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District Description
For the fourth year in a row, Boston Public Schools was a finalist for the Broad Prize for Urban Education, an annual award that honors the country's urban school districts that are making great improvements in student achievement while reducing achievement gaps among ethnic groups and between high- and low-income students. Nationally recognized superintendent Thomas Payzant will be retiring at the end of the 2005-06 school year.

Key Findings

- Despite being a finalist for the Broad Prize for Urban Education, given annually to the best urban district in the country, Boston Public Schools (BPS) did not demonstrate adequate yearly progress for the third straight year, placing the district in the second year of improvement.

- With the exception of Reading First, No Child Left Behind has had a minimal impact on BPS for at least two reasons. First, BPS has been engaged in NCLB-like reforms since 1997 and has had to change little to meet NCLB requirements. Second, the district's collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' union has prevented BPS from implementing some reforms—including restructuring schools—called for by NCLB.

- Reading First has changed the way the district teaches reading in the early elementary classrooms, as targeted by the program, and in later elementary and even high school classrooms as well.

- In 2004-05, after appealing to the Massachusetts Department of Education, BPS was able to serve as the supplemental educational services (SES) provider, even though the district was in its first year of improvement. The district earned the right to serve as SES provider again in 2005-06, despite entering its second year of improvement, after applying for and receiving a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education to study the impact of SES on student achievement.

- District administrators believe they are constrained in the actions they can take to meet NCLB requirements by the district's collective bargaining agreement with the local teachers' union.

* Other contacts for this case study include Chris Coxon, deputy superintendent for teaching and learning; Barbara McGann, director of human resources; Ann Deveny, senior program director for elementary language arts; Monica Roberts, acting development and Title I director; and Rachel Curtis, assistant superintendent for teaching and learning.
Overall Impact of NCLB

NCLB continues to have a small impact on Boston Public Schools, according to Maryellen Donahue, the district’s director of research, assessment, and evaluation. Donahue maintains this belief despite the fact that the district did not demonstrate AYP for the third straight year and was identified for improvement (year 2). Donahue insisted that the district has a better system than AYP for identifying schools in need of improvement, and waged a public debate with the U.S. Department of Education over whether the district could serve as a supplemental educational services provider (see section below on supplemental educational services). The district “is doing the work,” said Donahue. “NCLB is just the measure. Now maybe it’s not the best measure, but we’re used to tracking performance and conducting whole-school planning.” NCLB, added Donahue, has required few changes to Boston’s accountability system or approach to curriculum and instruction.

Monica Roberts, acting development and Title I director, agrees that NCLB has not had a significant impact on the district. “The district and state have been on the path to improvement for some time,” she said. “We have high standards. It hasn’t affected us as it has other states and districts.” Roberts added, however, that providing supplemental educational services has caused problems for the district because it takes money away from other important programs and fails to serve students who do not qualify for services but need them. Boston has a long history of providing high-quality after-school programs, said Roberts, and the district cannot use funds to complement or improve these programs.

One possible reason for NCLB’s relatively small impact is that the district has been prevented from implementing some school reform measures called for by NCLB. For example, said Chris Coxon, deputy superintendent for teaching and learning, the district would like to take corrective action or restructure schools that have not demonstrated AYP for four or more years, but the collective bargaining agreement between the district and the teachers’ union prevents it.

NCLB and Student Achievement

In general, student achievement in BPS dipped slightly in spring 2005 after increasing consistently since 1998. For example, the percentage of 4th grade students scoring either proficient or advanced declined from 30% in 2004 to 25% in 2005 in English/language arts and from 22% to 21% in math. Grade 6 math is the one area that demonstrated an increase (see table 1).

Table 1. Percentage of BPS Students Scoring Proficient or Advanced on State Tests, 2004-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3 Reading</th>
<th>% Proficient or Advanced: 2004</th>
<th>% Proficient or Advanced: 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 ELA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 Math</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 Math</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 ELA</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 Math</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 ELA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 Math</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Massachusetts Department of Education (September 27, 2005). 2004 and 2005 MCAS District Results.
Donahue said that district and school administrators were surprised by the slight downturn in achievement after years of growth, and that efforts are underway to determine the cause. They do have some hypotheses, however. Student achievement is down across the state, said Donahue, who added that fewer students were identified as English language learners, which may have had an impact on overall test scores because the former ELL students would have been tested without accommodations.

