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About this Case Study

This case study draws on the work of the Boston Compact during its three formative years and is based on interviews with more than 30 people, including active Compact participants, school-based leadership, funders, city leaders, and general observers. It catches the Compact at a critical point in its development, as a Gates Foundation grant that has covered the largest share of the budget winds down.

The first section of the case provides background on the Compact’s roots and structure. The study then outlines core strategies used during the formative years to translate Compact ideas into action and explores key lessons Compact members and other Boston leaders and stakeholder draw from their experience - things they feel worked and didn’t and implications for their work going forward. The final section of the case study steps outside the Boston context and outlines a more general set of recommendations to guide new compacts elsewhere.

The purpose of the case study is not to document every step, activity, and nuance of the Boston Compact. Writing a case study about something as dynamic as the Compact inevitably results in an abridged story that reads a little neat, tidy and more linear than the actual experience of doing a Compact. Instead, the case study will help provide an insider view of important Compact dynamics and highlight transferable principles other communities can use to guide their own efforts to form a strong, purposeful collaborative relationship between different school systems in their city.

Compact Background

A Shift in Thinking Among Key Leaders

The seeds of the Boston Compact were planted as early as 2009 with the establishment of the Boston Schoolchildren’s Consortium (BSC). Convened by the Boston Plan for Excellence, the BSC brought the superintendents from the Boston Public Schools and Archdiocese of Boston together with charter and private school leaders. Over the course of a series of school tours and discussions, relationships began to form and strengthen. As a result, three key leaders - BPS Superintendent Carol Johnson, Catholic Schools Superintendent Dr. Grassa O’Neill and Kevin Andrews, Chair of the Boston Charter Alliance - established stronger relationships with one another. They began to consult one another about their challenges and provide public support for their schools in the media.

In the fall of 2010, the Gates Foundation, also interested in cross-system collaboration, convened a group of district and charter school leaders from cities around the country who had begun to seek “common ground rather than a battleground.” Two leaders from the district and charter school sectors in Boston participated in this convening. When they returned to Boston, then-Mayor Thomas Menino convened district and charter school leadership and charged them with working together for the good of all students. In 2011, aided by a $100,000 planning grant from Gates, Boston school leaders began a series of deeper conversations to explore intersecting interests and potential areas of collaboration. At the time, cross-sector cooperation represented a major shift in Boston’s political and educational landscape.

Signing the Compact

In September 2011, after almost a year of exploratory dialogue, the mayor, Boston School Committee Chair, BPS superintendent, and leaders from the Boston Alliance of Charter Schools representing 16 charter school boards signed a formal “Compact” document officially outlining the commitment of their respective sectors to work together to improve the quality of education for Boston. In the words of founders, the mission of the Compact was to “bring district, charter and Catholic school educators together in order to provide equitable access to high-performing schools and excellent instruction to all students.”

- Executive Director, Charter School, Boston

We get better outcomes for kids when we work together. It also feels better to work together than to work against each other. It makes for a better city.
At the time of the Compact signing, leaders detailed an ambitious agenda of items and issues they wanted to address collaboratively:

- A common enrollment calendar for all schools
- Cross-sector professional development strategies
- A common accountability system (common metrics)
- Better use of city facilities (access to vacant buildings)

Later that school year, in April 2012, the Archdiocese of Boston and the city’s Catholic schools, encouraged by other Boston-based Catholic stakeholder groups, joined the Compact because they served a similar number of students as the charter schools, including many students from low-income families. Combined, the three sectors - the school district, public charters, and Catholic schools - cover approximately 93% of students in the city of Boston. There has been occasional mention among Compact members and other city leaders about including other private and/or religious school sectors but to date there has been no resolute push or pull either way.

This increases our visibility and shows the good things that our sector is doing. It brings accountability. if you’re a part of this, you have to be good. It also shows we have a lot of the same problems.

- Administrator, Catholic Schools Office, Archdiocese of Boston

**Start Up Funding Support**

In December 2012, the Gates Foundation provided a three-year grant of $3.25 million to support Compact work. Over $775,000 in additional funds have also been provided by other Boston-based funders, including Strategic Grant Partners, the Barr Foundation and the Boston Foundation.

