



Report to the Legislature: Student Opportunity Act Three-Year Evidence-Based Plans (2020-2021)

This report provides information on the implementation of three-year evidence-based plans pursuant to G.L. Ch. 69 §1S (d)

February 2022

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner

Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Members

Ms. Katherine Craven, Chair, Brookline
Mr. James Morton, Vice Chair, Springfield
Ms. Eleni Carris Livingston, Wellesley, Student member
Ms. Amanda Fernández, Belmont
Mr. Matthew Hills, Newton
Ms. Darlene Lombos, Boston
Mr. Michael Moriarty, Holyoke
Mr. James Peyser, Secretary of Education, Milton
Mr. Paymon Rouhanifard, Brookline
Ms. Mary Ann Stewart, Lexington
Dr. Martin West, Newton

Jeffrey C. Riley, Commissioner
Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public.
We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2020 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu

February, 2022

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to submit this progress report for FY21, describing the ongoing work of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department) in supporting districts as they develop and implement 3-year plans, as detailed in Section 1S(c) of the Student Opportunity Act (Chapter 132 of the Acts of 2019). Districts' plans, commonly referred to as SOA Plans, are intended to address—and ultimately close—longstanding gaps in learning experiences, academic outcomes, and lifetime outcomes for students from historically underserved groups. These include English learners, students with disabilities, students from high-poverty backgrounds, as well as other student groups.

The COVID-19 pandemic has substantially impacted the timeline for the development of districts' SOA plans and their implementation. Recognizing the urgent need for districts to focus on the immediate needs engendered by the pandemic, the legislature granted the Commissioner the authority to adjust the timeline for submitting districts' plans. That due date was moved from April 1, 2020, to January 2021. Districts' plans are publicly posted on the [Department website](#) in accordance with the SOA legislation.

The appropriation of additional Chapter 70 aid and the implementation of the new funding formula in the Student Opportunity Act was also, understandably, delayed due to the pandemic. The FY22 state budget, signed by Governor Baker on July 16, 2021, was the first to appropriate additional Chapter 70 aid and implement the new funding formula enacted in the Student Opportunity Act (SOA). As such, the current academic year represents the first full year of implementation of districts' SOA plans that includes investments from additional Chapter 70 aid.

Over the past year, districts have received a large influx of federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund (ESSER) funds intended to address loss of instructional time due to the pandemic. In light of the impact of the pandemic, as well as the large infusion of federal ESSER funds, the Department has asked districts to develop robust amendments to their original SOA plans. These amendments are due on April 1, 2022.

This report describes the Department's implementation of the SOA plan development process to date, summarizes descriptive information drawn from districts' initial three-year plans, and outlines the Department's next steps for implementation.

Massachusetts has been recognized for the progress our students have made over the last decade in overall student achievement, but persistent opportunity and achievement gaps remain,

especially for our students of color, low-income students, English learners, and students with disabilities. Closing these gaps is our urgent and collective work; the Student Opportunity Act supports our efforts to ensure that all students are prepared for success after high school.

I look forward to providing future updates to you regarding the implementation of the Student Opportunity Act. Please contact Chief Schools Office Komal Bhasin at komal.bhasin@mass.gov with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey C. Riley". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jeffrey" being more prominent and the last name "Riley" following in a similar style.

Jeffrey C. Riley
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Implementation of SOA Plan Development Process.....	2
Key Findings from Districts’ 3-year Gap-Closing Plans.....	3
Next steps	7
Appendix A: Districts receiving \$1.5 million or more in additional Chapter 70 aid in FY21 proposed House 21 budget (N=37)	A
Appendix B: FY22 Recommended SOA Evidence-Based Program Areas.....	B

Introduction

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education respectfully submits this Report to the Legislature pursuant to Chapter 132 of the Acts of 2019, The Student Opportunity Act:

Annually, not later than December 31, the commissioner shall submit a report to the clerks of the house of representatives and the senate and the chairs of the joint committee on education on the progress made in addressing persistent disparities in achievement among student subgroups in the aggregate and within subcategories on a statewide basis; provided, however, that district and school-level data shall be made available on the department's website along with the report. (M.G.L. Ch. 69 § 1S (d))

The Student Opportunity Act (SOA) legislation passed in November 2019 calls for districts to develop and submit 3-year gap-closing plans to DESE by April 1, 2020. A key goal of the plans is to address persistent disparities in learning experiences and achievement among student groups in the Commonwealth. The Act directs the Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education to establish statewide targets for addressing persistent disparities in achievement among specific student groups.

