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Commissioners of education, deputy commissioners of education, SEA leads, state legislators, state board members, governors’ representatives, business leaders, Great Schools Partnership, Nellie Mae Education Foundation, New England Board of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges
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Overall leadership, advocacy, and support for all NESSC activities

Great Schools Partnership
SEA leads, state liaisons

RESPONSIBILITIES
Facilitation and coordination of NESSC activities and communications

SEA Leads Team
SEA leads, state liaisons
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SEA leads, SEA Senior Staff, state liaisons
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Development of the common NESSC data metrics and methodologies; collecting and reporting state-by-state data; public reporting of NESSC performance indicators and Council approval
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Goals

• Increase Graduation Rate
• Increase College Enrollment Rate
• Decrease Drop-out Rate
Stakeholder Engagement

• NESSC Commissioners of Education
• NESSC Council
• NESSC Leads
• State Advisory Groups
• League Principals and Leadership Teams
• GSP Staff
Vision

College and career readiness for all students in CT, ME, NH, RI, and VT through:

1. proficiency-based graduation
2. multiple and flexible pathways
3. learner-centered accountability systems
Defining Personalization

Personalized Learning = Proficiency-Based Graduation + Multiple & Flexible Pathways + Learner-Centered Accountability
Theory of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personalized-Learning Levers</th>
<th>State and Regional Support Strategies</th>
<th>State and Regional Performance Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proficiency-based graduation</td>
<td>• Changes in state and district policy</td>
<td>• Increase five-year graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple and flexible pathways</td>
<td>• Changes in district and school practice</td>
<td>• Decrease annual dropout rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learner-centered accountability</td>
<td>• Increased public will, understanding, and support</td>
<td>• Increase the share of students enrolled in two- or four-year degree programs or pursuing industry-certified accredited postsecondary certificates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Performance-growth targets will be determined individually by each school*
GLOBAL BEST PRACTICES

An Internationally Benchmarked Self-Assessment Tool for Secondary Learning
# Alignment

## Table 2. GBP Dimensions Aligned to BMGF’s Pillars of Personalized Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Profiles</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Global Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captures individual skills, gaps, strengths, weaknesses, interests and aspirations of each student</td>
<td>1.1, 1.2, 1.6, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personalized Learning Plans</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Global Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each student has learning goals &amp; objectives. Learning experiences are diverse and matched to the individual needs of students</td>
<td>1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 2.5, 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Mastery</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Global Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continually assesses student progress against clearly defined standards &amp; goals. Students advance based on demonstrated mastery</td>
<td>1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible Environments</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Global Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple instructional delivery approaches that continuously optimize available resources in support of student learning</td>
<td>1.3, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Additional GBP dimensions provide a strong, systemic foundation for personalized learning*
Investment Strategy

- **School Coaching & Resources**: 65%
- **Amplification Tools**: 15%
- **Network**: 20%
# Identification of Schools

## Table 6. Required Activities Aligned to GBP Dimensions

### A. Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Activity</th>
<th>Aligned GBP Dimension</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has clearly defined graduation learning standards that lead to college and career readiness (and is on track to adopt these for the start of the 2015-2016 school year).</td>
<td>1.3 Academic Expectations</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school board has taken steps to support proficiency-based graduation through policy and/or adherence to state requirements (and is on track to adopt these for the start of the 2015-2016 school year)</td>
<td>1.3 Academic Expectations</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school must have adequate bandwidth to support access for all students.</td>
<td>1.7 Technology Information</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School must have trained Professional Learning Group facilitators.</td>
<td>1.8 Learning Communities</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every course and learning pathway offered by the school leads to graduation and college and career readiness. All courses are open for all students.</td>
<td>1.1 Equity</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students have a personalized learning plan.</td>
<td>1.2 Personalization &amp; Relevance</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are empowered to make demonstrable decisions about how, when, and where they engage in learning within classrooms and in other settings.</td>
<td>1.2 Personalization &amp; Relevance</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every student completes and submits an application to college, the armed services, career or trade licensing program, certificate-producing training program, or equivalent.</td>
<td>1.3 Academic Expectations</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5. LIS Global Best Practices Design, Implementation, and Demonstration Benchmark Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>August 2014 (design)</th>
<th>June 2016 (implementation)</th>
<th>June 2017 (demonstration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Equity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Personalization + Relevance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Academic Expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Standards-Based Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Assessment Practices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 International + Multicultural Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Technology Integration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Learning Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Vision, Mission + Action Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 School Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Multiple Pathways</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Transitions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Interventions + Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Time + Space</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Data Systems + Applications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Continual Improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Teacher Recruitment / Retention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Administrative Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Shared Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Moral Courage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
480 Public High Schools in the Five New England Secondary School Consortium States
75 League of Innovative Schools Members (16%)

