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# Introduction

## About this Report

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of Massachusetts school districts’ Student Opportunity Act plans, including information on what specific Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) districts have identified to advance equitable outcomes for students.

## About the Student Opportunity Act

The [Student Opportunity Act](https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2019/Chapter132) (SOA) was enacted in 2019, infusing significant new funding into the Commonwealth’s educational system, with a focus on providing more equitable funding to districts serving students who have historically been least well served. The law also includes a provision that requires every school district and charter school in the state to develop three-year plans, referred to as SOA plans. This report summarizes the second set of three-year plans for public school districts (excluding charter schools[[1]](#footnote-2)) since enactment of the Student Opportunity Act. Districts submitted new three-year plans by April 1, 2024.

## Purpose of SOA Plans

Districts' SOA plans identify where data reveals disparities in student learning opportunities and outcomes for the student groups they serve and describe how they will utilize Evidence-Based Programs to address those disparities.

It is important to note that, by design, districts' SOA plans highlight a few Evidence-Based Programs that districts identified as key levers for addressing disparities for targeted student groups. SOA plans are not expected to reflect districts' comprehensive plans for overall improvement. Those interested in viewing a district's comprehensive improvement plan should visit the district's website.

## Guidance and Support for Districts

DESE has continued to update guidance and support tools to enable districts to create stronger and more, focused plans. For example, in FY24 we updated guidance materials to more closely align with the agency’s three Strategic Objectives which are grounded in DESE’s [Educational Vision](https://www.doe.mass.edu/commissioner/vision/).

Since the first round of SOA plan submissions, we have also made several changes to improve the process and overall quality of the plans. This year, DESE created a [new Student Outcomes Comparison Tool](https://app.powerbigov.us/view?r=eyJrIjoiNmRkYTQ3NzEtYjFhZi00NzNiLTgyY2ItYWI3ZmVjMjc1OGU2IiwidCI6IjNlODYxZDE2LTQ4YjctNGEwZS05ODA2LThjMDRkODFiN2IyYSJ9) that allows districts to review disaggregated data across student groups for a range of critical indicators and highlights where disparities as requested. Additional information about SOA guidance can be found on DESE’s [website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/soa/resources.html). in learning experiences and outcomes are most prominent for different student groups. In addition, the Department hosted informational webinars following the release of the updated Guidance, posted SOA plan exemplars on its website for districts to reference, and hosted consultations to support districts with plan development

A small number of “Priority Districts” receiving greater than $75 million in Chapter 70 State Aid in fiscal year 2024 were selected to complete an SOA Plan Addendum[[2]](#footnote-3). The addendums for these 17 districts provide more in-depth budget detail for FY25-FY27 across all funding sources*,* excluding federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) funds, which expire September 30, 2024*.*

# Plan Submission and Review Process

## Timeline

320 districts were required to submit SOA plans during this timeframe.

* FY24 3-Year SOA plan guidance released — December 2023
* FY24 3-Year SOA plan overview webinar — January 9, 2024
* Plan submission deadline – April 1, 2024
* DESE reviewed SOA plans, provided feedback, and districts revised if necessary — April through June 2024
* DESE publicly posted all SOA plans — Summer 2024

## Review Process

Districts submitted their SOA plans in DESE’s new [Grants for Education Management System](https://mass.egrantsmanagement.com) (GEM$ system. Following submission, every district’s SOA plan was reviewed to ensure alignment with the letter and spirit of the SOA legislation. While the SOA legislation offers a broad outline of what is to be included in SOA Plans, it stipulates that plans “shall be submitted in a form and manner prescribed by the department.”

DESE’s SOA plan guidance was designed to:

1. embed statutory requirements of the SOA;
2. reflect best practices in the plan development process, and
3. incorporate writing prompts that enhance the consistency, quality, and transparency of the information districts provide.

