



**Office of the Superintendent
Equity, Strategy, and Opportunity Gaps**

**Racial Equity Planning Tool
New Skills Boston Eligibility and Selection Criteria
Cover Sheet**

Title: New Skills Boston
Name of the policy, practice initiative, program, or budget decision under consideration

Dept./School: _____

Main Contact: _____
Name Email Phone

Participants

List of core participants' names, affiliations/membership to a stakeholder group (staff, students, families, community advocates, partners, etc.), and their racial/ethnic identities. Add rows as needed.

Name	Affiliation/Stakeholder Group	Race/Ethnicity
Velesia Saunders	Opportunity Gap; Sped Disproportionality Specialist	Black/African American
Marsha Inniss-Mitchell	BPS - Postsecondary Initiatives	Black/African American
William Thomas	Head of School: New Mission and BCLA	Black/Asian
Michelle Sylvaria	Executive Director of CTE	White
Marinell Rousmaniere	EdVestors CEO (and BPS parent)	White
LaVonja Montoute	EdVestors	Black/ African American
Eva Mitchell	BPS Deputy Equity and Strategy Office	African-American
Bethany M. Allen	BPS Strategy & Innovation	Black American
Elia Bruggerman	High School Supt, working on Pathways + Core 4	Latinx
Steve Prudent (joined 3/3/21)	BHCC	
Joan Becker (joined 3/3/21)	UMass Boston/higher education	White
Monica Hogan (joined 3/3/21)	BPS Office of Data and Accountability	White
Liya Escalera	UMass Boston/higher education	Latinx

Are the participants reflective of the population that this decision impacts/involves? If not, please explain barriers to representation and the efforts to overcome them.

- Other Lenses represented:
 - SPED (Velesia)

- Non-profit-BPS connection and attended a high school with strong career pathways model (Marsha)
- School leader with experience implementing Pathways at multiple schools (Will)
- Equity lens across the district (Eva)
- BPS Parent (Marinell, Will)
- New Skills Boston strategy, career connected learning grantmaking, and summer internship host for BPS students (Lavonia)
- Background in creating spaces for young people to thrive (Bethany)
- Student of color high school parent experience (Bethany, Velecia, Eva, Will)
- Personal experience in pathways as a student (Elia)
- Post-secondary institutions (Joan, Steve)

BPS Racial Equity Planning Tool

Your planning process using the [BPS Racial Equity Planning Tool](#) should produce a write-up that responds to the following six sets of questions. Please also include the [Cover Page](#) (page 12) describing the core team leading the drafting of this proposal, and submit the [Summary](#) (page 14) as directed.

Step 1: Desired Outcomes

What is the proposal under consideration and the desired outcomes?

- Describe the proposal. What are its intended outcomes, internally and externally? Frame this through the experience of those most impacted: how does this proposal impact the students/communities with the greatest needs, particularly Black and Latinx students and families?
- How will the proposal address racism and close opportunity gaps?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

1. See [2.8.21 New Skills Boston: Leadership Team Meeting](#) (Draft criteria: open enrollment schools with 1 or fewer HQCCP)
 - 1.1. BINCA
 - 1.2. Brighton
 - 1.3. Burke
 - 1.4. CASH
 - 1.5. Charlestown
 - 1.6. Excel
 - 1.7. Snowden

4/16/21 Discussion:

Proposed: Expanding to include schools that have experience, specifically Charlestown and Madison Park, where the college partners have existing relationships. The data from earlier conversations shows that these schools have need, especially around college completion.

BPS: We have data that show students at these schools *do* go on to jobs/technical careers, whereas some schools that have zero or no pathways do not. Are there data that supports including schools with existing pathways as equitable? Early college data could be helpful.

Liya: What is the theory of change around starting with schools with no pathways? Nuri: When do you start onboarding new schools as a strategy? How many and when? In terms of new data, should we be benchmarking against schools with no pathways or high-performing schools? If that's the benchmark, we're not close yet. Michelle: We use the state data to benchmark in CTE. It would not be helpful to compare to exam schools because it is a completely different program of study. The goal of NSB is to increase the number of students accessing career pathways. Eva: District should support core systems/work. Vision is that every student will have access to pathways, NSB is an opportunity to work toward creating *new* pathways. Significant funding from ESSER will go toward building better foundational systems, so partner funding directed toward innovative/new work. Whatever we do we need to take before CERT and start with those who don't have it at all.