Districts had just been introduced to SOA plan expectations and guidelines when the pandemic arrived in full force and districts and schools shifted entirely to remote learning in March 2020. The Legislature provided key relief on the original deadline for plan submissions through Chapter 56 of the Acts of 2020, giving the Commissioner the authority to delay the submission of districts' three-year plans (commonly referred to as SOA Plans). That deadline was ultimately set for January 15, 2021.

After collecting, reviewing, and posting districts' three-year SOA plans on the [Department's website](#), the Department launched an amendment process for all districts to submit revisions to their initial plans. The amendment application was launched in December 2021; FY22 SOA Plan Amendments are due by April 1, 2022.

This report provides additional detail about the Department's implementation of the three-year evidence-based plan process to date, provides summary data from plans submitted in January 2021, and outlines next steps in implementation.

Implementation of SOA Plan Development Process

Directly following the enactment of the Student Opportunity Act, the Department created a district plan template and detailed guidance document for districts to follow while developing their three-year evidence-based plans to assist them in meeting the original April 1, 2020, submission deadline.

Every district in the Commonwealth is expected to engage in a robust planning process, regardless of the amount of additional Chapter 70 funding it receives. In accordance with the Student Opportunity Act, the Department requested that districts make four commitments as part of their three-year plans:

1. Intentionally focus on student groups who do not have opportunity to achieve at the same high levels as their peers;
2. Adopt, deepen or continue specific evidence-based programs to close opportunity and achievement gaps for student groups and allocate resources to support these programs;
3. Monitor success in reducing disparities in opportunity and achievement among specific student groups over three years with a small number of metrics and targets; and
4. Engage families and caregivers, particularly those representing specific student groups most in need of support, and determine how best to meet their students' needs.

Although all district plans address these four commitments, the Department's guidance called for a greater level of narrative and budget detail in plans from districts receiving substantial additional Chapter 70 aid—defined as any district receiving \$1.5 million or more. These districts are referred to in shorthand as 'long form' districts; all others are referred to as 'short form' districts. The SOA guidance, templates, and support materials for short form and long form districts are all available on the Department's [Student Opportunity Act Web Pages](#). In addition to providing written guidance to support plan development and submission, the Department offered a variety of other supports including webinars, presentations, a resource highlighting examples of the research and evidence base for recommended evidence-based practice areas, a dedicated email address for support, and custom data analytics. Many of these resources are also available on the Department's Student Opportunity Act Web Pages.

When the Department issued its initial guidance in February 2020, thirty-seven districts were slated to receive \$1.5 million or more in incremental Chapter 70 criteria in the FY2021 House 2 budget. The incremental Chapter 70 aid for these thirty-seven districts accounted for over 82 percent of the total incremental Chapter 70 aid in the budget. These districts were directed to create the more detailed long form submission. A list of these districts, and the amounts they were slated to receive appears in Appendix A.

Due to the pandemic, the incremental Chapter 70 funding was not ultimately included in the final FY21 budget that was signed into law on December 14, 2020. When the FY22 state budget was signed into law on July 15, 2021, only twenty-five districts received \$1.5 million or more in the FY22 budget; these districts accounted for over 83 percent of the incremental Chapter 70 aid.

Key Findings from Districts' 3-year Gap-Closing Plans

Student groups targeted for gap-closing

Districts are focusing their supports on the underserved student groups prioritized in the SOA legislation, including:

- Students with disabilities: 78% of districts statewide and 86% of long form districts
- High needs students: 59% statewide; 80% of long form districts
- Economically disadvantaged students: 55% statewide; 74% of long-form districts
- English learners and former English learners: 47% statewide; 86% of long form districts

Evidence-based program areas most frequently included in district plans

Guidance from the Department's SOA team encouraged districts to commit to a small number of high-impact, evidence-based program areas to close opportunity and achievement gaps among groups of students they serve. Statewide, districts prioritized 2.4 program areas, on average, in their plans. Eighty-two percent of long form districts included three or more evidence-based program areas in their plans; in contrast, 67 percent of short form districts focused on one or two evidence-based program areas.

