Goodwill Excel Center Public Charter School

ESSA School Improvement Plan
May 23, 2019

Table of Contents

Goodwill Excel Center Public Charter School ESSA School Improvement Plan 2
Appendix A: ESSA Needs Assessment 27
Appendix B: Meeting Notes and Agendas 44

Goodwill Excel Center Public Charter School
ESSA School Improvement Plan

Background and Purpose

The Goodwill Excel Center (GEC) has been identified by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School 2 (CS2). This designation under the new STAR Framework accountability system was issued because GEC's four and five-year adjusted cohort graduation rates fall below 67% in school year (SY) 17-18.

GEC is held accountable under the Alternative Accountability Framework (AAF) of the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) given GEC serves a highly at-risk population (nearly 100% of its population). GEC negotiated school specific goals and academic achievement expectations under this AAF which are included in GEC's charter agreement with PCSB. GEC's charter graduation goal is that GEC will graduate no fewer than 10% of its audited enrollment number and will graduate at least 25% of its audited enrollment number in one of the following years: SY 17-18, 18-19, and 19-20. Starting in SY 20-21, and every year thereafter, no less than 20% of GEC's audited enrollment number are expected to graduate in a school year. At the end of its second school year (SY 17-18), GEC achieved this graduation goal by graduating 25% of its verified audited enrollment number.

While GEC is exceeding its approved graduation goal with the DC PCSB, a goal aligned with the unique model and mission of GEC, GEC does not meet the District's expectation of a 67% ACGR (adjusted cohort graduation rate), a goal aligned with traditional high schools, which are the schools from which the majority of GEC students dropped out. GEC's five-year ACGR in SY 17-18 was 5.71% and 4-year ACGR was 6.9%. **GEC does not ever expect to meet a 67% ACGR given its unique model and student population**. The ACGR calculation is problematic for GEC for the following reasons—

1. Given the ages of the student body, the vast majority of students are not even factored in the rate calculation. 29 out of 356 students (8.14%) were eligible for inclusion in the four-year cohort graduation rate calculation. Four out of these 29 students graduated in SY 17-18. 35 out of 356 students (9.83%) were eligible for

inclusion in the five-year cohort graduation rate calculation. Two out of these 35 students graduated in SY 17-18.

2. GEC intentionally recruits students who are at-risk and have dropped out of school. Students are consequently far behind academically as indicated by reading and math scores and transcript analysis at entrance which will be outlined in this plan. In many cases, students come in so far behind academically, that there is not enough time for them to achieve graduation within the timeframe established for their cohort.

As required, GEC conducted a needs assessment that addressed qualitative and quantitative data around the groups of students in the ACGR cohorts to better understand the factors leading to the current adjusted cohort graduation rate results. Additionally, as required, GEC reviewed STAR Framework goal data and PCSB AAF charter goal data. The assessment uncovered some of the primary reasons why students in the four- and five-year graduation cohorts do not (and likely will not moving forward) graduate within four to five years which include:

- Students entered testing well below high school readiness levels in math and reading requiring remedial noncredit bearing courses to be taken prior to credit bearing courses, which delays an on time four- or five-year graduation; and
- students entered with prior low credit attainment as outlined in their transcripts, thus making an on time four- or five-year graduation not possible; and
- students in both the four- and five-year cohorts (30%) enrolled within 6 months of their expected four or five year graduation window with the above conditions and needed more time to successfully earn their high school diploma.

The needs assessment and data analysis focused on the metrics and goals most closely aligned to the ACGR graduation rate. GEC was not eligible to receive a score for many of the goals on the STAR Framework Report Card due to the small sample size of eligible students in various categories (i.e. PARCC testing). However, GEC did receive a score for the STAR Framework's secondary completion goal and focused analysis on this indicator. The secondary completion rate represents the number of students identified as seniors in a school year who graduate. GEC achieved a secondary completion rate of 54.09% in SY 17-18 (66 out of 122 identified seniors graduated). This result led to 0 of the 10 points earned in the STAR Framework as the floor to earn points is a 71.25% rate. This STAR Framework goal most closely aligns with GEC's analysis of ACGR cohorts and ACGR and will be addressed in the following plan.

The purpose of this school improvement plan is to address how the Goodwill Excel Center can improve adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR) for the small subset of students who fall within eligible four- and five-year cohort graduation rates, which is roughly 18% of GEC's enrolled student body. The plan will present relevant goals derived from the needs assessment and focus on supporting students in the ACGR

cohort as they find their way back on their high school journey. First and foremost, GEC's primary goal and focus will be to continue to work to meet and/or exceed the graduation goal expected in its DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) charter agreement. Additionally, GEC will work to improve its secondary completion rate in the STAR Framework.

GEC Mission, Vision, and Program

The Goodwill Excel Center (GEC) is a unique, adult charter high school with a mission to transform adult lives through the power of achieving a high school diploma and accessing post-secondary education and careers in growing sustainable industries. GEC responds to the fact that life commitments, and circumstances can often stop people from continuing their high school education. By offering adults access to transportation assistance, child care and flexible class schedules, and other relevant supports, GEC seeks to remove barriers that often prevent individuals from completing high school.

GEC provides an opportunity for all students, regardless of when they dropped out and how far behind they are from their peers in their ACGR cohort, the chance to return to school and obtain their high school diploma through an individualized educational journey. GEC enrolls students at five different points throughout the school year as it has five, eight-week terms in the year. The majority of GEC students (roughly 82% of the student body at any given time), are not even eligible to be factored in an adjusted cohort graduation rate calculation because they started ninth grade more than four or five years prior to enrollment at GEC.

GEC meets students where they are in their academic journey, skill level, and school readiness, so they can be supported through their own individualized plan and timeline to graduation. For most, due to life barriers and circumstances, prior credit attainment, and academic skill level at entry, this will not happen within four or five years of initially entering ninth grade.

Upon making the decision to return to school, GEC's responsibility is to first identify where a student is academically in order to determine the best pathway to graduation for the student. GEC does this through reading and math assessments (Scholastic Reading Inventory and iReady) conducted during new student orientation. In order for students to be successful in high school credit bearing classes, all students must first have the necessary foundational reading and math skills to apply in all credit-bearing courses. This approach could prevent a student in a four year or five-year graduation cohort from earning their diploma with the rest of their cohort, but will improve the likelihood that a student will be able to successfully engage and complete credit bearing courses and thus graduate.

Additionally, GEC believes in the critical importance of attendance in all scheduled classes and provides individualized schedules based on student availability that can be

adjusted each 8-week term. Students can have a modified schedule to account for other responsibilities outside of school (employment, parenting, care-giving, health matters, etc.). Once again, this approach could prevent a student in a four year or five year graduation cohort from earning their diploma with the rest of their cohort, but will improve the likelihood that a student will be able to attend classes and manage life responsibilities while progressing towards graduation.

Finally, understanding where students are in the journey to graduation is a key pillar of the GEC model. GEC believes in transparency with students so that they both understand what credits they bring with them to GEC, where they tested in the placement tests, and what courses they must still complete to have the credits required to graduate. The GEC Registrar and the GEC Academic Success Coaches hold frequent meetings with students throughout the year to review their graduation progress plans. These plans can be adjusted several times throughout the year based on the students' earned credits and schedule availability.

School Improvement Plan Vision and Goals

The vision of the Goodwill Excel Center (GEC) is to continue to live its mission while focused foremost on meeting the mission critical goals established in the charter agreement with the DC PCSB, the authorizing entity of GEC. The vision of GEC is also to meet students where they are at so that students are able to earn a high school diploma in an environment that meets these individual needs. Additionally, GEC approaches all students from a strengths-based mindset and understands that students might have academic gaps and breaks in their education journey, but they have made the choice to return to school and recommit to their journey.

In the process of reviewing qualitative and quantitative data during the needs assessment, GEC identified some opportunities to support students, and specifically the growth of students who fall in the four and five year graduation cohorts, to improve their chances of graduating with their cohort when possible. While small improvements are possible, once again, **GEC does not expect it will ever meet the expected 67 percent ACGR rate** given its unique model, approach, and mission.