Following the initial plan review, the DESE SOA team worked collaboratively with districts to revise any plan components that did not yet meet the minimum criteria (Appendix B). Communication took place via comments in DESE’s GEM$ system and individual phone conferences with districts. After receiving DESE’s feedback, districts had the opportunity to submit revisions to strengthen their plans by providing greater clarity and transparency for stakeholders. At the time of this report publication, 300 of 320 district plans met the required criteria.

As required by statute, SOA plans are posted on districts’ websites as well as on [DESE’s website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/soa/plans.html).

# Summary of plan data

Below we highlight relevant patterns observed in district SOA Plans related to identified student groups; selection of Strategic Objectives, Focus Areas, and Evidence-Based Programs; and spending aligned to Evidence-Based Programs. The following tables provide data based on all 320 districts[[3]](#footnote-4) (including priority districts) and for the subset of 17 priority districts.

## Identified Student Groups

The SOA legislation requires that, based on an analysis of disaggregated data, districts identify which student groups are experiencing gaps in student learning experiences and outcomes.

Exhibit 1. District Identification of Student Groups

District SOA plans primarily focus supports on student groups prioritized in the SOA legislation, including students with disabilities, low-income students, and English learners.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Student Group | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17% (n) |
| Students with disabilities  | 89% (285) | 88% (15) |
| Low-income | 69% (220) | 29% (5) |
| English Learners | 65% (207) | 100% (17) |

## Selection of Strategic Objectives, Focus Areas, and Evidence-Based Programs

The SOA legislation requires that districts identify key Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) that they will prioritize to narrow gaps for identified student groups. To support districts in this work, DESE provided a set of EBPs supported by research and aligned to DESE’s new Educational Vision and strategic objectives.

EBPs fall into ten categories, known as Focus Areas. The Focus Areas are further organized under DESE’s three Strategic Objectives: supporting the whole student, promoting deeper learning, and cultivating a diverse and effective workforce. The Strategic Objectives are part of DESE’s effort to align district supports to our Educational Vision.

## Selection of Strategic Objectives

Based on their data analysis, districts selected Focus Areas and Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) aligned with one or more of DESE’s three Strategic Objectives.

Exhibit 2. District Selection of EBPs Within Strategic Objectives.

Districts are most frequently choosing EBPs that support deeper learning for students.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Strategic Objective | All DistrictsN=320Selecting EBPs within this strategic objective% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17Selecting EBPs within this strategic objective% (n) |
| 1. Cultivate systems to support the whole student and foster joyful, healthy, and supportive learning environments so that all students feel valued, connected, nourished, and ready to learn. | 62% (197) | 70% (12) |
| 2. Promote deeper learning so that all students engage in grade-level work that is real-world, relevant, and interactive. | 87% (278) | 88% (15) |
| 3. Develop and sustain a workforce that is diverse, culturally responsive, well-prepared, and committed to continuous improvement, so that all students have equitable access to effective educators. | 8% (24) | 24% (4) |

## Selection of Focus Areas

Each of the three Strategic Objectives contains three or four Focus Areas. Within each Focus Area, districts could select one or more EBP(s). Districts were advised to select EBPs within no more than three Focus Areas. The table below indicates how many districts selected at least one EBP within each Focus Area.