The Department recommended 17 high-quality evidence-based program (EBP) areas for districts to consider when selecting approaches to support student groups. Each of them is aligned to one or more of the program categories outlined in the language of the Student Opportunity Act.¹

Three evidence-based program areas are being prioritized by 40-50 percent of all districts: inclusion/co-teaching for students with disabilities and English learners, increased personnel and services to support holistic student needs, and supporting educators to implement high-quality, aligned curriculum. Table 1, below, provides percentages for all 17 recommended evidence-based program areas, in the order of frequency with which they appear in all districts' plans. Data are aggregated across all districts and are broken out for long form districts (i.e., those slated to receive \$1.5 million or more in additional Chapter 70 aid in House 21 budget) and short-form districts (i.e., those slated to receive less than \$1.5 million).

¹ 1Program categories outlined in the Student Opportunity Act: A) Expanded learning time in the form of a longer school day or year; B) Increased opportunity for common planning time for teachers; C) Social services to support students' social-emotional and physical health; D) Hiring school personnel that best support improved student performance; E) Increased or improved professional development; F) Purchase of curriculum materials and equipment that are aligned with the statewide curriculum frameworks; G) Expanded early education and pre-kindergarten programming within the district in consultation or in partnership with community based organizations; H) Diversifying the educator and administrator workforce; I) Developing additional pathways to strengthen college and career readiness; J) Any other program determined to be evidence-based by the commissioner.

Table 1: Evidence-based program areas in districts' 3-year gap-closing plans

(in order of the frequency with which they appear in [All Districts'](#) plans submitted by March 2021)

Evidence Based Programs Selected by Districts	All district submissions		Long Form districts*		Short 36 districts*	
	287		35		252	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Inclusion/co-teaching for students with disabilities and English learners (SOA categories D and E)	139	48%	21	60%	114	45%
Increased personnel and services to support holistic student needs (C and D)	126	44%	26	74%	98	39%
Supporting educators to implement high-quality, aligned curriculum (E and F)	115	40%	15	43%	91	36%
Research-based early literacy programs in pre-kindergarten and early elementary grades (D, F, and G)	81	28%	5	14%	76	30%
Another evidence-based program proposed by the district	39	14%	6	17%	30	12%
Early College programs focused primarily on students under-represented in higher education (I)	31	11%	8	23%	21	8%
Diversifying the educator/administrator workforce through recruitment and retention (D and H)	27	9%	10	29%	16	6%
Expanded access to full-day, high-quality pre-kindergarten for 4-year-olds, including potential collaboration with other local providers (D, F, and G)	25	9%	9	26%	16	6%
Dropout prevention and recovery programs (I)	19	7%	5	14%	14	6%
Increased staffing to expand student access to arts, athletics, and enrichment, and strategic scheduling to enable common planning time for teachers (B and D)	19	7%	10	29%	9	4%
Expanded access to career-technical education, including After Dark, district-vocational partnerships and innovation pathways reflecting local labor market priorities (I)	17	6%	2	6%	15	6%
Acceleration Academies and/or summer learning to support skill development and accelerate advanced learners (A and E)	13	5%	1	3%	12	5%
Community partnerships for in-school enrichment and wraparound services (C)	13	5%	3	9%	10	4%
Facilities improvements to create healthy and safe school environments (J)	12	4%	7	20%	5	2%
Leadership pipeline development programs for schools (D and E)	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Strategies to recruit and retain educators/administrators in hard-to-staff schools and positions (D)	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%
Labor-management partnerships to improve student performance (E)	2	1%	1	3%	1	1%
Parent-teacher home visiting programs (E)	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

* Long form districts are those that were slated to receive \$1.5 million or more in the House 21 budget; Short form districts are those slated to receive less than \$1.5 million.

Financial investments in evidence-based program areas (EBPs)

The Student Opportunity Act calls for districts to provide information on how Chapter 70 aid will be used in support of their 3-year plans, as well as how other local, state, federal, and grant-based funding sources will be used to support them. Budget data collected in districts' original plans almost exclusively describe how districts expect to utilize locally appropriated funds, including Chapter 70 aid. In fact, the majority of budgets only indicate how additional FY21 Chapter 70 aid would be used to support the evidence-based program areas in their plans. This could be due to the perception of districts that their additional Chapter 70 aid is akin to grant funding, rather than the first of a multi-year phase in of new investments in education.

The narrow focus on incremental Chapter 70 aid in districts' budgets ultimately offers a very limited perspective on broader investments districts across the Commonwealth are likely to be making in gap-closing efforts through the implementation of the evidence-based program areas in their plans. This is particularly true for those districts that are not likely to see substantive increases in their Chapter 70 aid as the new funding formula is implemented and new investments are phased in between now and 2027.² The Department made changes to its approach to collecting budget data in the FY22 SOA Amendment process, which will capture broader information about district investments. Additional detail on these changes is provided in the next section.