**Governance**

The Compact is currently governed by a thirteen-member Steering Committee comprised of four high ranking leaders from each of the three represented sectors and the City’s Chief of Education. For the first two years of the Compact’s life, the Steering Committee met monthly, led by a trio of tri-chairs representing the three sectors; it now meets quarterly, with the co-chairs meeting monthly. Work groups were also formed to manage specific projects; this structure has since been revised to better reflect the Compact’s strategic interests (see Attachment 1–Boston Compact Governance).

The Compact is staffed by two full-time staffers: a skilled coordinator - the “Chief Collaboration Officer” - who serves as a neutral voice, facilitates critical meetings, and manages
operations, as well as an assistant who provides administrative and communication support. Initially housed at the Boston Educational Development Foundation and then Wheelock University, the Compact has since moved to the Boston Private Industry Council which now serves as its fiscal agent.

Core Strategies 2012-2014
The “real work” of the Compact thus far reflects two patterns: projects and initiatives identified by the Steering Committee and proposed to funders [structured programmatic efforts] and the creation of a “table” [the Steering Committee and its subcommittees] where mutual respect and trust has grown and organically generated rich examples of collaborative problem-solving and systemic change.

Practitioner Support Strategies
From the start, Compact leaders wanted a strong set of practitioner-focused strategies that would directly impact student outcomes and spread quality instructional practices across schools in the three sectors. As planning continued and morphed into a formal funding proposal to the Gates Foundation, the Steering Committee landed on a set of six main initiatives:

1. “School Portfolio”: Work designed to treat schools from the three sectors as a single portfolio of assets to be coordinated collaboratively while still recognizing system autonomy; for example, improved coordination operations (calendars, schedules, transportation, student information transfers, etc.) and improved access to school information for families weighing options (e.g., launch of Boston Schools Hub, an online school search tool)

2. School Performance Partnerships: Two “mini compacts” of three schools that enabled educators to work collaboratively to share and/or learn practices that would boost student achievement for three specific subgroups (ELLs, Black & Latino Boys, and students with disabilities)

3. Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL): A three-year WestEd professional development program to improve ELL instruction (144 educators from 22 schools)

4. Boston Compact Leadership Initiative: A cross-sector “community of practice” for 14 pairs of aspiring and veteran principals

5. Black and Latino Boys Literacy Initiative: Small grants to two schools to share practices with partner schools for improving literacy skills for Black and Latino boys in grades 2-4

6. Students with Disabilities: Review of legal and regulatory obligations, development of a system for sharing student records, and an analysis of student data in order to identify and share exemplary practice

Most of these initiatives emerged from the long-running stream of conversations leaders had been having about Compact and its role; one was added later at the request of one sector’s leader and did not reflect a full measure of cross-sector buy-in.

Collaborative Problem-Solving Table
Compact Steering Committee members have been meeting regularly, building trust, and pinpointing system-level improvements, particularly related to school schedules, facilities use, transportation, and other operational issues.

This more open-ended dynamic has resulted in a deeper commitment to improved cross-sector planning and some very tangible system changes:
- A common enrollment calendar for district and charter schools.
- Improved coordination and alignment of school and bus schedules with district and charter schools.
- Three leases of vacant district buildings to charter schools.
- Catholic schools renting “swing space” to charter schools.
- A tri-sector recruitment fair that introduced more than 200 prospective teachers of color to district, charter and Catholic schools in Boston.
- The establishment of a Chief of Education in the mayor’s cabinet (a new role) whose agenda includes all schools collaborating.
Compact Value & Lessons

Taking stock three years into the work, Compact leaders, school staff, evaluators contracted by the Compact, and other city observers summarize the Compact’s value in these terms: it has provided essential “space” (forums) for cross-sector relationship-building, learning, dialogue and problem-solving, and has introduced a powerful mechanism for talking about a “one Boston, all students, all schools” agenda.