February 2014 – June 2014
Exploration and Commitment

March 2014 – August 2014
Cohort 1 Selection

September 2014 – December 2014
Cohort 1 Preparation and Mid-Year Review

January 2015 – August 2015
Cohort 1 Preparation Year Ends and Cohort 2 Begins

September 2015 – June 2016
Cohort 1 Implementation Year; Cohort 2 Preparation Year

July 2016 – June 2017
Cohort 2 Implementation Year

• Regional networking meetings three times a year
• NESSC annual High School Redesign in Action conference
• Ongoing professional development events, webinars, training
• League member access to NESSC tools and resources
• League members visit other member schools
• GSP and NESSC work to secure support for League activities
• NESSC state work to align state programs and support with League goals

LAUNCH
2017 - 2020
Cycle of Action

WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO?

STEP 8: Implement + Monitor Action Plan

WHERE ARE WE NOW?

STEP 1: Analyze Student Achievement Data

STEP 2: Analyze Existing School Practices

STEP 3: Identify Internal + External Assets

WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE?

STEP 6: Determine Improvement Strategies + Rationale

STEP 5: Determine Student Achievement Goals

STEP 4: Identify Internal + External Obstacles

WHAT WILL HELP OR HINDER US?

STEP 7: Develop or Refine Action Plan
Personalized Learning Resources

Over the past several years, the Great Schools Partnership has developed a robust library of resources, tools, and guidance for administrators, school leaders, and educators who are working to implement personalized-learning systems in their districts and schools. All these tools and resources will be available to League of Innovative Schools members.

In addition, the Great Schools Partnership is rolling out a comprehensive online guide to proficiency-based learning in spring 2014, and will continue to develop additional tools and resources over the course of the NextGen Systems Initiative project.

Resource Sections:
- Assessment, Evaluation + Action Planning
- Curriculum + Instruction
- Personalized Support + Intervention Systems
- Professional Networking + Sharing
- Public Will + Community Engagement

Assessment, Evaluation, and Action Planning

**Global Best Practices: An An Internationally Benchmarked Self-Assessment Tool For Secondary Learning**
A comprehensive whole-school self-assessment process that distills research on the world’s highest performing school systems

**Global Best Practices Research Summary**
Sustainability + Scale Up
In Concept

480 New England High Schools

200
Momentum builds to influence more schools

5
Provide $ and support to entice and change a handful of schools

25
Successful implementation influences more schools
Sustainability + Scale Up

In Reality

480
New England High Schools

10
Momentum fails to build

5
Provide $ and support to entice and change a handful of schools

7
Handful of successful implementors influence more schools

3
Schools drop out

3
Schools drop out
Sustainability + Scale Up
NESSC Theory of Action

200
Momentum builds to influence more schools

480
New England High Schools

75
Schools join the League of Innovative Schools

Implement change in state policy
Create public support

Influence all 75 League Schools

$ and support to a subset of networking schools

30
$, support and networking influence second subset of schools

15
3 Schools drop out
Questions

John Fischer, Deputy Commissioner, Vermont Agency of Ed.

Mark Kostin, Associate Director, Great Schools Partnership

Paul Leather, Deputy Commissioner, New Hampshire DOE

Sharon Lee, Director, Multiple Pathways, Rhode Island DOE

David Ruff, Executive Director, Great Schools Partnership