Liya: Larger structure that this project fits into and not everyone is aware of. We all need to understand larger scaffolding so that they can be in conversation with each other/how things fit together so we can make smarter choices about how to use resources.

3/3/21 Discussion:

- Relationships matter, what is impact if we select schools without existing connection to BHCC and UMB? If we have all schools that have no experience, does that give any models of how to do this work successfully in the first round?
- For every level of growth expectation for a school, we need a commensurate level of support to help them get there. If we choose the schools with most need, we need to provide the most support. What are the right entry points?
- Lee Santos' questions [slides 1-2 from 2.8.21 meeting](#), could help inform selection criteria
- [Opportunity Index](#) -- should this be included in selection criteria?
- Initial cohort and second cohort recognizing readiness to launch after a year or planning vs. two years of planning? Take into consideration as we're thinking about messaging to school around selection. Assess what's needed to really deepen relationships, position for success
- Innovation pathway model: important that there's the ability to cohort students; to accommodate model, there are parameters that will be required to make it work for a school ([Innovation Pathway Criteria](#)).
 - If we're replicating things that already exist, what's different about this initiative if we don't push some of the places of rigidity? e.g., if size/ability to cohort students is an issue, McKinley would never be able to participate. Other bucket of work happening at BPS (e.g., @ BDEA) provide other avenues/entry points for smaller schools, schools that won't be able to participate; NSB is one part of a broader scope of work.
- Class of 2025 is the target cohort; there's an opportunity to mitigate students feeling left out if we tackle HS assignment process as a core equity strategy

- School's willingness to participate is typically an indicator for success (can we unpack this -- school's willingness is tempered by what they know they can handle; again, the capacity of schools with most need is often a limiting factor)
- Proposed next steps: craft language for this opportunity in smaller group based on feedback we heard today (see below). Other option: reconvene this group to have more time to come to a collective decision. BMA will follow up with summarizing: where did we land.
 - Expand to all open enrollment schools
 - Don't need to message *eligibility* criteria, but make it clear who is most likely to be accepted for this opportunity (i.e., selection criteria); may or may not say we have some must-have criteria based on grant/funder criteria
 - Communicate that we have different ways for all schools to engage in pathways at some level
- Part of selection is defining who makes the ultimate decision, who's a part of that process (note: REPT analysis is not decision making body, but to get information back to those who are)

2/16/21 Discussion:

- Should there be schools with poor pathways that should be included e.g. English High, East Boston, where pathway accessibility and demographics are similar?
- Does BCLA-McCormack fit? TechBoston? (pilots but also open enrollment)
- Charlestown -- there are pathways but not more than 1 HQCCP / innovation pathway. Should they be included on the list?
- McKinley is not included because these SWD students can attend pathways at other schools (question: is that enough access?) McKinley only has access to Madison which only has the capacity to include 12 students. Which limits access. Most importantly, it's been my understanding that the satellite program at Madison for McKinley students will be dismantled as the satellite at the King was dismantled this past year due to issues regarding students' IEP's. The exclusion of SWD students at McKinley is concerning.
- The ability to cohort student for any school participation dictates some sense of size
- Overall we need to answer as a district (and have schools answer this question in the selection process)-- how is this going to get the school out of the hole they are in, with respect to closing gaps in student performance and raising achievement? Is this a long term or a short term perspective? What is the frame that shows this is the right thing to do for students, not distracting from other strategies to close achievement gaps? How are we going to provide them support to make sure they are not stretched so thin, they cannot serve students' needs in other areas?
- Below is the NSB vision...
 - ➔ A city where social, institutional, and systemic barriers to entry and success are removed so that all young people can access quality career learning opportunities that support their exploration, informed decision making, and

preparation for their future opportunities and postsecondary paths.