Exhibit 3. District Selection of Focus Areas

Many districts across the state are making efforts to adopt and implement high-quality instructional materials (Focus Areas 2.1 and 2.2).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Focus Area | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17% (n) |
| **Focus Areas in Strategic Objective 1: Whole Student**  |   |   |
| 1.1 Promote students’ physical and mental health and wellness in welcoming, affirming, and safe spaces | 30% (96) | 24% (4) |
| 1.2 Implement a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) that helps all students progress both academically and in their social, emotional, and behavioral development  | 37% (119) | 53% (9) |
| 1.3 Develop authentic partnerships with students and families that elevate their voices and leadership in decision-making and connect them to their communities | 8% (26) | 0% (0) |
| **Focus Areas in Strategic Objective 2: High Quality Instructional Materials**  |  |
| 2.1 Select and skillfully implement high-quality and engaging instructional materials that support culturally and linguistically sustaining practices and foster deeper learning | 61% (195) | 53% (9) |
| 2.2 Use the MTSS process to implement academic supports and interventions that provide all students, particularly students with disabilities and multilingual learners, equitable access to deeper learning | 40% (129) | 35% (6) |
| 2.3 Reimagine the high school experience so that all students are engaged and prepared for post-secondary success | 16% (50) | 35% (6) |
| 2.4 Develop a coherent and holistic range of programming that is responsive to the needs and interests of diverse learners | 16% (51) | 29% (5) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Areas in Strategic Objective 3: Diverse Workforce**  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.1 Develop an increased and robust pipeline of diverse and well-prepared educators and leaders | 2% (6) | 6% (1) |
| 3.2 Create the conditions to sustain and retain diverse and effective staff, particularly those who entered the field through alternative pathways | 3% (9) | 12% (2) |
| 3.3 Implement opportunities for all staff to engage in a cycle of continuous improvement, utilizing effective teaming structures | 3% (11) | 0% (0) |

Exhibit 4. Number of Focus Areas Selected

Most districts selected between one to three focus areas.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Focus Areas Selected  | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17% (n) |
| 1 | 27% (86) | 12% (2) |
| 2 | 38% (120) | 18% (3) |
| 3 | 28% (88) | 71% (12) |
| 4 | 6% (18) | 0 |
| 5 | 1% (4) | 0 |
| 6 | <1% (1) | 0 |

## Selection of Evidence-Based Programs

The following exhibits show information about selected EBPs. Districts were encouraged to select a relatively small, focused number of EBPs in their SOA plan. A full list of all EBPs and selection frequency is available in Appendix C.

Exhibit 5. Number of EBPs Selected

The majority of districts selected between one and four EBPs, with the most selecting two to three.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of EBPs Selected | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority Districts N=17% (n) |
| 1 | 16% (51) | 0 |
| 2 | 32% (102) | 6% (1) |
| 3 | 32% (103) | 65% (11) |
| 4 | 12% (37) | 12% (2) |
| 5 | 6% (20) | 18% (3) |
| 6 | 1% (3) | 0 |
| 7 | <1% (1) | 0 |

Exhibit 6. Five Most Frequently Selected EBPs[[4]](#footnote-5)

Many districts’ SOA plans emphasize practices to implement and adopt high quality curriculum and build effective student support systems.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Evidence-Based Program | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17% (n) |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation** |  34% (110) | 29% (5) |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | 26% (83) | 35% (6) |
| **2.1A Inclusive Curriculum Adoption Process** | 22% (70) | 18% (3) |
| 2.2B High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities | 21% (66) | 12% (2) |
| 1.1B Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health | 19% (61) | 12% (2) |

Exhibit 7. Priority Districts’ Five Most Frequently Selected EBPs

Many priority districts are focused on building effective systems to provide student supports and early literacy initiatives.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Evidence-Based Program | All DistrictsN=320% (n) | Priority DistrictsN=17% (n) |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | 26% (83) | 35% (6) |
| **2.1C Comprehensive Approach to Early Literacy** | 18% (59) | 35% (6) |
| 1.2B Comprehensive Tiered Supports | 18% (56) | 35% (6) |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation** | 34% (110) | 29% (5) |
| **2.3B High-Quality Secondary Pathways and Programs** | 13% (42) | 29% (5) |

## Spending by Evidence-Based Programs

SOA plans include an estimate of the total amount of funding districts expect to use to implement each EBP in their plan over the next three years (*i.e., FY25-FY27*). Districts were instructed to develop their projections based on all fiscal resources at their disposal *(e.g., all local funding sources, including state Chapter 70 allocations; Federal Title grants; other federal and state grants; other resources).*

Exhibits 8 and 9 below summarize the aggregate budget estimates for the five EBPs in which districts report the largest total investments over the next three years. Figures for all 30 EBPs appear in Appendix D.