Overall Compact Accomplishments

The Compact has been able to:
- Directly engage administrators and staff in 79 district, charter, and Catholic schools (48% of city schools).
- Create the “right relational and political environment” for education in the city and help educators from different sectors learn about each other and “debunk myths” about each sector. People directly involved in the Compact, as well as external observers, talk about a palpable cultural shift in the city and a “healthier, less toxic” tone.
- Create mechanisms for, and demonstrate the value of, cross-system relationship-building and professional development at multiple levels – teachers, principals, and district and sector leaders. This multi-level relationship-building work has “teed things up” so the city can move forward on good ideas that would never be possible otherwise.
- Resolve scheduling and transportation issues between the district and charter school sectors saving an estimated $1 million in transportation costs in the process.
- Establish a strong cross-system approach to students with disabilities that has allowed the three sectors to do together what would have been challenging to do alone; for example, effective transfer of SPED records, identification of model teachers who can be observed by teachers from all sectors.
- Provide a forum leaders can use to thoughtfully explore sensitive issues and navigate sensitive “public debate” on issues related to district, charter, and Catholic school improvement and potential areas of collaboration without the vitriolic debates and public posturing that had colored the landscape for so long.
- Create a strong network of personal connections across sectors. Compact members feel comfortable picking up the phone or emailing colleagues in each sector with questions, issues, and opportunities.
- Successfully bring teachers and administrators from different sectors together to share, explore, test, and reflect on instructional practices together (QTEL, school partnerships, leadership and Black & Latino Boys initiatives, etc. as cross-sector professional development models).

In no small order, these compelling outcomes have bolstered support for the Compact – including support from Boston’s new mayor, new district superintendent, and new Catholic school superintendent – and put the Compact in a strong position to continue and grow even as the initial Gates investment winds down.

Impact on Teaching & Learning

The Compact’s various teaching and learning initiatives, while successful in pockets, have had less impact on instructional quality and student outcomes than members originally hoped. Ambitious to begin with, implementation proved challenging. Initiatives were often slow to develop, diffuse or loose in terms of focus (broad rather than deep), and sometimes lacked strong cross-sector buy-in and participation. They were also costly and ultimately unsustainable without significant external funding.
an extensive, ongoing resource development campaign which would position the Compact as another competitive entity in the city’s already crowded resource development landscape.

Even before the initiatives finished playing out, the Steering Committee had begun to evaluate their impact and revisit essential questions about the nature and role of the Compact itself. It is important to emphasize that Compact members still feel passionately that the Compact should continue to focus on quality instruction and increasing the number of high quality schools and classrooms across the city.

However, identifying the Compact’s specific role in supporting instructional quality is a nuanced, challenging piece of work which needs careful consideration given the size of Compact staff, costs and time demands of program delivery, and the Compact’s overall goal of leveraging and connecting existing assets and expertise first.

Compact leaders, funders and staff have noted, for example, that Boston has organizations that are well-equipped to run high-quality programs for educators and that each school system already has opportunities that could be opened to the other systems (professional development, educator professional learning groups, teacher recruitment fairs, school tours and open houses, etc.). In their eyes, the Compact’s primary value rests in its unique ability to convene sectors, understand the landscape of opportunity and challenges across the sectors, and support highly strategic initiatives that help sectors learn from one another or learn together.

**Governance, Sector Interests and Finding a Shared Cross-Sector Agenda**

As the Boston experience bears out, a Compact’s governance structure needs thoughtful design and nurturing. When the Boston Compact first launched, founders wanted a manageable leadership body, with equal representation from each of the three sectors. Boston has been happy with its Steering Committee (now 13 members, including the mayor’s Chief of Education) and tri-chair arrangement; however, participants stress that steering committee must either be the top administrator or a high level staff person with “ready access” to the top executive of the sector. Compact members also felt they were very wise to hire a skilled coordinator to facilitate meetings, nurture connections, and accelerate activity. In addition to covering critical operational and communication functions, the Compact’s Chief Collaboration Officer has been, in the words of members, our “neutral Switzerland.”