- A transformed system that recognizes students of color as "holders and creators of knowledge" and values the cultural wealth they bring to schools through their knowledge, skills, abilities to navigate their context despite systemic barriers, such as structural racism which threaten equitable outcomes.
- A learning environment, inclusive of settings from the schoolhouse to the workplace, with connected systems across sectors that employ equity-minded and asset-based strategies and accountability measures which prioritize the inherent strengths of students, their networks, and community, while also eliminating immediate barriers and addressing systemic inequalities
- A public-school district where every student can progress through pathways that are engaging and relevant, enhance their community, offer direct connections to postsecondary, and prepare young people to enter meaningful careers.

Desired outcomes as stated here: [DRAFT New Skills REPT preparation](#)

What is the proposal under consideration and the desired outcomes? School eligibility criteria for New Skills Boston which will identify 3-5 schools to develop and launch industry aligned career pathways programs starting in high school and moving through postsecondary to the workforce.

Problem to solve: With the goal of developing high quality pathways in collaboration with partners to increase student access to career learning experience, what eligibility criteria should be included for schools to participate initially and deeply in this 4.5 year initiative?

Intended outcomes, external and internal?

External

- A collective vision that ensures equitable outcomes for students which includes shared accountability across secondary, postsecondary, and workplace settings evidenced by shared definitions, equitable strategies, and metrics reviewed iteratively through a continuous improvement approach
- High quality pathways which incorporate core career learning activities such as career exploration, industry relevant course sequences, and work-based learning experiences within multiple settings
- Flexible pathways with clear on and off ramps that allow all students and their families to recognize their strengths, make informed choices, and access /deepen their career learning
- An established, cross sector infrastructure (secondary, postsecondary, workplace, and community partners) that supports a shared definition of pathways, collaborative goal setting around new, labor market aligned pathways, seamless transitions, and a collaborative data strategy that monitors progress to and through a pathway
- Student enrollment and completion of high priority pathways that is demographically representative of the city
- Aligned strategic policy, financial models, and community resources that support pathway coordination between sectors and ensures effective supports are accessible to all students

- Policies and practices that foster continued learning and exposure for educators and staff and facilitate cross sector dialogues around high quality pathways

Internal

- A transparent eligibility, application, and selection process
- Clear communication strategy that will ensure shared understanding of the expectations of developing new career pathways
- Increasing access to career pathways for students and school communities that considers equity for students and school readiness for this opportunity

DRAFT CRITERIA FOR SCHOOL SELECTION AND PARTICIPATION

Initial Eligibility for Discussion

- An open enrollment/traditional school serving students in grades 9-12 (schools with 7-12 or 6-12 grade configurations are also welcome to apply)
- Priority will be given to schools with 1 or no High-Quality College & Career Pathways (Chapter 74, Perkins/non-Chapter 74, Innovation Pathways, Early College)

Expectations for Participating Schools and Educators

Selected schools will be expected to:

- Develop an industry aligned pathway in one of the high demand, high growth labor market areas that meets all [requirements](#) for Innovation Pathways and is eligible for MA designation
- Participate in a cohort of schools through New Skills Boston receiving technical assistance to develop and maintain pathways through June 2025. Technical assistance in Year 1 will include planning support from the BPS CTE Office
- Design a pathway with embedded postsecondary opportunities in coordination with programs at Bunker Hill Community College and/or University of Massachusetts Boston
- Recruit and enroll students in the pathway starting in Fall 2022 and annually thereafter.
- Work collaboratively with pathway partners in postsecondary and work-based learning through June 2025, at a minimum, to support students participation, retention, and transitions in the career pathway
- Provide updates on student outcomes related to college and career readiness; and
- Participate in data collection and research activities related to the New Skills Boston initiative

Expected Outcomes for this work:

- Increased student access to high-quality career pathways and career learning opportunities

- Increased coordination and collaboration among college and career stakeholders on school day-based efforts;
- Articulated model and implementation strategy that can be leveraged for success in future years.

Resources Provided to Selected Schools:

- Technical assistance from CTE office for Year of Planning
- Financial resources to support both planning and implementation of resources

SECOND ITERATION: IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING/EVALUATION

THROUGHOUT ITERATIONS:

- **Build on student's cultural wealth and how we might leverage it in this work: aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familial and resistant capital, as we simultaneously define what our "equity lens" needs to look like for this initiative (Yosso/cultural wealth)**
- **Provide excellent and equitable pathways for BPS schools to ensure students are well prepared to achieve their goals, including securing family sustaining wages**

Step 2: Analysis of Data

What does the data tell us about the current situation for Black, Latinx, EL, and Special Education students?