The vision and goals in this plan were first determined by looking at GEC's unique school model and identifying the critical pieces of the school model that make GEC unique. Through meetings with the Leadership Team members, teachers, Academic Success coaches, students, GEC Board members, and alumni the team was able to determine what makes GEC's school model unique and what is supporting students on their graduation pathway and what might be missing. Staff looked at data from the needs assessment to better understand what current gaps might exist and what needs might not be met that attribute to this gap and this designation. Staff engaged in a data dive of the 4-year and 5-year ACGR cohorts to determine what might have prevented students from graduating in the 4-year and 5-year window. The key data reviewed include: ages of student at enrollment, average reading and math score at entry, average total number of credits at entry, number of students who stopped attending

school and did not meet attendance requirements despite specific supports identified in a attendance support plan, and number of students who entered GEC after January 1st in their expected cohort graduation year. Below are the key data points analyzed for the 4-year and 5-year ACGR cohorts:

Data Point	4-year cohort	5-year cohort
Cohort Size (# of students in ACGR cohort)	29 students	35 students
Average Reading Scores at enrollment (Lexile – SRI)	908	843
Average Math Scores at enrollment (iReady)	481	478
Students Who Tested into Reading Foundations Classes (Lexile level below 1000)	16 students (55% of cohort)	25 students (71% of cohort)
Students Who Tested into Math Lab Classes (iReady score below 508)	27 students (93% of cohort)	33 students (94% of cohort)
Average Credits Upon Entry (24 credits need to be earned to graduate)	9.5 credits	11 credits
Students With 0 Credits Upon Entry	5 students (17% of cohort)	7 students (20% of cohort)
Students Dropped Due to violation of Attendance Policy	14 students (48% of cohort)	27 students (77% of cohort)
Students Who Entered GEC After January 1st of SY 17-18	12 students (41% of cohort)	6 students (17% of cohort)
Students Under 18 years old	21 students (72% of cohort)	0 students

Additionally, staff reviewed data that showed the growth GEC has experienced in key areas since opening in school year 16-17. These areas include: attendance, truancy, credit attainment, term to term re-enrollment, reading growth, and math growth. The data shows improvement from GEC's first operating year (SY 16-17) to its second year (SY 17-18), and to its third year currently in progress (SY 18-19) in nearly every area. Following is a data summary reflecting this improvement:

School Goal	Year 1 (SY 2016-2017)	Year 2 (SY 2017-2018)	Year 3 (SY 2018-2019) – current (as of Term 4 – May, 2019)
ISA (in seat attendance)	48%	52%	62%
Truancy rate	91% above the threshold	77% above the threshold	60% above the threshold
Credit Attainment rate	58%	76%	78%
Term to term re-enrollment rate	79%	77%	85%
% achieving Reading growth goal	N/A	67%	67%
% achieving Math growth goal	N/A	95%	86%

By engaging in these data dives, staff were able to identify the following areas that staff could focus on to support graduation of its students in the ACGR cohort. These areas of need include the following:

1. Continue to focus on meeting GEC's graduation goal outlined in its charter agreement with PCSB.
2. Support students coming into GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort in obtaining their transcripts from previous schools. GEC can improve communication with incoming students regarding how credit attainment displayed on past transcripts from prior school can accelerate their graduation timeline and the processes to collect these documents from past schools.
3. Support students in the ACGR cohorts in improving their in seat attendance (ISA) and reducing truancy for those students under 18.
4. Support students at GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort with better understanding how their graduation plan is progressing through more targeted and frequent conversations around credits earned and remaining credits needed to graduate.
5. Monitor and track the secondary completion rate for GEC.

The school will know if it is moving towards its school vision and addressing its areas of greatest need by continuing to meet and or exceed its current PCSB charter goals which include- in seat attendance, term-to-term reenrollment, and ensuring students are earning credits each term to stay on their graduation pathway.

GEC staff created S.M.A.R.T improvement school goals to focus on student outcomes that advance GEC's vision of growth and its areas of need identified above. These goals are focused on student outcomes and include short-term and long-term targets aligned to the STAR Framework metrics as well as GEC's charter goals. This improvement plan is focused on improving GEC's graduation rates for 4-year and 5-year cohorts for ACGR (when possible), but can also be applied to all students as best practices for meeting the graduation goal established in GEC's charter agreement with PCSB.

Following is a table that outlines GEC's areas of need as determined by the needs assessment, the S.M.A.R.T goals aligned to the needs, short term expected students outcomes, long-term expected student outcomes and evidence needed to support goal attainment in both areas.

Needs Assessment Area of Greatest Need	S.M.A.R.T Goals	Short term expected student outcome	Evidence that short term goal has been met	Long-term expected student outcome	Evidence that long term goal has been met
Support students entering GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort (under age 22) in obtaining their transcripts from previous schools by improving transcript collection processes and communication to students around the need and value in submitting previous transcripts.	Improve support of students in ACGR cohorts in obtaining their transcripts from previous schools starting in SY 19-20 by ensuring 100% of ACGR cohort students who do not submit a transcript by orientation (iExcel) develop a transcript retrieval plan that is tracked and monitored by the Registrar throughout the first term of a student's enrollment.	1. More students in the ACGR cohorts will enroll at GEC with a transcript on file or have a transcript within their first term at GEC. 2. More students know and understand the prior credits they have and how prior credits will impact their path to graduation.	1. Transcript submitted to Registrar for student file. More students having transcript upon entry or by their first week of classes. 2. An initial graduation plan is created identifying anticipated graduation date based off of transcript and current credit and test scores.	GEC students graduate from the Goodwill Excel Center.	Graduation data will be pulled from GEC's Student Information System to demonstrate students have met the graduation requirements for GEC and graduated.

Needs Assessment Area of Greatest Need	S.M.A.R.T Goals	Short term expected student outcome	Evidence that short term goal has been met	Long-term expected student outcome	Evidence that long term goal has been met
Support students coming into GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort (under age 22) to improve their attendance (ISA) and reducing truancy rates for students under 18.	Beginning in SY 19-20, ensure students in the ACGR cohorts have at least two graduation planning meetings each term to review their signed LOU and current progress towards their graduation goal to keep students engaged and attending school.	1. ISA for ACGR cohort students is maintained or improved. 2. Students remain engaged and enrolled at GEC because they know where they stand with their graduation plan. 3. Attendance intervention plans implemented where needed to support attendance.	1. ISA data pulled from PowerSchool for students in the ACGR cohorts shows ISA maintenance or improvement.	1. Students continue to increase their ISA and ISA growth from term to term 2. Students remain enrolled at GEC and are not dropped from the roster due to attendance issues.	3. ISA data pulled from PowerSchool for students in the ACGR cohorts shows ISA maintenance or improvement.
Support students at GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort (under age 22) with better	Improve the quality and frequency of graduation plan meetings with	1. Students better understand their pathway to graduation	1. Students utilize and login into PowerSchool to track	GEC students graduate from the Goodwill Excel Center.	Graduation data will be pulled from GEC's Student Information System to

Needs Assessment Area of Greatest Need	S.M.A.R.T Goals	Short term expected student outcome	Evidence that short term goal has been met	Long-term expected student outcome	Evidence that long term goal has been met
understanding how their graduation plan is progressing through more targeted and frequent conversations around credits earned and remaining credits needed to graduate.	students in the ACGR cohorts by having 100% of students in the ACGR cohorts sign a letter of understanding (LOU) communicating their current credits, test scores, and pathway to graduation by the end of the second week of their first term.	and credits needed to graduate by term. 2. Students maintain productivity and on their graduate pathway by earning credits each term.	grades and graduation plans progression. 2. PowerSchool shows students have earned credits.		demonstrate students have met the graduation requirements for GEC and graduated.
Continue to meet GEC's charter agreement around graduation.	GEC will continue to meet or exceed the GEC PCSB graduation goal that a minimum of 10% of the audited verified enrollment must graduate in the school year. Starting in SY 20-21, and every	GEC meets its annual graduation goal outlined in its PCSB charter agreement.	Annual data validation process with PCSB verifies GEC has achieved goal.	GEC meets its annual graduation goal outlined in its PCSB charter agreement.	Annual data validation process with PCSB verifies GEC has achieved goal.

Needs Assessment Area of Greatest Need	S.M.A.R.T Goals	Short term expected student outcome	Evidence that short term goal has been met	Long-term expected student outcome	Evidence that long term goal has been met
	year thereafter, no less than 20% of verified enrolled students will graduate in a school year.				
Monitor and track students along their secondary completion rate.	Improve secondary completion rate in SY 19-20 by meeting or exceeding the rate achieved in SY 17-18 (54.09%) by creating and implementing a process to better identify who is a "senior" and slated to graduate two terms from their graduation date at the start of each academic term. The plan will be completed	1. Create a plan and process for how to track students two terms away from their graduation	1. Plan for tracking students two terms from graduation is created 2. Students are tracking their graduation term utilizing PowerSchool 3. Students understand where they are in their graduation timeline	GEC improves its secondary completion rate as defined by OSSE's STAR Framework.	Secondary completion rate has increased (above 54.09%) as shown by OSSE STAR Framework metrics.

Needs Assessment Area of Greatest Need	S.M.A.R.T Goals	Short term expected student outcome	Evidence that short term goal has been met	Long-term expected student outcome	Evidence that long term goal has been met
	by the end of SY 18-19 to be implemented in Term 1 of SY 19-20.				

People

In order to understand and address gaps in people and talent and meet the identified goals above, GEC will employ the following talent strategies:

- Provide relevant professional development opportunities focused on topics such as: understanding GEC data points, increasing student attendance and engagement through outreach and collaboration, intervention planning, and other relevant topics.
- Identify staff members and build out infrastructure and SOPs around needed processes for relevant operational gaps.
- Partner with Goodwill's learning and development team and other talent management organizations to support Leadership Team manager training.
- Build out an on-boarding plan for all new staff specific to their function in the school.
- Carry out the GEC performance management framework and make adjustments and revisions where needed.