Compact decision-making protocols needed an equal amount of attention and time to develop. While there have been a number of overlapping interests in the Compact, the three sectors do not, nor will they, always share the same interests and priorities. This can sometimes lead to mixed levels of buy-in or enthusiasm. In Boston, the Catholic schools sector has probably experienced this most often, although it has been supportive in many areas even when the work was not central, relevant, or even possible for them. For example, early discussions about using a shared metric (something families could use to compare schools) centered on MCAS results which Catholic schools do not track.

Similarly, important conversations about the use of vacant school facilities and other operational matters were much more meaningful to the district and charter sectors.

This dynamic is natural – which makes it all the more important to acknowledge the different interests and pain points for each sector and, to every extent possible, explore these interests regularly and balance the agenda so that all sectors can maintain the Compact as a priority, while at the same time acknowledging that some areas of work may be of more interest or benefit to a particular sector.

Additionally, many Compact members feel that particular decisions were too top-down or driven by one sector or one person and believe that the process to “listen” to sector interests and make decisions about Compact priorities can be improved. While this is never without challenge given the decision-making dynamics of each sector (one large district, multiple charter
schools/school boards, Catholic diocese), simple methods Steering Committee members have proposed to improve governance and decision-making include; surveys of building level administrators, focus groups, stronger decision-making protocols within subcommittees, strategic planning methods that put sector interests 'on the table' more clearly, etc.

In terms of formalizing specific sector commitments, participation requirements, and investments, Boston Compact founders took a fairly soft line for the first stage of development. Initially, they were concerned that pushing too strongly before building an adequate foundation might backfire and harm the Compact or cause critical people to back away. This is why the original Compact document founders signed leans heavily on language like “explore” and “learn” rather than hard-core sector commitments.

Now, having experienced the pros and cons of their early governance and operational choices, members think that it might be more powerful, for the right city and context, to start with firmer commitments tied to early stage wins and perhaps one “bold” piece of work. The history and tradition of people at the table will always affect how fast and deep a group can go, however, and founders felt Boston still needed time – at least a year - to build trust across the three sectors and feel firsthand the value of their collaborative work. Meanwhile, early stage wins and group activities like getting Compact leaders out together on school visits and tours, can help accelerate, but not eliminate, this natural developmental timeline and reassure antsy and impact-focused supporters and funders.

**Looking Ahead | Boston Compact Future Outlook**

As the Compact moves beyond the three-year Gates Foundation grant, members have engaged in a deep discussion about sustainability and the role of the Compact. In the eyes of many, the Compact has been a group of wonderfully dedicated practitioners “flying below the radar” (often deliberately) to do good work. Members understand, however, that few people beyond those directly involved in Compact activities are aware of what the Compact is or does.

With a new mayor and, for the first time, a chief of education for the city, both of whom value the Compact’s cross-sector vision, there is an opportunity to play a stronger, more visible role in promoting a shared citywide education agenda and tackle challenging issues related to data sharing, equity, and legislative advocacy on behalf of all Boston students.

“Unified enrollment” (a collaborative school application system), something the Compact has explored, for example, is viewed by many Compact steering committee members and some funders as a natural piece of work that represents a higher profile way to shift and showcase how systems can work together.

Whether the Compact throws its support into unified enrollment or not, many Compact members and other city leaders believe that an important window for cross-sector collaboration is now open in Boston and may not be forever. They believe the Compact is in a unique position to move a “one Boston, all kids, all schools” agenda in ways that have not been possible until now.

Structurally, the Compact has already started to signal a shift by adding the mayor’s Chief of Education as voting member of the Steering Committee and to the tri-chairs/executive committee. This allows the Compact to maintain its independence – a way for practitioners and the three sectors to express their collaborative voice and cross-sector interests – while at the same time establishing a strong link with the mayor and his cabinet.

The decision to shift to a more visible, leadership role for the Compact has strong support from city leaders and funders but is not entirely without concern. Compact members do not want to lose their focus on quality instruction and practitioner-oriented strategies and, for some, the idea of a “leadership

---

“This has broken down barriers between the sectors. They now have lots of things they can do together. It’s an incredible foundation.