***Caveat:*** We urge caution in interpreting aggregate budget data as districts across the Commonwealth employ a wide variety of complex budgeting strategies and definitions when articulating spending in SOA Plans.

Exhibit 8. Spending by Five Most Frequently Selected EBPs, All Districts

SOA Plans identify substantial funding for curriculum implementation and adoption, and student supports.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence-Based Program | Related Spending |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation** | $235,350,882 |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | $446,789,275 |
| **2.1A Inclusive Curriculum Adoption Process** | $64,210,728 |
| 2.2B High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities | $113,452,340 |
| 1.1B Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health | $122,746,274 |

Exhibit 9. Spending by Five Most Frequently Selected EBPs, Priority Districts

Priority districts targeted the highest level of funding towards systems for effective student support.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evidence-Based Program | Related Spending  |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | $376,992,128 |
| **2.1C Comprehensive Approach to Early Literacy** | $46,676,603 |
| 1.2B Comprehensive Tiered Supports | $178,379,014 |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation** | $107,080,097 |
| **2.3B High-Quality Secondary Pathways and Programs** | $95,541,232 |

Funds spent on the five most frequently selected EBPs (for all districts) account for 50% of spending by all districts. For priority districts, funds spent on the five most frequently selected EBPs account for 66% of all spending.

The SOA Data Advisory Commission is in the process of commissioning a study to assess the impact of the substantial increases in education investments, including both the increases in Chapter 70 funding the MA legislature has made since the Student Opportunity Act was passed in 2019 and the substantial influx of federal ESSER funds during the COVID-19 pandemic.

# Areas for Further Exploration

This report provides an overview of the content of SOA plans submitted by districts for implementation from SY24-25 through SY26-27. DESE recognizes that beyond written plans, high-quality implementation of those plans largely determines the ultimate impact on students. To that end, we are exploring ways to shift our focus primarily from the activity of collecting and reviewing plans towards providing high-quality implementation support that meaningfully aids districts in improving outcomes for historically underserved students.

Increased Focus on Implementation Support

While required by statute, SOA plans in and of themselves are not comprehensive district improvement plans. It is important to remember that districts were encouraged to select a relatively small, focused number of EBPs in their SOA plan. As a result, a district may not have selected a given EBP as part of their SOA plan but work on that strategy could still be underway.

While DESE has made efforts to support districts in SOA plan development through enhanced guidance, new data analysis tools, and technical assistance, in several sections of the submitted SOA plans, the narratives varied in terms of the level of data and detail provided. Especially for districts that received minimal increases in their Chapter 70 allocation, the SOA reporting requirements were sometimes experienced as distinct from the core, authentic planning opportunity that was intended by the guidance.

Moving forward, we are exploring how DESE can meaningfully harness the data we have about districts' improvement efforts and put greater focus on adaptive implementation assistance. Potentially shifting DESE's efforts more towards implementation support could help illuminate where supports are most warranted. In addition, aligning these efforts more tightly around districts' improvement plans could increase the coherence and effectiveness of districts' efforts to address gaps and learning loss.

Adapting Universal Strategies to Support Specific Student Groups

A vast majority of districts identified students with disabilities and/or English learners as their student groups to receive focused support. Meanwhile, several of the most selected EBPs (e.g., curriculum adoption and implementation) are universal strategies designed to enhance the educational experience of all students. Plan narratives varied in the extent to which they made an explicit connection to how the EBP would improve outcomes for targeted student groups. We believe this represents an important opportunity for DESE to curate, develop, and disseminate resources that support districts in adapting certain EBPs to meaningfully address the strengths and needs of specific student groups.