The table below outlines the questions asked as GEC begins to plan for people and talent to achieve the identified goals in this plan.

What is the school's theory of action around people?	People are the critical levers that work to promote GEC's mission and vision. GEC must have strong people in the right positions that are able to fully execute their responsibilities to meet GEC's school goals. All talent must be mission-focused and mission-driven, and GEC must work to retain and empower strong talent. GEC must provide talent with the tools and resources they need to grow, develop, and expand GEC's mission.
What changes do you plan to take to your approach to the talent in your building – leadership and educators – to achieve the coherent and ambitious vision?	GEC has a strong talent foundation. Staff are mission-driven and mission-focused. GEC will evolve and grow leadership and staff via the following strategies: • Updating interview protocols for new talent and expansion that identify the mission and vision critical components of all talent at GEC. • Individualizing professional development sessions for all staff based on need and interest. • Creating opportunities for staff to lead working groups on new initiatives and policies needed in the school.

	• Utilizing Fridays (GEC does not have classes on Fridays and Fridays are a day for staff meetings, planning, collaboration, and student support), for collaborative planning, data dives, and all-staff communication touch points focused on our mission and vision.
How were these approaches informed by the evidence in the needs assessment?	These approaches to talent at GEC are informed by the analysis of the evidence in GEC's needs assessment in several ways. • There is a need for staff to communicate, collaborate, and understand where students are in their graduation pathway, which involves attendance and credit attainment. Thus, providing an infrastructure and a platform for staff to collaborate and communicate will help address this need. • There is a need for all staff to understand the data that drives decisions and actions. Continued transparency and openness around the data can bring forth more discussion and goal-oriented solutions. • The needs assessment shows the need for some additional processes to help support students coming into GEC. The staff at GEC have ideas that can help support process building and work groups can lend themselves to brainstorming and process formation.
How is GEC planning to ensure it will have effective leadership over the next three years for the principal and other key leadership?	GEC is planning to ensure it will have effective leadership over the next three years by taking the following actions: • Continuing to implement and strengthen a strong performance management framework tied to core competencies and school goals. • Discussing growth and expansion opportunities for staff. • Providing professional development opportunities and coaching to support individual growth. • Ensuring compensation and benefits are competitive in DC.
How is the school building a pipeline of strong leadership?	In addition to ensuring there are various ways in which effective leadership will remain at GEC over the next three years, there are many steps being

	taken to build out a pipeline of strong leadership. The pipeline of strong leadership is being built through the following: • Manager development program through Goodwill of Greater Washington. • Seeking external partnerships to build management team competencies and manager competencies. The leadership at GEC is critical to the vision outlined in this plan and the mission and vision overall. Thus, it's important that the leadership continue to grow, but also remain at GEC as the growth happens.
How is GEC ensuring retention of effective educators?	It is important that GEC takes steps to retain effective educators at GEC. The following steps are being taken: • Ongoing participation in the Insight Survey as part of the DC Data Collaborative with TNTP and OSSE (GEC has participated in this survey since SY 2017-18 and continues to do so for SY 2018-19.) to obtain input directly from teachers. • Implementing a performance management framework tied to incentives and growth. • Ongoing assessment of GEC's compensation to ensure salaries remain competitive in the District. • Providing a platform for teachers to have a voice and to put ideas into action. • Continuing to have open lines of communication with all staff and hold transparency in high regard. • Creating pipelines for growth and leadership.
How is GEC planning to help support educators who are in need of support to improve?	While it's important to retain effective educators, it's also important to help educators who need support to improve. This is done through the following actions: • Individualized coaching plans based on areas identified as "in need of improvement" on staff performance rubrics. • Feedback loops and one on one coaching. • Professional development opportunities and resources. • Performance Improvement Plans where coaching plans do not show growth and progress.

What evidence-based strategies will be employed?	GEC has identified the following evidence-based strategies from the 2016 Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Field Guide that will help support the goals and actions to address talent needs. The three evidence-based strategies selected are:
	• Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration
	  o Teaming, shared leadership and responsibility, and collaboration
	  o Using teams, shared leadership, and a collaborative and trusting environment to accelerate improvement
	• Establish teacher agency, ownership, and urgency: start building the community immediately
	• Provide leadership and collegial support
	These evidence-based strategies were selected based on the needs identified in the needs assessment and GEC's SMART goals. GEC will focus on creating clarity, uplifting collaboration, and setting clear expectations for all staff.[1]

How is GEC determining strategies based on themes from the needs assessment to meet the projected short and long term goals?	GEC is identifying strategies to address identified needs and to meet goals via the following: • Ongoing communication between students and staff members. • Tracking and monitoring student graduation plans. • Maintaining transparency and clarity around graduation planning and processes.

Instruction

In order to understand and address improvements in instruction, GEC will employ a few strategies to better understand where students are in their academic journey and also better prepare instructional leaders and staff. These strategies will include the following:

- Professional development opportunities focused on topics such as: understanding student entry level credits and entry level assessment scores, spiraling and scaffolding standards throughout each term, and how to effectively track and monitor student growth and progress in the classroom.

[1] Lane, B., Unger, C., & Stein, L. (2016). Massachusetts turnaround practices field guide: A research-based guide designed to support district and school leaders engaged in school turnaround efforts.

- Carrying out the GEC performance management framework and having frequent feedback conversations with staff.
- Frequent classroom observations and student work analysis sessions.
- Implementing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for the instructional team that teach students in the same "grade level."
- Identifying skill gaps in students and identifying ways to close skill gaps throughout the classes.

The table below outlines the questions asked as GEC begins to think about and plan for our quality instruction to achieve identified goals.

What is the GEC's theory of action around ensuring that adults are effective instructional leaders and students are receiving and demonstrating evidence of high-quality instruction?	GEC's theory of action around ensuring that adults are effective instructional leaders and students are receiving and demonstrating evidence of high-quality instruction centers on the belief that GEC's instructional leaders and instructors are the critical levers in promoting strong and effective instruction. At GEC, instruction must be relevant and rigorous and aligned to GEC's school mission and vision. Students should be receiving high-quality instruction and also show through many ways how they have received that instruction. Instructors must be given the resources and tools to develop strong curriculum and receive feedback from their leaders to promote even stronger curriculum development and teaching.
What supports and interventions do you plan to undertake and how are they related to GEC's identified needs?	GEC plans to undertake the following interventions as it begins to address instructional areas: • Engaging in a curriculum map analysis to understand how standards are spiraled from Reading Foundations and Math Lab Classes to credit-bearing classes and beyond to ensure basic skills are covered and a transition is addressed for skills moving into credit-bearing classes. • Revising curriculum maps with a focus in backwards planning to PARCC and ACT assessments while continuing to use the Common Core Standards. • Analyzing student work from various classes and grade levels to determine areas of gaps and need. • Analyzing data as it pertains to attendance and credit attainment to create a visual for students

	about the importance of attendance as it relates to credit attainment. • Identifying key focuses for the entire instructional team as it relates to mastery and skill progression. • Identifying professional development workshops for instructional staff to attend that align to their content area and focus. • Identifying interventions around attendance, skill gaps, and other barriers and creating an intervention resource toolkit for teachers to use when needed in specific situations to support students. These interventions are related to GEC's identified needs because they address the need to dive into data, look for gaps and trends, and focus on the skills needed to continue positive growth and mastery.
How is GEC identifying capacity to ensure instructional approaches can be implemented timely and effectively?	GEC is identifying capacity to ensure instructional approaches can be implemented timely and effectively through: • Reviewing GEC's organizational chart and formal evaluation data to determine needs and trends from the evaluations as it relates to GEC's organizational capacity. • Currently recruiting talent for vacant positions and looking for talent with specific skills and capacity as it relates to the roles and responsibilities in the job description. Aiming to have all vacant positions filled by the start of the 2019-2020 school year. • Utilizing the summer break as a time for the instructional leadership to engage in a data dive and curriculum analysis and planning. • Preparing all curriculum maps with the updated focuses and goals for the instructional staff before their arrival for GEC's preservice training for the 2019-2020 school year. • Carrying out observations and evaluations for teachers on coaching plans throughout the end of the year to determine growth and/or continued areas of need. • Working in collaboration with other relevant teams at GEC to support tools and other relevant materials.

How is GEC planning for the instructional approach to be scaled across the school for maximum impact and over time?	GEC is planning for the instructional approach to be scaled across the school for maximum impact starting in school year 2019-2020 and over time. GEC will do this through the following methods: • Creating an implementation timeline of the above outlined next steps and a roll out plan to start with the instructional leadership team in our current school year. • Holding professional development and training sessions at the start of school year 2019-2020 with all instructional staff and then scheduling follow-up professional development and trainings throughout the entire year. • Implementing an informal and formal evaluation process for all instructional staff with frequent feedback meetings and conversations. • Embedding the professional developments and trainings in on-boarding plans for any new instructional team members hired in the middle of the year. • Empowering teachers and instructional staff to lead professional developments and trainings for the team on relevant topics aligned to the curriculum.