- Executive Director, Philanthropic Organization, Boston
agenda” could potentially be too far removed from the real work of schools. Members are also concerned that “going above the radar” will make some conversations much more challenging or draw fire prematurely, which could be the undoing of good ideas for Boston families and schools. These are cautionary notes which Compact leaders will need to pay attention to going forward. At the same time, they and the city around them feel the Compact is uniquely qualified to provide the cross-sector voice and leadership Boston needs.

Boston Compact leaders have also been working through the financial implications of the waning Gates Foundation grant. On one hand, the Compact could begin a round of intensive fundraising to raise another large chunk of money to support its work. However, city leaders and funders, while enthusiastic about the Compact and its potential, are cool to this idea. Current thinking is that the Compact does not need large amounts of funding to play the role it wants to play: it needs a small budget for coordination staff for now and perhaps, at a later point, highly targeted grants for a “bold leadership” initiative or targeted project. There is also a growing feeling among members that each sector should “put skin in the game” – contribute something, even if only a small amount, to support core operations - because the Compact is a strategic extension of their sector’s work and therefore a strong investment.

Recommendations for New Compacts Elsewhere

Compacts are, of course, creatures of their community environments. Not all of Boston’s experience will translate to other communities. City size, timing, leadership turnover, national funding opportunities, and other factors all played a role in Boston. However, several key lessons and Compact development principles from the Boston experience are absolutely transferable to other contexts:

Only do together what no one sector can do alone. Compacts, especially those tackling longstanding community challenges, should not be in the business of doing initiatives that each partner or sector could do alone. Instead, a compact’s work should be based on “doing together what we cannot do alone.” This should be a constant mantra that reminds members about their vision and the thinking that drives investments, initiatives, infrastructure, etc.

Deep partnership work requires organizational depth and commitment. It is one thing for organizational leaders to sign a compact document, quite another for Compact ideas and activities to penetrate each sector. A city the size of Boston may feel this challenge more acutely but it is something every compact will face. Going “one person deep” isn’t enough. People up, down, and across each organization need to understand the compact’s vision and their role in it. Marketing, positioning, outreach and communication can’t be afterthoughts or managed in an ad hoc way.

Most importantly, sector leaders must be daily activists for the cause. Depending on the community context and current culture of district and charter collaboration, participants may need some time to build relationships and trust; however, in relatively short order, Compact leaders must put in place explicit plans and actions designed to expand buy-in for Compact ideas within organizations and with parents and families. This can’t land on the shoulders of one person who goes to Compact meetings. Expanding Compact ideas within a single organization, across sectors, and across the community takes leadership and legwork.

Do less, better, and more deeply. Compacts can have incredible value as convening, communication and problem-solving mechanisms. The Boston story underscores this and suggests that new Compacts think about even more ways to maximize their convening role. However, to go from conversations to a “Compact” is an important jump. It requires more from everyone. Networking, smaller projects and programs that are nice but not essential or systemic…these can be done without a cross-sector Compact. Grant funds can provide an opportunity to test strategies; however, they can also give life to projects that have low or lopsided buy-in, little systemic impact, and low prospects for sustainability.
Instead, Compacts should fix their sights on ideas, actions and decisions that fundamentally improve the way each collaborating sector “does business” and how partners work collectively to get results that no one system can get alone and that benefit all city students. To achieve this, Compact leaders need to block out regular quality time to explore sector interests, tune out external noise, and make a shared commitment to systemic change and to a shared agenda that will drive decisions about what work to undertake (or not).

Think of the compact as a “verb” not a “noun.” Many collaborative efforts experience a common identity crisis: are we an organization, a thing of our own, or something else? People from different organizations convene around a shared interest, need or opportunity. Over time, the group takes on a life and infrastructure of its own: it gets staff, seeks and typically depends on outside grants, and often needs a “home.” It launches initiatives or runs programs - or strategies that look and act like programs. Members debate becoming their own independent 501(c)(3). This is sometimes a subtle evolution in thinking; sometimes not. However, Compacts should not be not separate things: they are what we do together to make fundamental changes in community systems.