Building and Sustaining a Diverse and Effective Workforce

We know that district leaders value the research that consistently shows that having a diverse and effective workforce is one of the most influential factors on students' academic and post-academic success[[5]](#footnote-6). Although relatively few districts (8%) selected EBPs from this Strategic Objective, we recognize that districts are investing in this priority in ways that may not be easily observed in SOA plans.

For example, investments in sustaining a diverse and effective workforce may be reflected in other line items of the plan (e.g., hiring highly qualified educators to support early literacy efforts through EBP 2.1D). It is also possible that districts are using other funding sources to support this work and their strategies are articulated in their district improvement plans. Further examination may be warranted.

Aligned DESE Support

DESE recently published its second annual [Catalog of Aligned Supports](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.doe.mass.edu%2Fcommissioner%2Fvision%2Fcatalog.xlsx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK), a resource designed to guide districts in providing equitable learning experiences for students. The Catalog reflects DESE’s commitment to providing supports to districts and schools that align with our [Educational Vision](https://www.doe.mass.edu/commissioner/vision/vision-supports.pdf) and the Strategic Objectives reflected in Student Opportunity Act plans. DESE will consider how we can adapt and/or add to our Catalog to address the implementation support opportunities that we identify through the Student Opportunity Act.

# Appendices

## Appendix A: Districts Required to Complete the SOA Plan Addendum

The following “Priority” districts were required to complete the SOA Plan Addendum, which asked for more information about these districts’ SOA Plans and investments in evidence-based programs, to better understand how they are using SOA funds to drive transformative change for students experiencing persistent disparities in achievement. Districts receiving greater than $75 million in Chapter 70 State Aid in fiscal year 2024 were selected to complete the addendum.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | District Name | FY 2024 Chapter 70 Aid |
| 1. | Springfield | $477,737,768 |
| 2. | Worcester | $357,541,905 |
| 3. | Lynn | $269,092,167 |
| 4. | Lawrence | $266,144,831 |
| 5. | Brockton | $241,067,581 |
| 6. | Boston | $230,700,785 |
| 7. | Lowell | $229,138,873 |
| 8. | New Bedford | $224,099,122 |
| 9. | Fall River | $188,024,477 |
| 10. | Chelsea | $116,781,512 |
| 11. | Everett | $111,682,212 |
| 12. | Revere | $98,418,182 |
| 13. | Holyoke | $96,959,371 |
| 14. | Taunton | $88,928,648 |
| 15. | Chicopee | $88,827,551 |
| 16. | Framingham | $84,996,534 |
| 17. | Haverhill | $82,633,811 |

## Appendix B: FY24 SOA Plan Rubric – GEM$ Checklist

Overall Plan

* Narrative throughout the plan is free of deficit-based language about students, staff, and families.
* Plan addresses between 1-3 of the ten Focus Areas linked to the three Strategic Objectives in DESE’s Educational Vision
* Plan focuses on implementation of key strategies to close gaps, rather than limiting its scope to a description of how additional Chapter 70 funds will be spent.
* There is internal consistency throughout the plan *(e.g., student groups, EBPs)*

Section 1: Summarize Your District’s Plan

* Summary addresses all required elements: student groups targeted, EBPs. investments, changes anticipated by 2027.
* Narrative is accessible to a general audience.

Section 2: Analyze Your Data and Select Student Groups for Focused Support

* Plan prioritizes a limited set of student groups experiencing the most significant gaps. *(i.e., does not check every student group in the district)*
* Plan describes the measures on which targeted student groups are experiencing the most significant disparities.
* Analysis of disparities and deeper analysis of their underlying causes draws upon multiple types of data *(e.g., systems, observational, perspectives, outcomes)*
* Selection of EBPs is linked to deeper analysis of underlying causes of disparities.

Section 3: Set Ambitious Three-Year Targets for Improving Student Achievement

* Additional targets all are aligned to selected student groups by subject matter and grade level and to DESE’s accountability targets.