Table 2 on page 4 lists anticipated FY21 investments in each evidence-based program (EBP) area *as reported by districts*. Data are aggregated across all districts, and are broken out for long form districts (*i.e., those slated to receive \$1.5 million or more in additoinal Chapter 70 aid in House 21 budget*) and short form districts (*i.e., those slated to receive less than \$1.5 million*). Given the impact the pandemic had upon the due date for plans and the delay in beginning the phase in of additional Chapter 70 aid, the Department urges readers to exercise great caution in interpreting the data in this table.

² Over 1/3 of districts were slated to receive less than \$50,000 in additional Chapter 70 aid in the governor's proposed House 21 budget. In the FY22 state budget signed into law on December 14, 2020, 42 percent of districts received less than \$50,000 in additional Chapter 70 aid.

Table 2: Financial Commitments Based on FY21 House 21 budget projections, as reported by districts
(EBPs are listed in the same order in which they appear in Table 1 – as of March 2021)

<i>Evidence Based Programs Selected by Districts</i>	<i>All districts</i>	<i>Long Form Districts*</i>	<i>Short Form Districts*</i>
Inclusion/co-teaching for students with disabilities and English learners	\$89,686,607	\$52,773,366	\$36,913,241
Increased personnel and services to support holistic student needs	\$105,974,29	\$78,420,448	\$27,553,847
Supporting educators to implement high-quality, aligned curriculum	\$31,593,418	\$23,727,883	\$7,865,535
Research-based early literacy programs in pre-kindergarten and early elementary grades	\$15,345,584	\$6,523,883	\$8,821,701
Another evidence-based program proposed by the district	\$9,679,450	\$7,035,333	\$2,644,117
Early College programs focused primarily on students under-represented in higher education	\$6,346,293	\$4,776,607	\$1,569,686
Diversifying the educator/administrator workforce through recruitment and retention	\$8,324,896	\$7,486,832	\$838,064
Expanded access to full-day, high-quality pre-kindergarten for 4-year-olds, including potential collaboration with other local providers	\$14,739,448	\$10,387,935	\$4,351,513
Dropout prevention and recovery programs	\$5,873,735	\$4,541,919	\$1,331,816
Increased staffing to expand student access to arts, athletics, and enrichment, and strategic scheduling to enable common planning time for teachers	\$8,970,414	\$7,861,365	\$1,109,049
Expanded access to career-technical education, including After Dark, district-vocational partnerships and innovation pathways reflecting local labor market priorities	\$2,263,355	\$334,218	\$1,929,137
Acceleration Academies and/or summer learning to support skill development and accelerate advanced learners	\$1,050,119	\$427,471	\$622,648
Community partnerships for in-school enrichment and wraparound services	\$603,449	\$57,768	\$545,681
Facilities improvements to create healthy and safe school environments	\$32,804,906	\$23,474,485	\$9,330,421
Leadership pipeline development programs for schools	\$72,000	\$0	\$72,000
Strategies to recruit and retain educators/administrators in hard-to-staff schools and positions	\$100,400	\$0	\$100,400
Labor-management partnerships to improve student performance	\$0	\$0	\$0
Parent-teacher home visiting programs	\$0	\$0	\$0

* Long form districts are those that were slated to receive \$1.5 million or more in the House 21 budget; Short form districts are those slated to receive less than \$1.5 million.

Next steps

In light of the impact of the pandemic and the subsequent infusion of federal ESSER funds, this year the Department has asked districts to develop robust amendments to their original SOA plans. These amendments are due to the Department by April 1, 2022.

FY22 SOA Plan Amendments

The amendment process asks districts to:

- Reengage their stakeholders to jointly reflect upon changing student needs.
- Reexamine the evidence-based program areas in their SOA plans and consider whether they are still the most important ones to focus on.
- Continue to focus on just a few evidence-based program areas they see as key to closing opportunity gaps, as SOA plans are not comprehensive district improvement plans.

The Department also made changes designed to improve the data collected from districts in their plan amendments. These changes include:

- A revised list of recommended SOA evidence-based program areas.
- Collecting budget information that describes how districts are braiding together funds from multiple funding streams to support the implementation of the EBPs in their plans.
- New closed-ended questions designed to capture a uniform set of information about EBP implementation.