There are critical questions that can help reveal whether or not people truly understand this mindset:

- Do we see ourselves as a shared/integrated resource base?
- Are we changing roles and job descriptions in each sector to reflect Compact ideas and activities?
- Does the work our Compact chooses to do reflect an essential change collaborating sectors want to make?
- At the end of the day, have we changed as leaders and educators and does our community benefit as a result of the way we work together?

**Final Thought**

Families and educators living in cities with a mix of district, charter and private school options have undoubtedly experienced a fair share of suspicion, vitriol, and misunderstanding between the sectors. In some communities, this history may seem like more than a Compact-like group can overcome. However, as the Boston experience demonstrates: No one sector has all the answers. Each sector can learn from the other and collaboration across the sectors benefits families and schools alike. Collaboration won’t always be easy but is in a community’s interest to try.

As a member of the Boston Compact describes it: “The Compact is like the United Nations. We can’t always stop the wars but the world needs us and sometimes we can broker peace and help people. There will be debates – wars even – but the Compact will remain a neutral zone and even a table for compromise.”

---

**We have to make sure we don’t get lost in the glitter. We can’t be afraid to engage in difficult issues like instruction but we need to do it well and deep.**

- Head of School, Charter School, Boston
Helpful Resources

Boston Compact
www.bostoncompact.org

Original Boston Compact Agreement (2011)

Boston Compact Bylaws (2015)

District-Charter Collaboration Compact: Interim Report 2013 | Center on Reinventing Public Education
www.crpe.org/publications/district-charter-collaboration-compact-interim-report

Charter, private, and public schools work together in Boston | Kappan Magazine
# Boston Compact Strategies Snapshot 2012-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Overall Value &amp; “Bang for the Buck”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Steering Committee                     | • Gave high level practitioners a forum for regular discussion, problem-solving  
• Improved personal relationships, “open door” access to people across sectors | • Uneven “weight”, participation, or sense of engagement and value for different sectors  
• Considerable workload for co-chairs, some Steering Committee members | High value. Led to changing tone of education discussion in city, myth-busting, bridge-building.                         |
| School Portfolio (now Operations Subcommittee) | • Viewed as a way to impact families quickly, gain Compact visibility (e.g., Boston Schools Hub) and showcase schools  
• Helped lay a foundation for universal enrollment  
• Helped address charter sector’s pain point about facilities (three new building leases) and BPS’ pain point of transportation costs | • Differences between the sectors about operational issues and interests (e.g., not all sectors affected by or interested in transportation, facilities) | High value. Led to important improvements e.g., common enrollment calendar, better facilities planning.                   |
| Cross-School Partnerships              | • Provided a strategy to engage building-based practitioners and impact teaching and learning  
• Improved cross-sector relationships and helped improve perspectives of each sector  
• Showed potential of cross-sector professional development/professional learning communities  
• Identified and spread effective instructional practices within small partnerships (e.g., teaching strategies for closing the gaps between students with disabilities and their peers in Algebra skills) | • Partnerships developed more slowly than anticipated, required significant facilitation or technical assistance support  
• Partnership guidelines were loose, focus and level of intensity highly variable or diffuse  
• Dependent on busy educator schedules, irregular participation | Only some modest improvements in instructional practice. Structure and focus of these needs to be revised if continued. (Partnerships Subcommittee has proposal for two new partnerships structured to incorporate lessons learned.) |
| Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL) | • Preliminary evidence that students of QTEL-trained teachers are more likely to improve English proficiency level | • Irregular participation / attendance  
• Uneven buy-in and leadership across sectors  
• State department of education rolled out RETELL, another ELL professional development program, which schools needed to be in compliance at the same time as the Compact unveiled QTEL – this led to reduced participation. | Viewed as something each sector could do for itself or already has resources to do and could invite/extend invite to other sectors. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
<th>OVERALL VALUE &amp; “BANG FOR THE BUCK”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston Compact Leadership Initiative (BCLI)</strong></td>
<td>- Explicit focus on issues of equity at the school level&lt;br&gt; - 21% increase in pre/post surveys of principals feeling that other sectors faced similar challenges&lt;br&gt; - 100% participants said that, after the program, they have at least one colleague in another sector they would call for support&lt;br&gt; - The Harvard Graduate School of Education (HGSE) added Catholic school principals to their Boston instructional rounds network as a result of the BCLI</td>
<td>- Time-intensive to run a program and the Compact lacked financial resources to sustain it</td>
<td>Despite positive reviews, the Steering Committee decided in March 2014 to hold BCLI as a one-year pilot only. The Harvard Graduate School of Education and the Lynch Foundation Leadership Academy are already in this space and are better equipped and resourced to maintain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black &amp; Latino Boys Literacy Initiative</strong></td>
<td>- Teachers reported improved practices&lt;br&gt; - The school grantee with experience in cross-sector coaching was very well received by colleagues in partner schools and contracted for additional work&lt;br&gt; - Minimal work for Compact staff (as was the intent of model)</td>
<td>- The school grantee without cross-sector experience needed assistance introducing and understanding each sector’s context.&lt;br&gt; - Lack of strong focus, slow start/progress&lt;br&gt; - Tended to focus on quality teaching in general rather than practices specifically related to Black and Latino boys</td>
<td>Initial work stopped, minimal impact. The Compact has since drafted a thought paper looking at four Boston schools effectively closing achievement gaps for Black and Latino boys and is determining next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students with Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>- Perceptions around which schools were or were not serving SWD was central to establishment of the Compact&lt;br&gt; - Group built sufficient trust; as a result, five charter schools signed non-disclosure agreements with BPS and shared all their student-level data&lt;br&gt; - Group then identified district and charter schools/classrooms in which students with high levels of need were thriving in inclusive settings, since all three sectors are moving to inclusion. Teachers are observing four schools now.</td>
<td>- Catholic schools do not categorize students in the same way, nor do they use the same standardized tests as public schools, so have been largely left out of the data</td>
<td>Moderate, with potential for greater impact in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Boston Compact Governance Changes 2012-2015

