

Working Group 4 Version

Element Detail 3c (jointly considered with Working Group 3)

Element: **Intervention Tutoring** for all **K–8th** grade students identified as struggling learners. Transition this role to school teachers as time is freed up and training is added to teacher prep; students who continue to need tutoring beyond **third** grade should be provided with this support.

Design Assumptions:

1. Identify interventions that are working and learn how those programs are designed and delivered; this will form basis of the groups design assumptions.
2. All K–8th grade students identified by teachers as needing literacy or numeracy support should be provided with intervention in small groups of students (a successful design will indicate proper ratios to effectively deliver to students)
3. The aim of the tutoring is to get the students on grade level before 3rd grade
4. Students can transition out of tutoring support as soon as it determines they are ready
5. Students in upper elementary school who continue to need tutoring should continue to get these services
6. One tutor would be able to serve up to 250 students identified as a struggling learner
7. One tutoring coordinator would coordinate the work of up to 11 tutors

Implementation Considerations:

- ~~1. What is the phase in period to full implementation?
 - Time needed to scale up training?
 - What is mix of tutors (certified, assistants, volunteers)?
 - What is ratio of tutors to students? Does this differ based on severity of learning gap?
 - During phase up what is prioritized (i.e., by grade of student, by severity of learning gap, by subject matter)?~~
- ~~6. What is the average time a student will need tutoring?
 - Based on severity of learning gap? (i.e., PARCC 1 means x time for tutoring, PARCC 2 means y time for tutoring, etc.)
 - Learning gap measured by what (PARCC, KRA)?
 - Goal of tutoring, what is success? (i.e., PARCC 4 or 5)?~~
- ~~10. Subjects for which tutoring should be provided? Does this differ based on grade level of student?~~

~~11. Potential cost savings?~~

~~o Savings in special education needs?~~

- ~~1. Tutoring would be provided for reading and math~~
- ~~2. As other building blocks recommended by the Commission are implemented (particularly developing teachers to have expertise in diagnosing and supporting learning difficulties), the number of students needing tutoring outside of the regular classroom time will decline. It is anticipated that a decrease will begin 2–3 years after those building block recommendations are implemented and will level off after 6–8 years.~~
- ~~3. The need for tutoring outside of the regular classroom time will not diminish to zero as there will always be some number of students in need of this resource.~~
- ~~13.4. _____~~ HB 1415, which authorizes funding for evidence-based early literacy intervention in grades K-8 with a priority for K-3rd graders, in a school with a high concentration of students living in poverty has been enacted, so implementation of reading tutors will likely begin this year. The bill mandates \$2.5 million in each of fiscal 2019 through 2022 for the program.
- ~~14.5. _____~~ HB 1415 funding expires after fiscal 2022, with a requirement to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at that time. Because tutors are considered a transitional program, needed until teachers have time and capacity to provide this support themselves, it is not anticipated that funding will be renewed.

~~Other Options:~~

- ~~2. Current legislation (HB 1415) funds reading tutors; could expand to include math tutors as well~~
- ~~3.1. Many students should be able to transition from tutoring by 3rd grade~~
- ~~4. As expertise in diagnosing and supporting learning difficulties is added to teacher preparation and schools are organized in ways to allow teachers time to provide this support directly, this activity can be phased out~~

Cost Savings: By identifying the need for and provision of tutoring earlier in a student's career, the need for the student to enter a special education track will be diminished.

Tutoring

Working Group 4 recommends:

Tutoring additional resources identified by Working Group 4

- Ratio of 11 tutors to 1 coordinator
- 1 tutor for every 250 students below college and career ready (scoring 1, 2, or 3 on PARCC)
- English and Math

Tutoring resource assumptions from APA report.

Tutor related resources via the compensatory education weight:

- 2 hours of extended learning time for 50% of students (concentration of poverty weight includes 3 hours for all students)
- Tutors at elementary (225:1), middle (180:1) and high school (200:1) – or, roughly 200:1

Blended evidence based and professional judgement panels (1 FTE tutor in middle school)

	Elementary (450 pupils)	Middle (720 pupils)	High (1,200 pupils)
Instructional	38.5 FTE (1:11.7)	46.4 FTE (1:15.5)	73 FTE (1:16.4)
Pupil Support	4 FTE (1:112.7)	7.9 FTE (1:91.1)	12.8 FTE (1:93.8)
Administrative	5 FTE (1:90)	7 FTE (1:102.9)	11 FTE (1:109.1)
Other	3 FTE (1:150)	4.5 FTE (1:266.7)	4 FTE (1:300)
Supplies/District Level	\$2,805 (\$6.23/pupil)	\$2,805 (\$3.90/pupil)	\$2,805 (\$2.34/pupil)

Per pupil base resource assumptions from APA report.

Transitional Tutoring (3c)

The Working Group asked APA to provide a cost estimate for transitional tutoring (3c). Working with NCEE and Legislative staff, the following model was developed.