Adequate Yearly Progress and School Improvement

DISTRICT AND SCHOOL AYP STATUS
For 2005-06, BPS entered its second year of improvement after failing to demonstrate AYP for the third straight year due to the achievement of all students in English/language arts (ELA) and math. Virtually every subgroup (English language learners, students with disabilities, low income, African American, Latino, and white) failed to demonstrate AYP in both subjects. Indeed, the only subgroup in BPS that did demonstrate AYP for 2005-06 was Asian or Pacific Islander. In addition, BPS did meet attendance targets for “all students” and for students with disabilities, low income, African American, Latino, and white.

In addition to the district not making AYP, 98 out of 145 schools in Boston did not demonstrate AYP for the 2005-06 school year. Of these, 20 are in year 1 of school improvement because they did not make AYP for two consecutive years, 28 are in year 2 of improvement, 8 are in corrective action because they did not make AYP for four or five consecutive years, and 7 are in school restructuring because they did not make AYP for six or more consecutive years. Overall, compared with last year, 6 schools had their accountability changed for the better, 22 schools had their accountability status changed for the worse, and the remainder stayed the same.

This increase in the number of schools failing to demonstrate AYP occurred despite the fact that the state in 2004 increased the minimum size from 20 to 40 for a subgroup to count for accountability purposes. Such an increase in the minimum subgroup size would be expected to reduce the number of schools failing to demonstrate AYP because it typically reduces the number of subgroups—especially relatively small ones such as students with disabilities and English language learners—for which schools are held accountable. Indeed, Donahue opposed the increase, fearing that it would lead schools to ignore the data for their smaller subgroups. The increase in the number of schools not making AYP occurred because student achievement was flat or declining slightly, while the state standard for demonstrating AYP increased.

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES
NCLB has not had an impact on the district’s strategies for increasing student achievement or closing achievement gaps, even as the district has entered year 2 of improvement. In 1996, BPS developed a five-year education reform plan called Focus on Children and updated the plan in 2002 through Focus on Children II. This plan has greatly shaped the approach that Boston public schools take to student learning, according to the Boston Plan for Excellence, a nonprofit group that works closely with the district. The focus of the work is on aligning district goals to state curriculum standards and expectations. Each school now develops and maintains a Whole School Improvement Plan that sets clear goals and allows for the measurement of progress toward those goals. The plans are available to families and the community to help build a better understanding of the reforms taking place.

In addition, beginning in April 2004, BPS developed an action plan for the district’s efforts to close the achievement gap among racial and ethnic groups, a central goal of the district and NCLB. According to the Broad Foundation, gaps for African American and Latino students compared to white students have narrowed in high school reading (gap reductions of 14% for African American and 15% for Latino students) and high school math (gap reductions of 21% for African American and Latino students).
The district implements a literacy initiative using the Readers and Writers Workshop methods from Columbia University and a math initiative using materials and methods developed by the National Science Foundation (NSF). Both initiatives are supported by a variety of funds, including local funds; Titles I, II, and III of NCLB; NSF grants; and private grants. A coaching model for professional development, described below, is a central part of the district’s reform strategy.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES AND CORRECTIVE ACTION AND RESTRUCTURING STRATEGIES**

Schools in need of improvement, corrective action, and restructuring all receive significant amounts of attention from the district, said Deputy Superintendent Coxon, who added that the central office would like to intervene more aggressively in schools that have not demonstrated AYP for at least four years, but is limited by its collective bargaining agreement with the local teachers’ union in its ability to reconstitute schools, reassign teachers, mandate districtwide professional development, and plan for the provision of after-school programs.

“School support specialists” play a central role in assisting schools in need of improvement at various stages. The specialists are funded by a state program; the district has enough funding for six but cannot find enough people who want the job and are qualified, said Coxon, and must rely on three. The specialists focus their attention on schools in corrective action and restructuring. They work with the schools’ Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs), comprising teachers and administrators, to develop and implement the whole school instruction plan, which is based on the state’s 10-step Performance Improvement Mapping process. The district and state (less intensively and frequently) monitor implementation of the process, ensuring that conditions necessary for success—culture, leadership, and district support—are in place.

In addition to school support specialists, the district’s deputy superintendents and assistant superintendents help to support schools. Each of the three deputy superintendents supervises about one-third of the schools in BPS but focuses his or her attention on those struggling the most to demonstrate AYP. The deputies split approximately $600,000 last year and $700,000 this year from the district to support schools’ efforts to increase student achievement and narrow achievement gaps. Schools use the extra funding to implement tutoring, run programs on Saturdays, and hire and train additional staff. Schools in corrective action and restructuring receive an additional $25,000 to $50,000 to implement their whole-school improvement plan.