- What existing data is available to help shape this proposal, and is that data disaggregated by race?
- What does quantitative and qualitative data tell us about existing racial inequities and their root causes?
- How will the proposal impact Black, Latinx, EL and Special Ed and economically disadvantaged students?
- What additional data would be helpful in analyzing the proposal and how can we obtain it?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

Data presented at the [2.8.21 New Skills Boston: Leadership Team Meeting](#)

- Note: we decided not to include MCAS achievement data with New Skills large group--should that be a REPT consideration or is the data we included sufficient?
- Actual post-graduation college and work outcomes (What are the results for students over time? Measuring student success over time (Data working group))

Data presented at 3.3.21 REPT Meeting:

- 1) [2018-19 Graduates Attending Institutions of Higher Education - All Colleges and Universities](#)
- 2) [2019 & 2020 Immediate Enrollment](#)
- 3) [6-year College Enrollment & Completion - Class of 2011](#)

Notes: Might be helpful to compare both the enrollment and completion rates by school, not the subgroups, because of the small N sizes at most schools. Data based on the same definitions PIC uses for Success Boston reporting. First-year enrollment captures enrollment of high school grads in the immediate fall or following spring semester (e.g., Fall 2020 or Winter 2021 for a spring 2020 graduate). PIC tracked this first-year enrollee cohort through 6 years for the completion rate analysis. Completions are at any college (transfers are included) and include certificates, Associate's, and Bachelor's degree.

- 4) [Opportunity Index FY22](#)

School	OI Score*
BINCA	0.652
Brighton	0.671
Burke	0.668
CASH	0.663
Charlestown	0.626
Excel	0.633
Snowden	0.559
<i>Dearborn</i>	0.622
<i>East Boston</i>	0.480
<i>Madison Park</i>	0.664
BCLA	0.544
<i>TechBoston</i>	0.592
<i>English</i>	0.647
<i>Quincy Upper</i>	0.373
ACC	0.562
McKinley	0.891

*A higher score indicates a higher average level of student need, as [defined by the index](#)

Data collected for 4.16 meeting

[limited early college data for Charlestown and Madison Park](#)

[Senior Exit Survey plans for after high school](#)

[Special populations by CTE program](#)

[Race/Ethnicity by CTE program](#)

[Class of 2018 Positive Perkins response for grad survey follow up](#) (employed, in college/training, or military)

Note: Where there are duplicate programs in the district, the data is combined for all programs in that CTE content area. For example, Health Assisting represents the Health Assisting students in 2 schools: Madison Park and EHS.

Step 3: Stakeholder Engagement

How have Black, Latinx, EL, Special Education and economically disadvantaged students, families, staff, and other key internal and external stakeholders been engaged in considering and shaping the proposal?

- Who are the stakeholders most impacted by the proposal and how have we involved them and those from historically marginalized communities in developing the proposal?
- What has our engagement told us about the potential positive and/or negative impacts of the proposal for different groups and how this proposal might produce or perpetuate racial inequity?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

Discussion

- Have not yet engaged the key stakeholders (Black, Latinx, EL, Special Education and economically disadvantaged students, families, staff) directly. We have brought our understanding/experience with these stakeholders
 - Potential negative impact identified: McKinley does not meet draft eligibility criteria but has the most need by many metrics (e.g., highest Opportunity Index).
- Higher ed students: missing perspective often shared re pressure to be industry-focused
- Have engaged HS principals, have not engaged higher ed equivalents (e.g., deans)
 - Also important to engage HS families, students, as communities (not just school leads) as they often express frustration when they hear about opportunities that the principal is seen as having “passed” on (might not have the full picture, but the sense is, “why wasn’t this offered at our school?”)

Step 4: Strategies for Racial Equity

Given what we learned from steps #2 and #3, what are our strategies for advancing racial equity?

- Do our strategies address conditions that perpetuate inequities instead of “fixing” students/other people?
- Who may benefit from or be burdened by the proposal? What are potential unintended consequences?
- How could the proposal be modified to enhance positive impacts or mitigate negative impacts?
- Are there complementary strategies that we or our partner(s), can implement?