What evidence-based strategies will be employed?	The following evidence-based strategies will help support GEC's goals and actions to address needs for instruction. GEC has identified the following evidence-based strategies from the 2016 Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Field Guide:
	• Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to all Students
	  ○ Using data to identify student-specific and nonacademic needs
	• Intention Practices for Improving Instruction
	  ○ Defined expectations for rigorous and consistent instructional practices
	  ○ Teachers and teacher teams use student data to adapt and improve instructional strategies
	  ○ Highly consistent, aligned, and rigorous instructional practices
	  ○ Providing targeted interventions and supports to students and monitoring for effectiveness

	• Establish teacher agency, ownership, and urgency These evidence-based strategies were selected based on the needs identified in the needs assessment and our SMART goals above. The GEC staff aims to focus on building out its instructional culture and developing teacher agency and urgency while also streamlining consistent, aligned, and rigorous instructional practices.[2]
How is GEC determining strategies based on themes from the needs assessment to meet the projected short and long term goals?	By looking at the needs assessment, it is clear that the following were themes related to instruction: • Planning around student needs and skill gaps • Increased student attendance and credit attainment Thus, the school is determining strategies based on these themes to meet the long term and short term goals by identifying steps in which planning will help support actions and increased student attendance and credit attainment is looked at through the lens of curriculum and instruction.

Structures

In order to understand and address gaps in GEC's school decision-making, structural configuration, and management, GEC will employ a few strategies to better understand where our structural gaps are. These strategies will include the following:

- Identifying and codifying standard operations procedures (SOPs) used for students from the entry point to their first day of school and then throughout their time at GEC.
- Identifying gaps in the SOPs and creating a list of policies and processes that are needed, but not codified and creating a timeline for completion.
- Creating a decision-making tree to understand the relevant staff members in different decision-making situations and analyzing the process.
- Engaging in a gap analysis to better understand the structural gaps that might exist and making an action list to address the gaps.

The table below outlines the questions asked as GEC begins to ensure GEC's infrastructure is aligned to achieve goals that GEC has set out. The following strategies

[2] Lane, B., Unger, C., & Stein, L. (2016). Massachusetts turnaround practices field guide: A research-based guide designed to support district and school leaders engaged in school turnaround efforts.

will allow GEC to address gaps as identified in the needs assessment and work towards identified SMART goals as it relates to structural needs.

What is GEC's theory of action around structures and how will it reinforce and facilitate the work you are doing around People and Instruction?	GEC's theory of action around structures is that the foundation of GEC lies on strong operational structures and procedures. From the moment a student applies online to be a student at GEC, structures are in place to support the student through the enrollment and orientation process to their first day of school. Strong operating structures keep staff grounded and maintain stability. There is always room for reflection, revision, and growth in processes and procedures and ultimately structures. People and Instruction are the main levers in the structure. Strong talent leads the work in the structure, as a strong structure will not have any traction without strong talent.
What supports and interventions does GEC plan to undertake and how are they related to your school's identified needs?	The following interventions will be taken to address structural gaps: • Organizational chart analysis and SWOT analysis- Understand the strength strengths of the current organizational chart and alignment and determine any opportunities for growth and possible changes needed to support other needs as identified. • Partner with, Goodwill Education Initiatives (GEI) from Indiana, to analyze best practices used by other Goodwill's implementing the Excel Center model to improve GEC's structure. • Identify priority items and actions for structural improvement and re-alignment. • Create a timeline for action based on structural analysis. • Analyze school year schedule and Friday planning and meeting schedule to determine needs to build in collaborative planning time and other relevant needs. These interventions are related to the school's identified needs because they address the need to understand the structure that allows (or does not allow) for processes to take place and also brings forth needed infrastructure to carry out new or needed processes. Additionally, these interventions allow staff

	to take a step back and reflect and determine next steps as GEC moves forward in any structural shifts based on our interventions.

What evidence-based strategies will be employed?	The following evidence-based strategies will help support GEC's goals and actions to address needs around structure. The evidence-based strategies selected are from the 2016 Massachusetts Turnaround Practices Field Guide:
	• School Climate and Culture
	  o Shared behavioral and expectations that support student learning
	• Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration
	  o Using teams, shared leadership, and a collaborative and trusting environment to accelerate improvement
	These evidence-based strategies were selected based on the needs identified in the needs assessment and GEC's SMART goals above. GEC will focus on building out its instructional culture and developing teacher agency and urgency while also streamlining consistent, aligned, and rigorous instructional practices.[3]

How is GEC determining strategies based on themes from the needs assessment to meet the projected short and long term goals?	These strategies were determined based on the themes from the needs assessment as the main themes relating to structure were: processes and collaboration. Therefore, through these evidence-based strategies that focus on shared leadership and shared expectations and also creating a collaborative environment, staff can use these to meet short- and long-term goals and further unpack the structural gaps.

Goals and Continuous Improvement

In order to ensure the school improvement plan is carried out, GEC must have routines for how it will determine whether the School Improvement Plan is having its intended outcomes. These routines will include self-monitoring and continuous stakeholder engagement. The following table outlines how GEC will implement these routines as it works to meet the goals in this plan and strive for continuous improvement.

[3] Lane, B., Unger, C., & Stein, L. (2016). Massachusetts turnaround practices field guide: A research-based guide designed to support district and school leaders engaged in school turnaround efforts.

How is GEC establishing or continuing internal routines?	GEC is continuing to carry out internal routines by: • Continuing the 2x/term (every 4 weeks) Leadership Team meetings to evaluate school goals and school actions. • Continuing the performance management framework with formal and informal evaluations and bi-weekly one on ones and feedback sessions with staff. • Continue the Monday morning huddles with all staff members to communicate mission critical activities in the school. • Continue bi-weekly all-staff data meetings and collaborative planning meetings. • Continuing end of term data evaluations (every 8 weeks) and data action plans on multiple-levels (leadership team, instructional team, and all other relevant teams). • Continue enrollment cycle with 5 enrollment periods/year. • Continuing to track and monitor school-level data on a weekly basis using a Data Dashboard to include tracking of ACGR cohort sub groups. GEC is working to establish new internal routines by: • Gathering feedback from staff around what meetings and structures work best to relay information and collaborate. • Refining the graduation plan meeting process and establishing a working group to meet and focus on this plan. • Utilizing the summer time to have the leadership team engage in a process analysis overview for their specific teams to identify the processes used, codify those process, and establish what processes are needed.
How is GEC establishing or continuing routines with stakeholders?	GEC is continuing to carry out routines with stakeholders by: • Utilizing surveys for staff to receive feedback and action (such as the Insight Survey). GEC is establishing new routines with stakeholders by: • Creating opportunities for focus groups throughout the year with alumni and current students.

	• Analyzing Insight Staff Survey data from the 2018-19 school year.
How is GEC conducting an annual process of reviewing, sharing progress publicly, and, as necessary, revising its School Improvement Plan?	GEC is conducting an annual process of reviewing, sharing progress publicly, and revising its School Improvement Plan as necessary by: • Analyzing school level data as it relates to STAR Framework Goals and PCSB PMF Goals. • Creating course-correction plans where goals are not met and sharing them with all staff and stakeholders. • Sharing progress via emails and meetings with relevant stakeholders. • Creating a timeline to look back on the School Improvement Plan and ensure alignment to it and benchmarks to assess if revision is needed.
How is GEC structuring for sustainability, including how is GEC coordinating and integrating the activities outlined in this plan with other federal, state, and local services, resources and programs?	GEC is structuring for sustainability in this domain by taking the following actions: • Determining who on the GEC team can lead various actions and needs and act as a team lead. • Creating a calendar and timeline to ensure all deadlines are met for all activities and coordinating activities with an aligned point of contact and team lead. • Ensuring all activities have a co-lead and a support system in place. • Maintaining its focus on meeting and or exceeding all PCSB charter goals.

Conclusion

GEC serves students who are making the choice to reenroll back in high school to achieve what they did not achieve before – graduation. For a few students, graduation will happen on the same timeline as their initial four or five year graduation cohort, but for most GEC students this will not happen for the reasons outlined in this plan. GEC's unique model provides an opportunity for students to regain traction on their graduation journey at any time in their life journey. GEC welcomes the opportunity for students to come back to school and will strive to constantly meet the diverse needs of students committing to their education.

Works Cited

Lane, B., Unger, C., & Stein, L. (2016). Massachusetts turnaround practices field guide: A research-based guide designed to support district and school leaders engaged in school turnaround efforts.

Appendix A: ESSA Needs Assessment

Goodwill Excel Center Charter School
ESSA Needs Assessment

Purpose

The Goodwill Excel Center (GEC) has been identified by Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School, Type 2 (CS2). This designation under the new STAR Framework accountability system was issued because GEC's 4- and 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rates fall below 67% in school year (SY) 17-18. GEC's 5-year graduation rate in SY 17-18 was 5.71% and 4-year graduate rate was 6.9%.