Although BPS has been able to replace some principals of schools in corrective action, the district has been constrained by its collective bargaining agreements. In 2004-05, the superintendent negotiated the right to name up to five “superintendent schools.” Teachers in these schools must participate in 20 additional hours of paid professional development. In addition, superintendent schools are not held to seniority rules in hiring teachers, meaning that they can hire the staff that they believe to be most effective rather than those with the greatest numbers of years working in the system. BPS identified five superintendent schools in 2004-05 and added three more in 2005-06. The intent is for a school to remain a superintendent school for two years. In 2004-05 and 2005-06 the superintendent identified schools in corrective action or restructuring, but he has the flexibility to identify any school that is considered to be struggling.

**Testing Issues**

For the first time in 2005-06, the highly regarded Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) will be administered in English/language arts and math to all students in grades 3 through 8. In 2004-05, the MCAS was administered in ELA in grades 3, 4, 7, and 10 and in math in grades 4, 6, 8, and 10. The science test will again be administered to students in grades 5 and 8, although results will not count toward AYP until 2007.

NCLB has not resulted in changes to testing students with disabilities or English language learners, according to Donahue, but it has pushed the district to align the accommodations the
district offers students during testing with those provided during instruction. The student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP) Team, or “504” team, must determine annually how a student with disabilities will participate in MCAS in each subject scheduled for assessment. This information must be documented in the student’s IEP and should be documented in the student’s section 504 plan under the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The team may determine that the student can take the standard test with or without accommodations or may be eligible to take the MCAS Alternate Assessment.

All English language learners must participate in all MCAS tests scheduled for their grades regardless of the number of years they have been in the U.S. The only exception is for ELLs who are in their first year of enrollment in U.S. schools. These students are not required to participate in English/language arts or reading tests. Any student who currently is or has been an ELL may use an approved bilingual word-to-word dictionary on MCAS tests. Spanish speakers in grade 10 who have been enrolled in schools in the continental U.S. for fewer than three years may take the English-Spanish version of the math test if they can read and write at or near grade level in Spanish. Students may write their answers in English or Spanish. All students must take the English/language arts tests in English. In addition to participating in MCAS, ELLs must annually take the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) tests in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Impact of NCLB on Curriculum and Instruction

With two exceptions, NCLB has had little direct impact on curriculum and instruction, merely accelerating changes that would have happened in the absence of NCLB. Five years ago, before President Bush signed NCLB, the district adopted curricula in math (Terc Investigations for elementary schools and Connected Math for middle and high schools) and English/language arts (Readers and Writers Workshop) that all schools were expected to implement. In 2004-05, BPS dropped the use of Connected Math in the middle schools because it did not align with MCAS, according to Donahue, and switched to Glencoe Series.

Reading First is one exception, in that this program has had a clear impact on curriculum and instruction in the district. It has pushed the district toward a “more structured” English/language arts program in all grades, according to Coxon (see below for a detailed discussion of Reading First). Another exception is that NCLB, according to Coxon, has pushed the district to become “more deliberative” about enrolling minority students in advanced placement courses and getting more students to take the PSAT. NCLB, he explained, has encouraged BPS to raise the standard beyond preparing students to graduate from high school to preparing for college. At the same time, the district continues to provide a great deal of remediation for students who do not pass the MCAS in 10th grade. Students must pass the MCAS before they can receive a diploma.

English Language Learners

The district’s overarching goal is to close the achievement gaps between English language learners and native English speakers, according to Donahue. Last year, Massachusetts passed a law that required all schools to end bilingual education and use “sheltered English”—instruction in English using specific techniques to make subject matter understandable to those still learning English—as appropriate. This law, said Donahue, has had serious implications for BPS. He explained that the law has had a negative effect on the ability of teachers and schools to educate all students by preventing schools from systematically teaching ELLs English and requiring teachers to veer from the common curriculum for all students to make sure that ELLs can keep pace. Any teacher who serves at least one ELL student must take 75 hours of professional development, although this is not required for recertification. The teachers’ union has resisted. One result, said Donahue, is that
implementation suffers for Readers and Writers Workshop. The district is providing a great deal of professional development for teachers in how to work with ELLs in their classrooms, but complying with the state law has been a “huge challenge” and takes away from the district’s other goals.