Section 4: Engage Families/Caregivers and other Stakeholders

* Family/caregiver engagement strategies are clearly articulated and include approaches to support parents in addressing their students’ needs.
* Section includes description of steps district takes (or plans to take) to engage families/caregivers of targeted student groups.
* Plan for assessing progress in increasing family/caregiver engagement includes a metric that can assess change over time and indicates how it will measure increased engagement for families/caregivers of student groups targeted in this plan.
* Narrative describes ways in which different stakeholder groups provided meaningful input that was used to inform the SOA plan AND describes how/where their perspectives are reflected in the SOA Plan.
* Plans for ongoing engagement of stakeholder groups throughout the implementation of the SOA Plan are described.

Section 5: Select Evidence Based Programs to Address Disparities in Outcomes *(to be completed for each EBP selected)*

* District offers a clear description of 1) what is currently being implemented, 2) what changes will be implemented/in place by June 2027, AND aligns to best practice as articulated in guidance.
* Plan describes how EBP implementation will support targeted student groups and/or improve their learning experiences and outcomes.
* Plan clearly indicates which schools will be impacted through implementation of this EBP.
* Budget provides clear information on budget allocation that aligns to implementation description and is organized by foundation category.
* Progress monitoring metrics are clearly defined and well-suited to monitoring early and midterm outcomes of implementation of this EBP.

## Appendix C: Selection of Evidence-Based Programs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evidence-Based Program  | All Districts% (n)[[6]](#footnote-7) | Priority Districts% (n) |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation[[7]](#footnote-8)** | 34% (110) | 29% (5) |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | 26% (83) | 35% (6) |
| **2.1A Inclusive Curriculum Adoption Process** | 22% (70) | 18% (3) |
| 2.2B High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities | 21% (66) | 12% (2) |
| 1.1B Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health | 19% (61) | 12% (2) |
| **2.1C Comprehensive Approach to Early Literacy** | 18% (59) | 35% (6) |
| 1.2B Comprehensive Tiered Supports | 18% (56) | 35% (6) |
| **2.2D Targeted Academic Support and Acceleration** | 13% (43) | 18% (3) |
| **2.3B High-Quality Secondary Pathways and Programs** | 13% (42) | 29% (5) |
| 2.2C Collaborative Teaching Models | 11% (35) | 18% (3) |
| 1.1A Integrated Services for Student Wellbeing | 9% (30) | 12% (2) |
| **2.1D Early Literacy Screening and Support** | 8% (26) | 6% (1) |
| 2.4C Effective Programming for Multilingual Learners | 8% (26) | 6% (1) |
| 2.2A Effective Use of WIDA Framework | 8% (25) | 6% (1) |
| **2.4A Expanded Access to Pre-K** | 6% (20) | 18% (3) |
| 1.3B Students and Families as Valued Partners | 4% (14) | 0% (0) |
| 1.1C Positive School Environments | 4% (13) | 12% (2) |
| 1.3A Diverse Approaches to Meaningful Family Engagement | 4% (13) | 0% (0) |
| 2.3A Authentic Postsecondary Planning | 4% (12) | 6% (1) |
| 3.3B Support for Effective Team Practices | 2% (7) | 0% (0) |
| 2.4B Extended Learning Time | 2% (5) | 6% (1) |
| 3.3A Resources Allocation Aligned to Student Success | 2% (5) | 0% (0) |
| 3.2B Retention Support Programs | 1% (4) | 6% (1) |
| 3.2C Pathways for Professional Growth and Leadership | 1% (4) | 6% (1) |
| 2.4D Diverse Enrichment Opportunities | 1% (3) | 6% (1) |
| **3.1B Enhanced Pathways to Increase Educator Diversity** | 1% (3) | 6% (1) |
| 3.1A Intentional Hiring Systems | 1% (2) | 6% (1) |
| 3.1C Educator Preparation Partnerships | <1% (1) | 0% (0) |
| 3.2A Inclusive School Communities | <1% (1) | 0% (0) |
| 3.3C Collaborative Labor Management Partnerships | 0% (0) | 0% (0) |