The following needs assessment has been conducted to review qualitative and quantitative data the school has access to in order to better understand the factors leading to the current adjusted cohort graduation rate. It is important to note in this assessment that while GEC did not meet the expected graduation rate under the ESSA STAR Framework system in SY 17-18, GEC exceeded the graduation goal outlined in its charter agreement with the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB).

Background and Mission

The Goodwill Excel Center (GEC) launched in SY 16-17 to meet the education needs of the more than 60,000 adult residents of the District of Columbia who do not have a high school diploma. The mission of GEC is to transform adult lives through the power of achieving a high school diploma and accessing post-secondary education and careers in growing, sustainable local industries. The GEC is the only charter high school in Washington, DC specifically focused on the unique needs of adults of all ages that offers a high school diploma. The GEC model is based on the Excel Center model founded by Goodwill Education Initiatives (GEI) in Indianapolis, Indiana in 2010.

Students graduate from Excel Centers earning a high school diploma (not a GED), postsecondary plans to enter college and/or a career, and market valuable industry specific certifications. Additionally, students are supported one-on-one by Academic Success Coaches and have access to an education program developed to support at-risk adults who did not achieve success in traditional high schools. Programming at GEC to support outcomes and success for these at-risk students includes:

- flexible scheduling to meet the needs of working adults;
- 8-week terms where students can earn high school credit;
- a 4-day school week with an extra support day on Friday for tutoring;

- onsite child development center to serve young children of students (operated in partnership with the YMCA);
- metro cards to support transportation barriers;
- a competency-based face-to-face instructional model;
- math and reading remediation classes for student who test below high school readiness levels at entry;
- special populations support services;
- college and career readiness coaching;
- and training leading to certifications in high-growth employment industries.

The GEC is held accountable under PCSB's Alternative Accountability Framework (AAF) because GEC serves a highly at-risk population. The Goodwill Excel Center has negotiated school-specific goals and academic achievement expectations under this AAF which are included in GEC's charter agreement with PCSB. GEC's graduation goal is that GEC will graduate no fewer than 10% of its audited enrollment number by the end of any school year and 25% by SY 19-20. At the end of its second school year (SY 17-18), GEC achieved this graduation goal by graduating 25% of its audited enrollment number.

While GEC is exceeding its approved graduation goal with the PCSB, a goal aligned with the unique model and mission of GEC, GEC does not meet the District's expectation of a 67% ACGR (adjusted cohort graduation rate). The ACGR calculation is problematic for GEC for the following reasons—

- Given the ages of the student body, the vast majority of students are not even factored in the rate calculation.
- GEC intentionally recruits students who have dropped out of school and who are consequently far behind academically as indicated by reading and math scores and transcript analysis at entrance. In many cases, students come in so far behind academically, that there is not enough time for them to achieve graduation within their cohort.

Stakeholder Engagement Process

The following stakeholder groups have been engaged in either, assembling, discussing and/or analyzing various school data around the Goodwill Excel Center's adjusted cohort graduation rate:

- School Executive Leadership:
    - President/CEO, Catherine Meloy
    - Chief Mission Officer, Colleen Paletta
- School Board
- School Principal/Director: Chelsea Kirk
- School leadership and administrative team members
    - Data manager, Demetri Tyler
    - Registrar, Amina Abdul-Rahim

    - Office Manager, Dawn Rhodes
    - Lead Instructional Staff, Tom Pengelly and Ruth Chambers-Turner
    - Manager of College and Career Readiness, Joseph McDonald
    - Lead Academic Success Coach, LaTia Taliaferro
    - Manager of Special Populations, VerShaun Terry
- GEC Students
- GEC Alumni
-

The following structures were utilized to engage stakeholders:

- Stakeholder Meetings
- Survey Reviews
- Focus Groups
- Leadership Team Meetings

The following evidence has been collected and reviewed in the needs assessment analysis: reviews of meeting minutes, notes and presentations

Summary of Key Evidence Reviewed and Themes

Area of Review & Analysis	Key Qualitative and Quantitative Evidence Reviewed	Key Themes
STAR Framework and Other School Data (PCSB Alternative Accountability Goals and Academic Achievement Expectations)	**<u>SY 17-18 STAR Framework data summary</u>** **Graduation Rate:** % students graduating in 4 years and 5 years • ***Results***: 4-year rate: 6.9% (2/29 students), 4-year rate: 5.71% (2/35 students) **Evidence reviewed in this section:** **Evidence Reviewed Impacting Graduation Rate (for both cohorts):** • # of credits earned at entry (transcript credits) • Math and Reading entry assessment scores o Math (iReady) and Reading (SRI) assessments are required during iExcel	1. While GEC did not receive a STAR rating, the report card does reflect strong performance in the following indicators key to GEC's mission and purpose: Attendance Growth and Re-engagement 2. When looking at the 4-year and 5-year cohort data and evidence there are several themes and contributing factors as to why students did not graduate within the 4-year and 5-year ACGR window. These include:

	orientation for course placement o Any student scoring under 1000 on the SRI is required to take Reading Foundations before entering high school Humanities courses o Any student scoring under 508 on the iReady is required to take Math Foundations before entering high school math courses • Length of enrollment at GEC (entry and exit date) o What term (or time of year) students enrolled in the school year at GEC • Exit reason **PCSB Alternative Accountability Goals SY 17-18 DATA summary**[4] • All goals were met in SY 17-18 with the exception of two: In seat attendance (52.4% against a goal of 60%) and ACT (Of the 91 graduates, 20.3% scored a 16 or higher against a goal of 50%) • GEC exceeded its PCSB-approved graduation goal in SY 17-18 with 25.2% of the school's verified enrolled students graduated by the end of the academic school year against a minimum goal of 10%. **Evidence reviewed in this section:** **School Environment: Attendance** • In Seat Attendance (ISA)	a. Below 9th grade reading and math scores at entry, which required math lab and reading foundations courses that do not result in high school credit. i. 4-year cohort: 55% of the students tested into Reading Foundations classes and 93% of the cohort tested into Math Lab classes. ii. 5-year cohort: 71% of the students tested into Reading Foundations classes and 94% of the students tested into Math Lab classes. b. Entering GEC not on track to graduate within the window due to low credit attainment earned prior to entry on incoming transcripts.

[4] See Annual Report in appendix of needs assessment

	• Truancy rates • Term to term re-enrollment **Credit Attainment** • Credit attainment **Math and reading growth and participation** **Graduation Rate** • Graduation rate for the school year (per the PCSB-approved graduation rate business rules) **Truancy related data reviewed SY 17-18** • Reviewed data contributing to a PCSB Notice of Concern around truancy rates in February 2018 and the improvement plans presented at PCSB board meetings that resulted in the notice of concern being lifted in May 2018. • Reviewed subsequent SY 18-19 truancy data and continued improvement planning showing improvement in truancy rates year over year.	c. 30% of the two cohorts enrolled at GEC within 6 months left of the school year, which do not allow for ample time to complete all credits within the graduation window. GEC operates with five 8-week terms, and many of the students in these cohorts enrolled in Terms 3, 4, and 5, which are the final 3 terms of the school year. d. The overwhelming theme as for why students did not graduate was due to student poor attendance. GEC strives to support students in many ways to support them in identifying barriers that might cause attendance concerns. Additionally, GEC has an attendance support plan, as set out in the Student Handbook, which is upheld to fidelity. The attendance support plan is for students who have four unexcused absences. At the

		fourth unexcused absence, the coach reaches out to the student to set up an attendance plan meeting within the next two days. The coach works with the student to identify the barriers to attendance and work with the student, teachers, case managers, and other relevant staff members to develop an individualized plan that promotes successful re-engagement. The coach will track and monitor the attendance support plan. If the student has less than four unexcused absences during the eight-day period, then the student will no longer be subject to the pan. Students under 18 who do not meet the requirements of the plan will remain on the plan. Students under 18 and younger will be unenrolled after 20 consecutive full-day absences. For

		students over 18, if they do not meet the requirements of the plan, they will be withdrawn. 3. GEC's ISA was 52.3% for SY 2017-18. Though below the attendance goal, this was an improvement from SY 2016-17. 4. GEC is performing above expectation on its graduation goal established in its approved charter agreement with the DC PCSB. 5. Given many of the younger (under age 18) students fall in the ACGR calculation rate, continuing to improve attendance rates for younger students is an area of potential growth.
School Performance History, Community and Neighborhood Context	**Per the SY 16-17 PCSB School Quality Report GEC (enrollment: 382)** • *Student Demographics* - 82.5%economically disadvantaged - 91.1% at-risk - 28.6% special education - 95.3% Black Non-Hispanic **Per the SY 17-18 PCSB School Quality Report GEC (enrollment: 356)** • *Student Demographics* - 74.1% economically disadvantaged	1. GEC is serving a majority at-risk student population who are majority Black Non-Hispanic and economically disadvantaged. Year over year the demographics have not varied greatly in any single category. 2. GEC is located in Ward 3. This area is both metro and bus accessible and provides a safe environment for all students.