Students with Disabilities

Although not required under state law, BPS has been reducing the number of students with disabilities (SWDs) in separate classrooms for several years, according to Coxon. At the same time, BPS has been losing student enrollment, mostly among the general education population, so the percentage of SWDs has been increasing. The resulting increase in the proportion of SWDs in general education classrooms has, like the increase in ELLs, been difficult for teachers and administrators, said Donahue. NCLB has helped a great deal, according to Coxon, by encouraging schools to include special education teachers in their professional development activities and to provide them with access to general-education materials.

NCLB School Choice

BPS had an increase in the number of schools required to offer school choice for the 2005-06 school year. In 2004-05, a total of 57 schools offered choice, including 35 required to offer only choice and 22 that also faced other sanctions. For 2005-06, that number went up to 63 schools, including 20 required to offer only choice and 43 that also faced other sanctions.

Despite the significant increase in the number of schools required to offer choice under NCLB, the law has had little impact due to the district’s history of offering all students school choice. In BPS, elementary and middle schools are organized into three geographic zones. Students are assigned to schools in their zone of residence based on choice and availability of seats. All high schools are citywide, meaning that students can choose to attend any high school in the district as long as space exists. The district’s choice plan sets aside 50% of a school’s seats for students living in the neighborhood. Remaining seats are open to all applicants, with priority given to applicants who do not live in the neighborhood of the school.

Therefore, NCLB’s choice requirements have had little impact on the district other than requiring schools in year 1 of improvement to send a letter to students and their parents that informs them of their right to choose another school—a right they have anyway under district policy. The district, said Roberts, is beginning to collect data on students choosing a different school as a result of the Title I mandate in an effort to determine whether there are differences between these children and children who take advantage of the district’s open choice policy.

Supplemental Educational Services

Twice as many schools were required to offer supplemental services in 2005-06 (43 schools) as in 2004-05 (22 schools). In 2004-05, though the district was in its first year of improvement, BPS was able to serve as the supplemental educational services provider after appealing to the Massachusetts Department of Education. In 2005-06, the district earned the right to serve as SES provider despite the fact that it has entered its second year of improvement, after applying for and receiving a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) to study the impact of its provision of services. If BPS does not demonstrate AYP in 2005-06, its ability to provide SES next year depends upon ED’s evaluation of the district’s provision of services in 2005-06, according to Monica Roberts, acting development and Title I director.

Currently, BPS is the largest of approximately 20 providers of SES in the district. In 2005-06, approximately 19,000 students are eligible for SES, and the district has estimated that it can serve about 4,560 with existing resources (an increase over last year, when the district was able
to provide SES to about 2,000 students). Of the 4,560 students the district hopes to serve this year, BPS is expected to be the provider for 61%. Other providers will serve the remaining 39%, according to Roberts, who added that an evaluator is currently assessing the impact of SES on student achievement.

**Teacher Qualifications, Support, and Professional Development**

**HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS**

In 2004-05, approximately 85% of the 4,385 teachers in BPS were highly qualified. An estimate for 2005-06 was anticipated by January 2006, according to Barbara McGann, after conducting a survey of teachers and paraprofessionals in November 2005. "We'd like all our teachers to be highly qualified," she said, "but they probably won't be." Teachers who are not highly qualified by May of 2006 will be given notice, added McGann, who indicated that recruiting and retaining highly qualified special education and ELL teachers are the district's biggest challenges. In addition, some teachers, according to McGann, are allowing their licenses to expire after they were identified as highly qualified under the state's high objective uniform state standard of evaluation (HOUSSE), believing incorrectly that it was no longer necessary to maintain their state license to teach. Other issues are likely to emerge for some secondary teachers who are highly qualified to teach elementary school but not high school. In many cases, these teachers just need to complete some paperwork to show that they are highly qualified under HOUSSE, said McGann, but there are likely going to be some cases in which the teacher will not be determined to be highly qualified and will have to be reassigned or released. The district, McGann added, is hesitant to reassign such teachers because it typically requires replacing another teacher. McGann expects the teachers' union to file a grievance in such cases. McGann noted that the union has already prevented the district from giving bonuses to special education teachers who work in underperforming schools and serve a particular need of BPS. The union has argued that all special education teachers should receive the same bonus regardless of the school they teach in, a policy the district cannot afford.