Revised list of recommended SOA evidence-based program areas

The revised list of SOA evidence-based program areas adds two program areas included in the ESSER III applications:

- Culturally responsive teaching and other strategies that create equitable and culturally responsive learning environments for students, and
- Language support programs, including dual language (DL) and transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs

The Department sees these as important additions. The culturally responsive teaching and other strategies program area is particularly germane to SOA plans, as it reinforces a necessary approach to closing gaps in learning experiences for students from historically underserved populations. The second elevates the important role of asset-based language support programs, particularly for the Commonwealth's English learners.

The revised list also separates some of the original evidence-based program areas into distinct categories and substantially expands one EBP area that was very narrowly focused.

- **Expanded learning time (ELT) for students** was included in the original SOA legislation. Key building blocks of ELT programs were pulled apart and incorporated into several different evidence-based program areas last year; this year it is a stand-alone EBP area.

- **Increased staffing to expand student access to arts, athletics, and enrichment, and strategic scheduling to enable common planning time for teachers** combines two EBPs with independent evidence-bases and that serve different functions. They are separate into the following EBPs in the FY22 list:
 - *Increasing opportunities for educators and support staff to engage in a cycle of continuous improvement, utilizing district and school teaming structures.* Well-implemented teaming structures play a key role at the district, school and teacher/support team level in building collaborative environments that use the continuous cycle of improvement to do things like improve instruction, monitor and support the implementation of strategies/curriculum, support distributed leadership in districts and schools
 - *Increasing opportunities for all students to engage in arts, enrichment, world languages, athletics, and elective courses.* Arts, enrichment, languages, athletics, and elective courses are often the first courses to get cut when budgets are tight or when a school shows up as a school in need of targeted/focused support in DESE’s accountability system. These types of cuts disproportionately impact students of color, English learners, and students living in economically distressed communities – and there is a research and evidence base that demonstrates meaningful positive impacts on students’ social emotional learning, academic achievement, and art learning
- **Developing effective family-school partnerships** program area dramatically expands what was a relatively narrow family engagement focus in the originally list—developing home school relationships through parent/teacher visiting programs. Many districts are focusing on broader family-school partnerships. As a consequence, the EBP was expanded to capture other important aspects of partnering.

A complete list of FY22 recommended SOA evidence-based program areas appears in the Appendix B.

Updates to budget data collection

As noted earlier in this report, the Student Opportunity Act calls for districts to provide information on how Chapter 70 aid will support their plans, and how other local, state, federal, and grant-based funding sources will be used. The FY22 SOA amendment is designed to gather additional information about the broader investments districts plan to make to support the evidence-based program areas in their plans.

This year’s guidance poses the following question to districts: *What investments are you making in the evidence-based program areas in your plans in FY22, and how are you braiding different funding sources to support them?* The budget template directs districts to provide budget information by funding source, *e.g., locally appropriated funds (including Chapter 70 aid), federal ESSER funds, other federal and state grants.* These data will offer a critical window into the level of financial resources it takes for districts to fund high-quality implement of the types of evidence-based program areas included in their plans, and what kinds of funding districts are leveraging to close gaps for students.

As they developed their budgets, districts are also asked to thoughtfully consider how best to utilize their federal ESSER funds, which represent a short-term infusion of funds intended to target the loss of instructional time caused by the pandemic, in combination with Chapter 70 aid increases, which provide

a more equitable long-term funding stream, particularly for those districts with higher concentrations of poverty and serving larger numbers of English learners.

Implementation Indicators

To better understand where districts are in implementing EBPs and to track that progress over time, the template for SOA amendments adds a set of closed-ended implementation indicators for each evidence-based program area. The Department's SOA team worked with the program offices most closely aligned with each evidence-based program area to develop between 3-10 program components that are hallmarks of high-quality approaches to implementation. Indicators for each EBP are available in the [FY22 SOA Implementation Indicators Resource](#).

These implementation indicators: 1) provide districts with a set of key elements for each evidence-based practices that conveys what the Department views as critical aspects of effective implementation; and 2) allow the Department to collect a uniform set of data from all districts implementing particular evidence-based program areas.

At the individual district level, these data offer stakeholders a snapshot of the specific activities that districts are implementing and serve as a starting point for the Department to engage in follow-up conversations with districts about their implementation and allocation of resources. In the aggregate, these serve as useful data-points as the Department considers where to invest its limited resources to provide supports for evidence-based program areas, including guidance, professional development offerings, and grant funding.