	- 96.5% at-risk - 30.6% special education - 93% Black Non-Hispanic The Goodwill Excel Center resides in the heart of the business district in downtown Washington, DC in Ward 3. It is located two blocks from the White House and resides in a neighborhood with extremely low crime rates and high neighborhood security given the proximity to the White House.	
School Team	**Evidence reviewed in this section:** • Organizational chart • Composition of instructional and non-instruction school staff • Leadership Team composition Per the organizational chart, Oversight of GEC is performed via a management agreement with Goodwill of Greater Washington (GGW). Through this agreement, GEC receives HR, Finance, Marketing, IT, Legal, Facilities Maintenance, Development, and Executive management support. There has been consistent leadership provided to the school via GGW since the school's launch. The current school Director was promoted from Lead Humanities Instructor to GEC Director in March, 2018. The current school Director's vision was shared and articulated during the hiring process and in several meetings with leadership and school staff as evidenced by presentations from various meetings. Prior to the tenure of the current Director, few staff evaluations were conducted. Within the first three and a half months of the new Director's tenure, a full performance evaluation	1. GEC's staffing model intentionally responds to the needs of its students and has grown to meet the needs of its at-risk student population. 2. GEC has maintained most of its school-based leadership team since launching in SY 16-17 and has sought to promote from within when possible. Executive and management support from GGW has remained consistent with no turnover. Several positions added at the end of SY 17-18 continue to grow the capacity of the school to meet the needs of its student population and mission (i.e., Data Manager, Manager of College and Career Readiness, Manager of Student Support) 3. Given the lack of a comprehensive teacher evaluation system

	system was created and launched to effectively evaluate all school staff starting in SY 18-19. The GEC School Team is comprised of 33 total staff (up from 23 in SY 16-17, the first year of operation) and a childcare center run by the YMCA. The GEC model is a unique staffing structure which includes more wrap around services and support in the school building given the population served. The following teams comprise the GEC School Team: • Leadership Team • Instructional Team • Special Populations Team • Academic Success Coaching Team • College and Career Readiness Team • Operations and Enrollment Team Each team is led by a lead and/or Manager and they sit on the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team is comprised of the following staff. • School Director • Lead STEM Teacher- promoted at the end of SY 17-18 from a Science teacher • Lead Humanities Teacher- a former School Director recruited from an Excel Center in Indianapolis • Manager of Special Populations – hired prior to school launch in SY 16-17 • Lead Academic Success Coach- promoted from an Academic Success Coach position	implemented in SY 17-18 there is not as much data available in staff effectiveness. This system was created at the end of SY 17-18.

	• Manager of College and Career Readiness (position added at the end of SY 17-18) • Registrar Manager - hired prior to school launch in SY 16-17 • Data Performance Manager (position added at the end of SY 17-18) • Manager of Student Support Services (position added at the end of SY 17-18) In addition to the School Team listed above, GEC also contracts with the YMCA to provide an on-site licensed child development center. The YMCA at GEC has 24 student slots and is used by students who are enrolled at GEC. The YMCA has a Director, Assistant Director, and teaching staff.	
School Instruction	**Evidence reviewed in this section:** • GEC Course Offerings • GEC Curriculum scope and sequences • GEC School year schedule • GEC Competency Based Summary GEC is a competency-based curriculum model. All curriculum is Common Core aligned and created with the goal of mastery aligned to spiraled standards throughout the course progression. Students take classes based on iReady (math) and SRI (reading) placement scores and transcripts submitted during orientation. Students at GEC need 24 credits to graduate, and many students will leave GEC having earned more than 24 credits due to previous transcripts and the need to take remediation classes. GEC has the following classes:	1. GEC employs a competency-based education model where credit is earned through competency as opposed to seat hours. 2. GEC's instructional model is built on understanding the needs of the student from the entry point at orientation. Thus, entry level reading and math scores determine class placement for students and informs a student's graduation pathway. 3. GEC incorporates a unique and flexible school-day schedule to allow for adult students to balance their

	• Humanities classes (English and Social Studies) – 2 credits
	  o World Studies A
	  o World Studies B
	  o American Studies A
	  o American Studies B
	• Math classes – 1 credit
	  o Algebra I
	  o Geometry
	  o Algebra II
	  o Business Algebra
	• Science classes – 1 credit
	  o Earth and Space Science
	  o Biology
	  o Chemistry
	  o Physics
	• Art/Music – .5 credits
	• World Language classes - .5 credits
	• CTE classes – 1 credit
	  o Computer Applications I
	  o ACT Prep
	  o Senior Seminar
	• CCR Pathways (Certification Pathways)– 2 credits
	  o Hospitality
	  o Security
	  o Computer Applications II
	• Foundation classes – 1 elective credit
	  o Math Lab A/B
	  o Reading Foundations A/B
	
	Classes at GEC range from 60 min, 90 min, and 120 min depending on the course. During the 8-week class, all classes include:
	• Formative assessments
	• Summative assessment
	
	The GEC class schedule is from 9:00am-5:00pm. Students have many opportunities to be a voice in their
		responsibilities and remain in school. Constant conversations regarding availability and graduation planning are held in the student's time at GEC.

	course progression, scheduling, and graduation pathway. • Students are able to utilize the flexible scheduling by providing their availability, so they can maximize instructional time with their adult lives. • Students meet with their Academic Success Coach throughout the term to review their graduation pathway and availability, as their availability can and does each term. • Students make graduation planning appointments with the Registrar to review their graduation plan. The GEC school-week is Monday-Thursday with Friday being an extra support day and tutoring day for students. • All staff are available from 12-3pm on Fridays for extra support and tutoring. • Students can make appointments to come in earlier. • The YMCA is open on Fridays from students to take advantage of as well. Teacher planning and PD opportunities: • Each teacher has at least 90 minutes in their daily schedule set aside for a planning period. • Friday mornings from 8:30-11:30am are set aside for teacher planning meetings, work time, data dive meetings, and PD opportunities. • Friday mornings are also set aside for bi-weekly collaborative planning meetings with the whole staff. In these	

	meetings, staff discuss their student caseloads and class rosters to analyze progress with intervention plans or students in need of intervention. At GEC, the accelerated 8-week model can feel quick and also presents a need for several interventions for students who might need them. GEC creates opportunities for intervention planning and implementation in many ways. • Teacher one on ones and intervention planning with Lead Teachers are opportunities where teachers have the chance to discuss students of concern with their Lead and brainstorm around interventions. If determined there is a need, the teacher will then refer the student for a Student Support Team (SST) meeting. • Student Support Team (SST) meetings are two days/week and are led by the Manager of Special Populations. Any teacher or staff can refer a student for an SST meeting based on an academic need observed in the classroom or a behavioral need observed in the classroom or school setting. All GEC team members that work with the student being referred for the SST meeting complete an SST data collection form and are invited to the meeting. At the meeting, where the student is present, interventions are discussed and decided on and then put into place. A follow-up meeting	

	is set to return and check in on the result of the interventions put into place. • Focus Student Meetings take place every Wednesday with the focus student team. This team is comprised of The Manager of Student Support Services, The Lead Academic Success Coach, The Manager of Special Populations, The School Psychologist, and The School Director. At these meetings, students of concern are discussed with next step support services needed and a plan for support. Math Lab and Reading Foundations classes are a critical part of the instructional model at GEC. • AAF goals around these courses allow for students to have 16 weeks (two GEC academic terms) to show growth. • Students can remain in these classes beyond the growth mark as the goal is to provide initial intervention where needed to ensure the student is prepared for the full credit courses. GEC employs the co-teaching model in many of its classes. GEC has four Special Education teachers (STEM SPED, 2 Math SPED, and Humanities SPED teachers). These teachers also carry an individual caseload and co-teach in specific classes as determined by the need each term. • Co-teaching provides for extra support in the GEC classrooms.	

	• The Manager of Special Populations manages the Special Education teachers. • Special Education teachers and the other instructors have co-planning time built into their schedule, as determined at the beginning of each term.	
School Resources & Operations	**Evidence reviewed in this section includes:** • Budgets from the first two years of operation • Technology capacity and resources • Resources allocated to student support • Other sources of funding	1. GEC increased resources in Special Education, Student Support, and Academic Success Coaching as a result of additional funds the school determined it was eligible for in SY 17-18 due to the at-risk student population. These resources are being used to address gaps in capacity to effectively support the barriers students come to GEC with (low academic skills as evidenced by entry math and reading scores, low credit attainment, multiple external barriers that compete with student's ability to prioritize their education and come to school daily).

Improvement Plan Priorities

Considering the analysis conducted in the previous section, the following areas of greatest need have been identified in order of priority need. These areas of need were determined to be most critical in influencing growth in GEC's current adjusted cohort graduation rate. These areas will be addressed in the School Improvement Plan.