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

NCLB supports the district's model for professional development, which is based on the Collaborative Coaching and Learning (CCL) model and school-based professional development, according to Roberts. Most of the 10% set-aside of Title I dollars for professional development is used for these purposes, she said. BPS used to distinguish professional development for teachers working to become highly qualified from professional development for teachers who were already highly qualified, said Roberts, who noted that CCL was important for increasing student achievement but did not help teachers with the certification process. The district no longer makes such distinctions, she said, after the district incorporated to a greater degree subject-matter focus in CCL and worked to allow teachers to earn course credits for the time they put in on CCL.

CCL became the district's primary method for professional development after it was decided that one-on-one coaching of teachers was not having a big enough impact. Under CCL, all schools have both literacy and math coaching time in proportion to staff size. Coaches work with groups of teachers to implement district programs, analyze student work, and shape instruction to improve learning for all students. CCL has been difficult to implement, according to Donahue. One of the biggest challenges has been finding and paying substitute teachers to cover teachers during training periods. The district is now studying the implementation of CCL to determine what changes could be made to facilitate implementation and increase effectiveness.

Most of the professional development BPS teachers receive is highly decentralized and school-based. Under its collective bargaining agreement with the teachers' union, every BPS school has 18 hours of discretionary professional development for teachers. The schools' principals and instructional leadership teams have the autonomy, based on their improvement plans, to determine the top-
ics of professional development. Under the collective bargaining agreement, however, teachers in the school must approve of the way the training is delivered, a requirement that can “hamper principals,” said Coxon. The training can be provided by educators in the school, with assistance from the district’s central office, or through an outside provider, such as a consultant or university. Any professional development that the central office offers to all teachers in the district is voluntary.

The teachers’ union places other restrictions on how the district trains and assigns teachers, Coxon said. For example, the district would like teachers in upper elementary schools to specialize in reading or math and have students change classes for those subjects. The union has prevented this practice, said Coxon, out of fear that teachers will lose years toward tenure as general-education teachers.

Paraprofessional Qualifications and Support

In 2004-05, the district employed 991 paraprofessionals who provide instructional support in Title I schools, but it is uncertain how many of these paraprofessionals were highly qualified as defined by NCLB. For 2005-06, the district is conducting a survey to determine the number of Title I paraprofessionals and the percentage of them who are highly qualified. As of January 2006 the numbers were not yet available.

The district requires paraprofessionals to be highly qualified before they are hired, a policy that is strongly supported by the union, since BPS believes it will make them better members of the instructional team, said McGann. Any paraprofessionals who are unable to become highly qualified will not be able to continue their service. BPS gives “enormous” amounts of assistance to ensure that paraprofessionals are highly qualified, according to McGann.

The district holds information sessions at the teachers’ union meetings and sends emails to paraprofessionals reminding them of the requirements and the services being provided. The district pays for paraprofessionals to take the ParaPro test and administers it on a regular basis. BPS also has partnerships with higher education institutions, including Cambridge College, which provide grant-funded training for paraprofessionals.

Funding and Costs

BPS received fewer Title I dollars in 2005-06 ($43.6 million) than in 2004-05 ($44.8 million). The reasons for the decrease, according to Roberts, are that the district is serving fewer low-income students (although a higher percentage) and more charter schools are receiving Title I funds this year than last. The district sends about 82% of Title I dollars to schools to help them pay for teachers, curriculum, and professional development. Approximately 14% of the district’s allocation pays for SES, and the remaining 4% helps cover the cost of literacy coaches, professional development, and other services and materials.

Capacity Issues

In 2005-06, the district had the capacity to provide SES to fewer than one-quarter of students who are eligible, and, according to Roberts, many more students than those who are eligible for SES are in need of support services such as tutoring. Donahue added that the district “can always use more money.” She noted that NCLB’s requirement to collect and maintain data, which requires a great deal of infrastructure and staff expertise, has not been funded by NCLB at the district level. In addition, Donahue said, analyzing and using data requires a great deal of support for educators in schools if the data are going to make any impact on student achievement. The district has accomplished the data requirements by taking money from other areas, said Donahue.

Finally, to meet the school-improvement requirements and student-achievement goals of NCLB, BPS needs more flexibility than it has under its current collective bargaining agreement,
according to Coxon. Currently, the district is too constrained with regard to intervening in low-performing schools, providing teachers professional development to implement more aggressive school improvement strategies, and even offering students after-school tutoring.