## Appendix D: Spending by Evidence-Based Programs[[8]](#footnote-9)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evidence-Based Program  | All Districts | Priority Districts |
| 1.2A Effective Student Support System | $446,789,275 | $376,992,128 |
| **2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation**  | $235,350,882 | $107,080,097 |
| 1.2B Comprehensive Tiered Supports | $234,433,412 | $178,379,014 |
| 2.2C Collaborative Teaching Models | $189,918,866 | $134,617,106 |
| **2.3B High-Quality Secondary Pathways and Programs** | $163,167,086 | $95,541,232 |
| 1.1B Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health | $122,746,274 | $22,222,975 |
| 2.2B High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities | $113,452,340 | $8,740,000 |
| **2.4A Expanded Access to Pre-K** | $100,164,167 | $77,800,703 |
| **2.1C Comprehensive Approach to Early Literacy** | $90,887,591 | $46,676,603 |
| 1.1C Positive School Environments | $74,139,075 | $71,559,175 |
| 1.1A Integrated Services for Student Wellbeing | $73,166,206 | $23,701,605 |
| 2.4C Effective Programming for Multilingual Learners | $67,056,658 | $4,268,250 |
| **2.1A Inclusive Curriculum Adoption Process** | $64,210,728 | $25,001,218 |
| 2.4D Diverse Enrichment Opportunities | $61,446,146 | $59,998,146 |
| **2.2D Targeted Academic Support and Acceleration** | $51,509,568 | $19,879,039 |
| **2.1D Early Literacy Screening and Support** | $28,994,725 | $110,000 |
| 2.2A Effective Use of WIDA Framework | $21,089,302 | $435,000 |
| **3.1B Enhanced Pathways to Increase Educator Diversity** | $10,377,960 | $9,092,960 |
| 2.3A Authentic Postsecondary Planning | $8,891,856 | $3,200,000 |
| 3.3B Support for Effective Team Practices | $7,803,468 | $0 |
| 1.3A Diverse Approaches to Meaningful Family Engagement | $7,782,527 | $0 |
| 2.4B Extended Learning Time | $7,322,406 | $1,590,000 |
| 3.3A Resources Allocation Aligned to Student Success | $2,964,267 | $0 |
| 3.2C Pathways for Professional Growth and Leadership | $2,663,935 | $2,475,000 |
| 3.2B Retention Support Programs | $2,183,574 | $886,989 |
| 1.3B Students and Families as Valued Partners | $2,028,500 | $0 |
| 3.1A Intentional Hiring Systems | $680,000 | $650,000 |
| 3.2A Inclusive School Communities | $654,000 | $0 |
| 3.1C Educator Preparation Partnerships | $70,000 | $0 |
| 3.3C Collaborative Labor Management Partnerships | $0 | $0 |

1. Charter schools operate on a different timeline for submission; therefore, their data are not included in this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A list of these districts can be found in Appendix A. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. At the time of this report, three districts had not yet fully entered their plan information into the GEM$ system, therefore slightly impacting the frequency exhibits in this section of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. While all evidence-based programs represent strong practices, districts are especially encouraged to consider and adopt EBPs designated as “priority EBPs” by the Commissioner. These are denoted in the table by bold text. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Hanushek, E. A., Kain, J. F., & Rivkin, S. G. Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. Working paper. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1998.; Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E.A. and Rivkin, S.G. Estimating Principal Effectiveness. Working Paper #32. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. n sizes vary within percent ranges due to rounding. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. While all evidence-based programs represent strong practices, districts are especially encouraged to consider and adopt EBPs designated as “priority EBPs” by the Commissioner. These are denoted in the table by bold text. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. When reading this table, refer to caveat noted on page 12 of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)