Area of Greatest Need	Root Cause Summary
Supporting students coming into GEC who fall within an ACGR cohort in obtaining their transcripts from previous	In our data dive, it was determined the following:

schools. Improving document collection processes is needed and communication for newly enrolled documents regarding previous transcripts.	• 4-year cohort: the average credits of students coming into GEC was 10.3 credits. Of the 29 students, 5 students did not have any credits (or transcripts) at the point of enrollment. • 5-year cohort: the average credits of students coming into GEC was 10.1 credits. Of the 35 students, 7 students did not have any credits (or transcripts) at the point of enrollment. If students come in with all of their earned credits on their transcripts, they will be put in a position where they have better attendance, remain engaged, are closer to graduation, and have a better chance graduating within their 4- or 5-year cohort.
Supporting students to improve their attendance (ISA) and truancy rates for enrolled students who are under 18 (assuming most of the 4-year and 5-year cohort students in the ACGR calculation were under 18 or not much older) • 4-year cohort: 48% of the students in this cohort were unenrolled due to attendance. 72% of the cohort was under 18 years old. • 5-year cohort: 77% of the students in this cohort were unenrolled due to attendance. All students were 18 or older in this cohort.	In our data dive, the following information was uncovered: • 4-year cohort: 14/29 students exited GEC as a result of attendance issues or their own choice. • 5-year cohort: 27/35 students exited GEC as a result of attendance issues or their own choice. • 2017-2018 ISA: 52.3% • 2017-2018 truancy rate was: 76.6% If students have stronger ISA and are present more consistently, then they will earn more credits and remain on track to graduation. Additionally, if students are present and engaged, then they will remain enrolled at GEC as opposed to being withdrawn due to attendance violations.
Improve graduation plan conversations and meetings with all students, and especially students within the 4-year and 5-year cohorts to communicate pathway	In our data dive, it was determined that we have students who could have graduated within their 4 and 5-year cohorts (as evidenced by the ACGR graduation rates). Students need to know

and timeline to graduation with course needs and requirements.	what their current status is upon enrolling at GEC and what their prior credits are, their current class schedule with placement tests, and their trajectory to graduation with a focus on timeline. These conversations happen with Academic Success Coaches and the Registrar, Manager, but they need to happen more frequently and consistently, especially during enrollment.

*In addition to the above needs and root causes, essential to GEC's mission and accountability is to continue to meet and/or exceed it's PCSB charter goal around graduation.

Appendix B: Meeting Notes and Agendas

Notes and Agendas – ESSA School Improvement Plan

- 3/13/19: ESSA Data Dive meeting with OSSE, PCSB, and GEC
- 4/5/19: Needs Assessment Plan and Timeline
- 4/9/19: Data Meeting Notes
- 4/10/19: Alumni Focus Group
- 4/12/19: Data Meeting Notes
- 4/24/19: Needs Assessment Review
- 4/26/19: Improvement Plan Brainstorm
- 4/30/19: Improvement Plan Drafting
- 5/6/19: Improvement Plan Discussion
- 5/16/19: Leadership Team Meeting
- 5/17/19: Improvement Plan Edits and Discussion
- 5/21/19: ESSA Improvement Plan Overview and Submission
- 5/13/19: GEC Board of Directors Meeting

3/13/19 Data Dive Meeting with PCSB, OSSE, and GEC staff

From: Melodi Sampson <msampson@dcpcsb.org>
Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 12:48:00 PM
To: Chelsea Kirk
Cc: catherine.meloy@dcgoodwill.org; Demetri Tyler; Colleen Paletta; Parrish, Christina (OSSE)
Subject: Re: Response Required: Support Status Designation Data Dive Meeting with OSSE

Hi, All.

We look forward to coming to your school next week for the Data Dive session. OSSE prepared a meeting agenda, which is available here: https://dcpcsb.egnyte.com/dl/yzUfrPbPJa.

Please see a few notes/requests regarding our visit below:

- May we meet in a room with Wi-Fi access and projection capabilities?
- Each attendee should bring a laptop to explore the Framework
- If you would like to extend STAR Framework access (beyond what is public facing) to any of the meeting attendees who don't already have it, please complete the eSchoolPlus registration process for that individual. (Please work with your DAR LEA Liaison if you need support with this step.)

If you have questions, let me know. Otherwise, we'll see you next week!

Best,

Melodi

Notes-

- OSSE clarified the Secondary Completion goal in ESSA framework is % of 12th graders who earn their graduation. (10 of 70 points possible in the alt STAR framework)

- Donna Johnson recommended that GEC look at how to include targeted improvement in secondary completion in the improvement plan due May 31st.

- Donna Johnson requested the following data or numbers from SY 17-18 to help analyze how the Secondary Completion goal may not be fully capturing our students---

    - # of students who enroll October 1 through term 4 in 17-18.
    - # of students who moved into 12 grade status after 9/30 through start of term 5

Needs Assessment Plan and Timeline

- 4/5/19 – review needs assessment plan template shared by PCSB on 3/28/19 and create a timeline, review initial draft
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Needs for the data and next steps
    - Data dive notes and trends
    - What data is needed for the data dive?
        - Students in the cohorts
        - Credits at entry (transcript obtained)
        - Term entered GEC (date of entry)
        - Math and reading scores (SRI and iReady)
    - Narratives of some of the students in the cohorts
- Structure of the needs assessment
- Draft of the needs assessment
    - Purpose
    - Mission and vision
    - Key needs framed around the structure of the needs assessment
    - Goals and summaries
- Timeline and next steps
    - Monday - Colleen accepts track changes from Chelsea/makes comments and completes the school ops and re-framing of improvement plan priorities (or Chelsea does this Monday, whatever is decided!)
    - Tuesday - Chelsea and Demetri meet to review Demetri's data pull and "tell a story" of the students in this possible cohort
    - Wednesday - Revised draft for everyone to look at including the data and the narratives. Perhaps a focus group of students
    - Thursday - Focus group of alumni, final edits and adds to the needs assessment
    - Friday - Review the needs assessment and submit to PCSB

Data Meeting Notes

- 4/9/19 – ACGR cohort data dive and analysis
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Demetri presented the ACGR cohort data (Excel Spreadsheet data)
  - ACGR 17-18 student data with ages
- Analysis of data with trends
- Summaries and key findings
- The 2 cohorts are not the same students

4 year cohort – trends (29 total students in this cohort)

- Avg. reading – 908 SRI score
- Avg. math – 481 iReady score
- Avg. credit entry – 9.5 credits (includes those w/0 credits)
- 5 of the students came in with 0 credits → 17%
- Of the students who didn't make the full-year cohort, 4 of the students will graduate this SY (some graduated in January – 2 students)
- Of the 29, 6 are currently on the rolls
  - 6 still active
  - 2 graduated (in July)
- 14/29 (48%) → dropped because of attendance
- Others will get added into the 5-year graduation rate (accepted some this SY)
- Entry date
  - ½ of the cohort (17 students) came before October 5th
  - 12 of the students enrolled after January 1
  - They expect students who came in after January to graduate in July
  - *5 terms/year → more time for enrollment → during those windows, you can get students who are expected to graduate
    - For example – 7 students (of the 24) came in May 21st (term 5) and are expected to graduate in July

5 year cohort – trends (31 students)

- Avg reading – 843 SRI
- Avg math – 478 iReady
- Avg credits – 11 credits (7 with 0 credits)
- Dropped because of attendance → 27/35
- Entry date
  - 6 students enrolled after January 1st
- Similar trends to 4-year cohort

Questions from the data –

- What are the trends in the data?
- What are the barriers towards graduation for these two cohorts?
- What supports can be brought in to help guide students in these cohorts to graduation?
- What is GEC doing well to support these cohorts towards graduation? What is GEC not doing well or has the opportunity to do better to support these cohorts towards graduation?
- What is the impact of this data on the school as a whole?
- What are best practices that could be used to help improve this data?

Alumni Focus Group

- 4/10/19 – alumni focus group around graduation and barriers
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk and alumni

Notes –

Questions:

1. Name, age, and graduation rate from GEC
2. What do you think are the main barriers that prevent traditional HS students from graduating?
3. What do you think brings people back to GEC and back to HS?
    a. Do you think age plays a factor?
    b. Do you think people feel the need to come back at a younger age? → are they incentivized to come back at a younger age?
4. At GEC, what do you think helps people stay on track?
    a. Do you think there are supports here at GEC? Describe them.
    b. Does age matter about the choice students make?
5. What are some of the factors that causes a student to fall off track at GEC?
6. When you think about students at the traditional 9th grade age, what are some of the factors that might be good for them to keep them on track and might keep them off track?
    a. Flexible scheduling?
7. What would help students graduate faster and is that the purpose of our school?
    a. Is it the choice of the person or more that can be done at the school to graduate faster?
8. At GEC, how would you describe the school culture and learning environment?
    a. How does this align towards graduation?

