partners, including students, family members and representatives of institutions of higher education and of community agencies and groups are envisioned to be key decision making participants at Hope High School under the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan. These partners will participate in all aspects of governance and program design in the Small Learning Communities. I commit to working with these partners in school improvement activities at the school.

13. Individual Learning Plans for Students
I commit to participating in the development of Individual Learning Plans consistent with the Regents' High School Regulations and the protocol that the Providence Public Schools has created for each of my students by no later than October 30, 2005.

14. Comprehensive School Counseling
I commit to participating in the implementation of the Comprehensive School Counseling model at Hope High School.

15. Partnership with Families
I commit to involving the family members of each of my students as partners in the education of the student. This includes serving as the faculty advisor to 15 students. I commit to meeting with my advisees each week to focus on my students' overall progress, classwork, homework completion and future academic and vocational plans.

16. Professional Development
I commit to participating in the professional development required in order for me to effectively implement the elements of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan in my classroom and in my Small Learning Community. This shall include the required hours of professional development as set forth by the Providence Public Schools and I also commit to participate in a week-long summer professional development academy to be conducted by my Small Learning Community during the summer of 2005.

17. Recent Participation in Professional Development
   a. During the 2003-2004 school year I participated in the following professional development activities (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of Professional Development Activity	Date(s)

   b. During the 2004-2005 school year I participated in the following professional development activities (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of Professional Development Activity	Date(s)

18. Recent Participation in Reform Activities:

a. During the 2003-2004 school year (or before) I participated in the following School Improvement Team or Committee Work relating to school reform at Hope High School (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of School Improvement Team or Committee Work	Date(s)

b. During the 2004-2005 school year I participated in the following School Improvement Team or Committee Work relating to school reform at Hope High School (use additional sheet if needed):

Description School Improvement Team or Committee Work	Date(s)

19. Instructional Initiatives:
Select one of the following classroom/instructional initiatives and discuss how you have incorporated it into your classroom practice. What were the results? (Use an additional sheet if needed.)

a. Principles of Learning
b. Disciplinary Literacy
c. Using data to inform instruction
d. Differentiated instruction

Name _____ Date _____

Attachment A2

Hope High School Commitment Statement
For Administrators

As an administrator who desires to remain at the new Hope High School for the 2005-2006 school year and commit to making it a success, I hereby commit to the following:

1. Commitment Process

I have completed this Commitment Statement and am submitting it to the Hope High School Recommitment Review Process Group. I understand that by completing and signing this Commitment Statement I am committing to all of the terms and conditions contained in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan for Hope High School including but not limited to those that are discussed specifically below. I also understand that after this Commitment Statement has been fully discussed with me by the Superintendent I may be recommended for reassignment to another administrative assignment if it is determined that I am not in a position to fulfill the commitments contained herein.

2. Evaluation and Peer Review

I commit to participating in the development of a system of evaluation and peer review for teachers to be implemented in my Small Learning Community which would include mentoring, support, development of Growth Plans and the potential for reassignment.

3. Student Advisory

I commit to assisting my faculty in the implementation of student advisory and to personally participating in such professional development as may be necessary for me to be effective in this role.

4. Teacher Meetings

I commit to convening and supporting teacher meetings to be held throughout the year. These include at least:

a. Ensuring that teachers make themselves available for students after school at least once per week;

b. Ensuring that teachers participate in department meetings once per month;

c. Ensuring that teachers participating in faculty meetings conducted by me not more than once per month;

d. Ensuring faculty participation in School Improvement Team meetings or committee meetings as appropriate.

5. Schedule

I commit to participating in a non traditional schedule and understand that this may mean that although my overall work day will be consistent with the current length of the work day, that these hours of work may be flexed to start earlier or later than the traditional high school schedule in Providence based on student need and program design.

6. Teaching Assignments
I commit to assigning teachers based on student need and program requirements and understand that teacher preference may only be considered when not in conflict with student need and program requirements.

7. Ninth Grade Academies
I commit to implementing the Ninth Grade academies structure set forth in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

8. Curriculum and Instruction
I commit to planning, conducting and participating in committee work and professional development related to the development of curriculum and standards based instructional strategies in my Small Learning Community.

9. Departmental Teacher Leaders
I commit to working with and developing Departmental Teacher Leaders as set forth in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan.

10. School Improvement Team
I commit to convening and supporting the work of the School Improvement Team as described in the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan, including committee work and professional development activities sponsored by the School Improvement Team.

11. Campus Coordinating Council
I understand that the Campus Coordinating Council will resolve all matters relating to the shared use of a single campus by three Small Learning Communities and I commit to abiding by the decisions of the Campus Coordinating Council.

12. Community Partners
I understand that community partners, including students, family members and representatives of institutions of higher education and of community agencies and groups are envisioned to be key decision making participants at Hope High School under the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan. These partners will participate in all aspects of governance and program design in the Small Learning Communities. I commit to working with these partners in school improvement activities at the school.

13. Individual Learning Plans for Students
I commit to participating in the development of Individual Learning Plans consistent with the Regents' High School Regulations and the protocol that the Providence Public Schools has created for each of the students in my Small Learning Community by no later than October 30, 2005.

14. Comprehensive School Counseling
I commit to participating in the implementation of the Comprehensive School Counseling model at Hope High School.

15. Partnership with Families

I commit to involving the family members of each of the students enrolled in my Small Learning Community as partners in the education of the student.

16. Professional Development

I commit to participating in the professional development required in order for me to effectively implement the elements of the Consolidated Corrective Action Plan in my Small Learning Community. I also commit to planning and conducting a week-long summer professional development academy for my Small Learning Community during the summer of 2005.

17. Recent Participation in Professional Development

c. During the 2003-2004 school year I participated in the following professional development activities (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of Professional Development Activity	Date(s)

d. During the 2004-2005 school year I participated in the following professional development activities (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of Professional Development Activity	Date(s)

18. Recent Participation in Reform Activities:

a. During the 2003-2004 school year (or before) I participated in the following School Improvement Team or Committee Work relating to school reform at Hope High School (use additional sheet if needed):

Description of School Improvement Team or Committee Work	Date(s)

b. During the 2004-2005 school year I participated in the following School Improvement Team or Committee Work relating to school reform at Hope High School (use additional sheet if needed):

Description School Improvement Team or Committee Work	Date(s)

19. Instructional Initiatives:
Select one of the following classroom/instructional initiatives and discuss how you have supported your faculty to implement these practices. What were the results? (Use an additional sheet if needed.)

a. Principles of Learning
b. Disciplinary Literacy
c. Using data to inform instruction
d. Differentiated instruction

_____ _____
Name Date