**Reading First**

BPS is in its second year of implementing a Reading First grant. BPS first applied for the grant four years ago and was turned down by the state because, said Ann Deveny, senior program director for elementary language arts, the district proposed using the Reading First funds to help implement Readers Workshop, which it was going to use regardless of whether it received the grant. Although BPS was using a Houghton Mifflin off-the-shelf reading program, it was not using it the way the publisher intended but rather incorporating it into the implementation of Readers and Writers Workshop. According to Deveny, the state told BPS that it could not award a Reading First grant to “do business in the same way” and that the district needed to align its work with NCLB.

The state did invite BPS to reapply, which the district did, making “some accommodations.” In particular, the district decided to drop the Houghton reading program, even though administrators believed that it had a strong guided reading program, and purchase a program developed by Harcourt Brace due to the strength of its teachers’ guide, believing that it would increase fidelity to the program and continue to implement guided reading for Readers and Writers Workshop. Harcourt has been very helpful with implementation, according to Deveny, by providing professional development and creating a new curriculum for the district that integrates the Harcourt program with Readers and Writers Workshop.

The district was awarded a five-year, $12.5 million grant for 12 schools in 2004-05. That year, the district received $5 million in funds to cover two years. This disbursement enabled the district to buy materials, hire coaches and an administrator, and train teachers during the start-up phase. The district was able to “hit the ground running,” said Deveny.

In addition to the original 12 Reading First schools, 12 additional schools are implementing the Reading First “model.” To do so, 2 schools are using a state grant ($150,000 across both schools) that is similar to Reading First, and 10 schools are using local funds. The goal, said Deveny, is to determine whether the district can implement the Reading First model using half the resources and half the coaching.

All 500 teachers in the 24 “Reading First” schools have been given Palm Pilots that enable them to administer the DIBELS reading test to students, collect and analyze data, and compare results with other teachers and schools. According to Deveny, the initial reaction to using Palm Pilots, developed by Wireless Generation, was to ask, “Have you lost your mind?” Teachers, though, are finding the Palm Pilots very easy to use, said Deveny, and the immediate access to data has created a sense of urgency. Students are excited about the use of technology, and teachers feel empowered. “Plus,” said Deveny, “I can see immediately what students are being tested and what the results are by student, classroom, and school.” Literacy coaches and principals can view results for the school and can compare with other schools. Ultimately, the district will be able to view data longitudinally and compare the original Reading First schools with the 12 schools that are implementing the model using local or state funds.

**Other Issues**

BPS has developed an Intranet system (myBPS assessment) that can be used by teachers and principals to analyze their students’ achievement on MCAS by academic standard and test question. The system allows teachers to ask questions about the data in a way that is intuitive and usable for shaping instruction. “It’s a wonderful tool, and easy to use,” said Donahue, who added that the district is currently studying teacher and administrator implementation of the system.
Data File—Boston Public Schools

Location: Massachusetts
Type: Urban

Number of Schools

Total: 145
Early learning centers (K-1): 6
Elementary: 67
K-8: 11
Middle schools: 18
Middle and high school (6-12): 1
High schools: 30
Exam schools (selective high schools): 3
Special education schools (K-12): 6
Alternative (at-risk) programs: 3

Number of Title I schools: 137

Student Enrollment and Demographics

Total enrollment: 58,600

- African American: 45%
- Latino: 32%
- White: 14%
- Asian: 8%
- American Indian: <1%
- Low-income students: 74%
- Students with disabilities: 19%
- English language learners: 17%

Teachers

Total number of teachers: 3,499 in core academic area
Percentage meeting NCLB "highly qualified" requirements: 88.2%

Paraprofessionals

Total number of Title I instructional paraprofessionals: 1,041 full-time equivalent
Percentage meeting NCLB "highly qualified" requirements: 48%

Total Number That Did Not Make AYP Based on 2004-05 Testing

Title I and non-Title I schools that did not make AYP, including those in improvement, restructuring, or corrective action: 98
### Number of Title I Schools in Improvement, Restructuring, or Corrective Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Based on 2003-04 testing</th>
<th>Based on 2004-05 testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools in year 1 of improvement (Did not make AYP for two consecutive years):</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in year 2 of improvement (Did not make AYP for three consecutive years):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in corrective action (Did not make AYP for four consecutive years):</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in restructuring (Did not make AYP for five or more consecutive years):</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Schools Offering Choice and/or SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Based on 2003-04 testing</th>
<th>Based on 2004-05 testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools offering choice only:</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools in year 1 of school improvement offering SES instead of choice:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools offering SES and choice:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>