Responses from alumni:

- Alumni feel as though the students make a choice to come back to school and the students must also commit to this decision
- Main barriers – effort and attendance and other life responsibilities
- Some of the factors that cause students to fall off track include:
    - Failing classes
    - Coming in with low effort
    - Not being fully committed to school
    - Distractions
    - Family emergencies
    - Not wanting to be open minded to the new school and experience
- Supports at GEC that help students stay on track include:
    - Coaches
    - Graduation planning meetings
    - All of the teachers

    - The fast terms and the fact there are 5 terms/year
    - Calls from coaches
    - Check ins and grade reports
    - Always knowing where you stand in the term
- Traditional high schoolers might not be ready for school yet and might need more time before coming back to school
- Traditional high schoolers might still think this new school (GEC) is like their old school, and it's not
    - The classes are different
    - Different structure
    - More accountability
- Traditional high schoolers need to understand that they are making a decision on their own and they are not being forced to be here – people want this
- Supports that would help students even more at GEC include:
    - More coach meetings
    - Mentoring
- The learning environment at GEC can be described as:
    - A place you want to be – open and warm
    - Fast-paced
    - Teachers will help you when you need support
    - You have to ask for help and advocate for yourself
    - Welcoming
    - Energizing and a good place to be
    - A place for people who want to learn
    - Family and community
    - Different levels
    - New approaches
    - Never learning the same thing twice

Next steps and thoughts from alumni focus group:

- How can we bring in more coach meetings and create that infrastructure?
- How do you build in commitment and the soft skills?
- What gaps exist when students enter the school that might support their enrollment and retention?

Data Meeting Notes

- 4/12/19 – ACGR cohort data dive and further analysis
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Needs in the data to determine further trends
    - Age of students (U18 or not – truancy)
    - Incoming credits (credits towards graduation or not)
- Need to create a data table from the Excel sheet
- Perhaps a visual is needed?

Needs Assessment Review

- 4/24/19 – review feedback from needs assessment and next steps to improvement plan
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Data overview
- Structure of the needs assessment
- Summaries of key goals and findings
- Evidence reviewed and refining key findings
- Dive into PCSB goals and STAR framework goals
- Understanding the context of the secondary completion goal in the STAR Framework
- Improvement plan priorities
    - What are the top priorities from the needs assessment?
    - How do we measure those?

Improvement Plan Brainstorm

- 4/26/19 – review feedback from needs assessment and next steps to improvement plan
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Data overview
- Understanding the feedback from the needs assessment
    - PCSB feedback and next steps
    - Edits and revision plan
- Evidence-based strategies needed for the improvement plan
    - Review the two documents in the improvement plan template
    - What evidence-based strategies from these documents align to our needs and the goals we will have to make?
- Perhaps we want to add a visual (graphic) to our needs assessment
    - To show that the ACGR graduation goal is mathematically impossible given when students come into GEC and the graduation timeline with the windows
    - Data needed to pull for a graphic like this –
        - Credit bearing credits on old transcripts (that count toward graduation – not elective credits)
- Brainstorm for the improvement plan
    - Alignment from needs assessment
    - Extra data needed?
    - Goals table and the need to be SMART goals

Improvement Plan Drafting

- 4/30/19 – review the improvement plan template, brainstorm structure and form, create initial goals
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- The improvement plan has key criteria – people, instruction, structure
- Review our current GEC organizational chart – people
    - Do we have the right people in the right places to meet our goals? How does this impact ACGR cohorts and graduation rates?
    - Aligns to structure too
- Review GEC school model – structure
    - Mission and vision of GEC
    - Entry assessments and skill gap analysis of incoming students
    - What are the needs of the students coming into GEC and what is being done to asses and evaluate this?
    - How id GEC's structure and model impacting the ACGR cohorts and graduation rate?
- Review GEC curriculum and instructional model
    - Competency based model
    - 5, 8-week terms in the year
    - Students have incoming transcripts
    - Needs from students and needs that must be addressed for credit-bearing classes
    - How does the GEC instructional model impact the ACGR cohorts and graduation rate?
- Data table – review data analysis notes
    - Structure of data table for the plan
- Needs assessment review
    - Key needs from the needs assessment
    - Alignment to goals
    - Goals tracking and measurement
- Next steps
    - Draft
    - Timeline
    - Revisions

Improvement Plan Discussion

- 5/6/19 – discuss draft items on the improvement plan, goals, and alignment to the needs assessment
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk, Demetri Tyler, Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Overview of current draft of the Improvement Plan
    - Where are we?
    - Structure?
    - Does it address every question in the plan template?
- Stakeholder engagement – who do we need to further engage?
- SMART goals
    - Are all goals SMART?
    - Do the goals align with the needs assessment?
    - Are the goals measurable?
    - Short and long term measurements feasible?
- Next steps
    - Edits
    - Revisions
    - Plan to send off to Melodi

Leadership Team Meeting

- 5/16/19 – discuss draft items on the improvement plan, goals, and alignment to the needs assessment
- Team members present – Leadership Team

Notes –

- Overview of Needs Assessment and Improvement Plan
- Discussion around supports needed and goals to support the ACGR cohorts
- Questions and discussion around the impact of ACGR cohorts and the graduation rate

Improvement Plan Edits and Discussion

- 5/17/19 – Discuss revisions from PCSB on Improvement Plan and next steps
- Team members present – Chelsea Kirk and Colleen Paletta

Notes –

- Call with PCSB--
    - Central questions around evidence-based strategies and STAR framework goals
- Next steps from call
    - Ensure goals are all measurable
    - Cite all evidence-based strategies
    - Include rationale for looking at secondary completion data from the STAR framework data earlier in the plan
- Internal next steps
    - Edit and revise
    - Focus on revising goals to ensure they are measurable
        - What is being measured?
        - Make sure there is an alignment to needs assessment

Discuss Revisions from PCSB on Improvement Plan and Next Steps

- 5/21/19 – Discuss revisions from PCSB on Improvement Plan and Next Steps
- Team members present – Colleen Paletta and Catherine Meloy

Notes –

- Discussion around key concerns with plan- meeting the expected ACGR rate is not possible and that needs to be included in the narrative
- Discussed status of plan and dates for final submission

GEC Board of Directors Meeting

- 5/13/19 – Board of Directors Meeting
- Team members present – GEC Board, President and CEO, Chief Mission Officer, CFO, General Counsel, and GEC Director

Board of Directors Meeting
Monday, May 13, 2019

MINUTES

Participants: Glen Howard, Chair
Scott Bess (via conference phone)
Michelle Gillard
Elizabeth Karmin
Elizabeth Lindsey
Lisa Mallory
Catherine Meloy
April Young (via conference phone)

The following Staff members were also present: Chelsea Kirk, Colleen Paletta, Rosa Proctor, Elizabeth Rienzo and Josh Wallish. Ms. Rienzo recorded the minutes of the meeting.

Mr. Howard called the meeting to order at 9:35am.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Howard asked for any proposed corrections and/or additions to the minutes of the March 19, 2019 Board meeting. There being none, and upon motion duly made and seconded, the Board **unanimously approved the minutes**.

Mission Moment

Mss. Kirk and Paletta described Staff Appreciation Week activities at the Goodwill Excel Center.

Financial Report

Ms. Proctor presented the March 2019 financials, highlighting a number of items of particular importance.

Mr. Wallish presented the Fourth Amended Management and Administrative Support Services, Staffing and Sublicense Agreement between GEC and Goodwill of Greater Washington (the "Agreement"). Because three members of the GEC Board are also members of the Goodwill of Greater Washington Board, the Agreement is a conflicting interest transaction that is required to be approved by only those Directors who do not also serve on

the Goodwill of Greater Washington Board (the "Disinterested Directors"). After discussion by the entire GEC Board, the Disinterested Directors (Scott Bess, Michelle Gillard, Elizabeth Lindsey and April Young) went into executive session. During the executive session, after discussion, upon motion duly made and seconded, the Disinterested Directors **found the Agreement to be fair to the Corporation and unanimously approved it.**

Ms. Proctor presented the proposed budget for fiscal year 2020. Discussion followed with Ms. Proctor and Ms. Meloy responding to numerous questions. Upon motion duly made and seconded, **the Board unanimously approved the Fiscal 2020 budget.**

Update on Operations

Ms. Paletta provided an update on school operations, focusing on key school metrics, as well as PARCC and ACT testing. Discussion among Board members followed, with Ms. Paletta responding to questions.

Ms. Paletta presented in detail the GEC School Improvement Plan requirements based on the Every Student Succeeds Act. Extensive discussion followed with Mss. Kirk and Paletta responding to numerous questions. Upon motion made and seconded, **the Board unanimously approved the School Improvement Plan, subject to the understanding that, if the Public Charter School Board makes material revisions that require future Board consideration and approval, a special meeting will be called for that purpose.**

Executive Session

Management and Staff left the meeting and the Board went into executive session, during which no decisions were made or actions taken.

Mr. Howard adjourned the meeting at 11:25am.

_____
Elizabeth Karmin
Secretary