Assumptions

- Schools would be categorized into three tiers based upon performance
- Initial resources identified:
 - 1.0 FTE Coordinator (certified teacher) for schools in lowest tier of performance
 - 0.75 FTE Coordinator (certified teacher) for schools in middle tier
 - 0.5 FTE Coordinator (certified teacher) for schools in highest performance tier
 - Additionally, provide a 1.0 FTE Tutor per 250 students – costed out at average of instructional aide and teacher salary
- Funding for this transitional resource should be provided as a categorical for six years. The funding could be reallocated into the new system at that time.
- Schools would have additional resources through the compensatory education weight to provide additional interventions for struggling students.
- Currently, the 2016 study base has some staffing for tutoring in the middle school level which would need to be adjusted (either removing from the base or assuming a portion of the resources identified in this categorical would be duplicative, and therefore reduced) if the final Commission base was similar.

Cost/Adjustment

A salary of \$65,440 (\$84,160 with benefits) was used for coordinators, and a salary of \$47,438 (\$64,127 with benefits) was used for tutors. Using 2017 data from MSDE, there were 886,211 students at 1572 schools. Using this information, the cost of providing transitional tutoring would be \$99.2 million for 1,179 coordinator FTEs and \$227.3 million to provide about 3,545 tutor FTEs for a total of \$326.5 million.

Guiding Questions

1. Can schools change tiers over the years?
2. EB provided a 1.0 Tutor per school in the base (per 450 students in Elementary and Middle school and per 600 students in High school), this is a richer model that we believe is reflective of the level of need we have heard for this transitional funding, is it the right model?

Working Group 3 Version

Element Detail 3c — as of WG 3's July 26 meeting

Element: The Commission's Preliminary Report calls for reorganizing schools so that teachers trained to diagnose and address students' learning needs can work collaboratively to monitor students and intervene when they are struggling. Teachers will meet regularly to compare notes on student progress, decide on any needed interventions – academic or referral to services – and assign a single teacher to take responsibility for following the student until he or she is back on track. (See Working Group 2 elements)

As it will take several years to put this system in place, it will be necessary to develop a transitional program to address the needs of struggling learners. This will be a program to provide **tutoring in reading** for all students who are behind grade level, with a particular emphasis on bringing students up to grade level in reading by 3rd grade. (At such time as the State can provide sufficient resources, and if at that time a transitional program is still needed, similar tutoring arrangements should be made for students needing help with math.) Funding will be provided for a lead teacher in each school who will be in charge of the tutoring program. The school will be required to use the rest of this special grant money for tutoring but the design of the program will be up to the school, to enable it to determine how best to address the unique needs of its pupils and to take advantage of local resources. MSDE will be responsible for developing a statewide professional development program for the lead teachers in tutoring. Over time, fewer students will need tutoring as teachers are better trained to provide individualized instruction to students that is aligned with CCR standards and State curriculum frameworks. There will always be some students who fall behind but increasingly they will be tutored by their regular teachers as those teachers' time is freed up for such work and as they are trained in diagnosing and addressing learning difficulties. [See Working Group 2 element on teacher PD and sufficient time in the school day for this purpose.] Many of the students who require tutoring after the transitional program ends (in roughly 6 to 8 years) will attend schools serving high proportions of disadvantaged, low-performing students or students with special needs, and a portion of the additional resources recommended by Working Group 4 for these at-risk students will be available over the long-term to provide the needed supports and services.

Just as the Commission’s Preliminary Report proposed several measures to greatly reduce the proportion of students falling behind, it also proposed measures for enriching the curriculum for students who need and could benefit from challenges that go beyond the standard curriculum. MSDE and local districts will need additional funding – and policy direction – to develop options for students who would benefit from opportunities for academic acceleration and enrichment.

Design Assumptions for Transitional Program:

1. As a new system is implemented, school leaders and teachers should be trained in new approaches to supporting students. This will involve three strands of training: for school leaders on the system of supports; for veteran teachers in schools; and for new teachers in preparatory programs on the pedagogy as well as the new system.
2. The special-education system will remain in place for students with disabilities, but as more students are supported early, fewer students will be referred for special-education services

Implementation Considerations:

1. HB 1415 (Chapter 361) of 2018 authorizes funding for evidence-based early literacy intervention in grades K-8 with a priority for K-3rd graders in schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty. The bill mandates \$2.5 million in each of fiscal 2019 through 2022 for the program.
2. HB 1415 funding for these interventions expires after fiscal 2022, with a requirement to evaluate the effectiveness of the program at that time. Because tutors are considered a transitional program, needed until teachers have time and capacity to provide this support themselves, HB 1415 funding will have to continue in order to cover the full 6 to 8 years required to fully implement the new forms of school organization and professional development that will make it possible for regular teachers to take over the tutoring function