FY22 SOA Plan Amendment Review

Districts' FY22 SOA Plan Amendments will be reviewed against statutory requirements described in the 2019 Student Opportunity Act and against the guidelines DESE provided to districts for engaging in a meaningful plan development process and submitting a well-documented SOA plan. These recommendations and guidelines were designed to ensure that districts' SOA plans would effectively communicate to all of the Commonwealth's stakeholders (i.e., districts' and schools' local stakeholders, the state legislature, the broader education community, and the general public) that we are making strong collective efforts to close opportunity gaps for student groups—particularly students with disabilities, English learners, students of color, and students from economically disadvantaged communities—and are setting ourselves up to successfully address them through the implementation of evidence-based programs and strategies. The Department is currently in the process of developing review criteria, planning the details of the implementing the review and feedback process. Districts will have the opportunity to make further changes to their plans once they receive feedback.

The Department is also in the process of developing an interactive SOA dashboard, where districts' FY22 SOA Plan Amendments will be posted, as called for by the Student Opportunity Act. This dashboard should be available on the [SOA Web](#) pages by July 2021.

Appendix A: Districts receiving \$1.5 million or more in additional Chapter 70 aid in FY21 proposed House 21 budget (N=37)

District	Proposed Increase in House 21 Budget (<i>not appropriated</i>)
Arlington	2,003,712
Attleboro	1,741,815
Boston	1,887,000
Brockton	21,093,362
Chelsea	10,946,931
Chicopee	4,008,948
Clinton	1,798,622
Everett	5,880,423
Fall River	11,889,280
Fitchburg	3,865,158
Framingham	7,089,523
Haverhill	6,912,163
Holyoke	4,376,984
Lawrence	21,784,737
Leominster	1,921,215
Lowell	12,783,357
Lynn	30,196,549
Malden	2,164,407
Marlborough	3,170,716
Methuen	3,494,766
Milford	3,815,946
New Bedford	10,673,283
Norwood	1,535,754
Pittsfield	2,913,040
Quincy	6,568,404
Randolph	1,546,005
Revere	10,416,561
Rockland	1,627,848
Springfield	19,633,837
Taunton	3,579,393
Waltham	2,000,649
West Springfield	2,000,935
Worcester	18,049,384
Greater Fall River RVT	1,844,096
Greater Lawrence RVT	2,151,235
Greater New Bedford RVT	1,809,972
Greater Lowell RVT	2,175,384

*

Appendix B: FY22 Recommended SOA Evidence-Based Program Areas

In December 2021, prior to districts' submission of their FY22 SOA Plan Amendments, the original list of 17 recommended evidence-based program areas was expanded and revised to incorporate 21 recommended program areas. The revised list of recommended evidence-based program areas appears below. New, revised, and expended evidence-based program areas appear in bold text.

Enhanced Core Instruction

1. Expanded access to full-day, high-quality pre-kindergarten for 4-year-olds, including potential collaboration with other local providers (SOA categories D, F, and G)
2. Research-based early literacy programs in pre-kindergarten and early elementary grades (E, F, and G)
3. Early College programs focused primarily on students under-represented in higher education (I)
4. Supporting educators to implement high-quality, aligned curriculum (E and F)
5. Expanded access to career-technical education, including "After Dark" district-vocational partnerships and innovation pathways reflecting local labor market priorities (I)
6. **Culturally responsive teaching and other strategies that create equitable and culturally responsive learning environments for students (D, E, and F)**
7. **Expanded learning time for all students in the form of a longer school day and school year (A, B, D, and E)**

Targeted Student Supports

8. Inclusion/co-teaching for students with disabilities and English learners (D and E)
9. **English Language Education programs, including dual language (DL) and transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs (D, E, and F)**
10. Acceleration Academies and/or summer learning to support skill development and accelerate advanced learners (A and E)
11. Dropout prevention and recovery programs (I)

Talent Development

12. Diversifying the educator/administrator workforce through recruitment and retention (D and H)
13. Leadership pipeline development programs for schools (D and E)
14. Strategies to recruit and retain educators/administrators in hard-to-staff schools and positions (D and E)
15. **Increasing opportunities for educators and academic support staff to engage in a cycle of continuous improvement utilizing district and school teaming structures (B and E)**

Conditions for Student Success

16. Expanding capacity to address SEL and mental health needs of students / families (C, D, and E)
17. **Increasing opportunities for all students to engage in arts, enrichment, world languages, athletics, and elective courses (D and B)**
18. **Developing effective family/school partnerships (E)**
19. Community partnerships for in-school enrichment and wraparound services (C)
20. Labor-management partnerships to improve student performance (E)
21. Facilities improvements to create healthy and safe school environments (J)