- How will we collaborate with stakeholders for long-term positive change?
- Are the impacts aligned with our desired outcomes defined in Step #1?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

Discussion

- Need to assess capacity to position this for success--and capacity not just at the school level but also at the pse level. Need to look at a number of variables that impact capacity.
- envision strategies that leverage both the systems focus and specific school delivery focus of the grant project; ensure that conversations are balanced about the work that can be done to support all students
 - Be intentional about ensuring our system-level strategies meet the needs of the groups identified as being repeatedly left out
- Be explicit about strategies we will adopt that will get to longstanding perceptions of career pathways, such as linear occupational trajectories, limited flexibility in changing education and career direction
- The equity question seems to be weighted toward equity for schools rather than equity for students: by and large the student populations are the same - how are we differentiating here?
- Is it possible that we could be alienating students who would benefit, simply because they attend a certain school with a low OI score?
 - what can we do for those students?
- Unintended consequences are trust and transparency with secondary schools - how do they know what is happening and why or why not it is a match for their school community? If they can't see themselves in the frame for this work, where do they see themselves?
- The opportunity index model is an example of how we have provided schools with clarity on why they fall into a certain criteria. Even though some were disappointed, they understood the WHY.
- Mitigation strategies: Be really really clear about the selection criteria are for schools that apply, and what the resources are they will receive
- ensuring we have complementary strategies to meet the needs of education settings serving small populations - alt ed, etc.
- Provide clarity on what supports will be provided to schools that do apply, to ensure they fully understand what the commitment is
- Oi score aligned with partnership fund qualification- >.57
- Open enrollment schools to eliminate barriers to entry and access
- one or no pathways asa strategy to increase equity and access

Step 5: Implementation Plan

What is our plan for implementation?

- Is the plan realistic and adequately resourced?

- Does it include leadership and personnel who are Black, Latinx and bring a racial equity lens?
- Does it ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, and community engagement?
- If any of these answers is no, what resources or actions are needed, who will perform them and when?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

- N/A

Step 6: Accountability & Communications**How will we ensure accountability, including evaluating and communicating results?**

- How will impact be documented and evaluated, including whether we achieve the anticipated outcomes, advance racial equity and close opportunity gaps?
- How are we disaggregating and presenting data to highlight how this strategy is impacting Black, Latinx, EL, Special Education, and other historically marginalized communities?
- How will we continue to partner and deepen relationships with students, families, and communities of color to make sure our work to advance racial equity is effective and sustainable for the long-haul?

FIRST ITERATION: SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY AND SELECTION

- [Announcement to schools - Final version](#)

Racial Equity Planning Tool Summary

The purpose of this tool is to ensure students from historically marginalized populations are at the center of our decision-making, such as students of Color, English learners and Special Education students. Use this form to summarize your process. Submit this completed form to REPTsuptoffice@bostonpublicschools.org

Title: _____ **Date** _____
Name of the policy, practice initiative, program, or budget decision under consideration

Racial Equity Tool Sections	Summary
Proposal Leadership <i>Who led this process, what are their affiliations and racial/ethnic identities? Is there Black and Latinx representation?</i>	
Strategic Plan Alignment <i>How does the proposal align with the district's strategic plan?</i>	
1. Proposal & Impact <i>What is the proposal, its desired outcomes and impact on traditionally marginalized communities, such as Black, Latinx, EL, and Special Ed students</i>	

and their families (most impacted)?	
2. Analysis of Data <i>What data did you use? Was it disaggregated by race and other key factors? What did it show?</i>	
3. Stakeholder Engagement <i>Who was engaged (quantity, demographics, and roles), how and what did it yield? What did the students/families most impacted say?</i>	
4. Racial Equity Strategies <i>How does this proposal mitigate disparities and increase equity, particularly racial equity? What are the unintended consequences? What complementary strategies will further advance equity?</i>	
5. Budget & Implementation <i>What are the budget impacts? How will implementation ensure equity objectives are met? Are there leadership and personnel who are Black, Latinx and bring a racial equity lens?</i>	
6. Accountability & Communication <i>How will impacts be documented and communicated to stakeholders?</i>	