2011 Governance Structure When Compact Launched

Steering Committee
- 5 high level leaders from each sector (district, charter) with equal votes
- Co-chairs (BPS, Boston Alliance of Charter Schools)
- 2 year terms
- Monthly meetings

Work Groups
- Organized to support core strategy areas / specific initiatives; School Portfolio work group created to “to inform the vision for the portfolio of schools and strategic decision-making” (joint student data analysis, joint recommendations for student enrollment and assignment, facilities and transportation planning, etc.)
- Chairs, not necessarily on Steering Committee
- Monthly meetings

Staff
- “Chief Collaboration Officer”
- 1 staff/consultant

2015 Governance Structure

Steering Committee
- 4-member Executive Committee: 1 high level leader from each sector (district, charter, and Catholic) and the mayor’s Chief of Education, equal votes
- 3 year staggered renewable terms
- Quarterly meetings
- Formal bylaws adopted July 2015

Subcommittees
- 6 standing subcommittees
- 1 ad hoc committee (Enrollment)
- Chaired by Steering Committee member
- Meetings: monthly, bi-monthly, or semi-annually as needed

Staff
- “Chief Collaboration Officer” and assistant
- 2 staff

Current Subcommittee Charges

Governance: Drive bylaw revisions and nominations to Steering Committee, research governance strategies with an eye towards sustainability

School Partnerships: Build cross-sector educator relationships, identify and scale effective practices, close achievement gaps.

Teaching & Learning: Examine centralized data to determine for each of the Compact’s focus subgroups (students with disabilities, black and Latino boys, ELL students) which practices are improving student outcomes. Work with School Partnerships to explore and proliferate areas of promising practice.

Operations: In the interest of creating a level playing field for the three sectors, share operational practices and data across sectors transparently to promote knowledge and create opportunities for collaborative efficiencies

Enrollment: Shape and, if appropriate, support implementation of a proposal for universal enrollment across district and charter sectors. Align with Catholic schools to the extent possible.