

# District Review Report

## Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical School District



Review conducted April 8-11, 2013

---

Center for District and School Accountability  
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

### Organization of this Report

Franklin County RVTSD District Review Overview .....	1
Franklin County RVTSD District Review Findings .....	8
Franklin County RVTSD District Review Recommendations .....	30
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....	40
Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance .....	42
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	52

**Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906  
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Replay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



This document was prepared by the  
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner  
**Published December 2013**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2013 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
*Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."*

This document printed on recycled paper

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



# Franklin County RVTSD District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of system wide functions using the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) six district standards: leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial and asset management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

Districts reviewed in the 2012-2013 school year included those classified into Level 3<sup>1</sup> of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance in each of the state's six regions: Greater Boston, Berkshires, Northeast, Southeast, Central, and Pioneer Valley. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

## Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards above. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in each of the district standards review documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers' association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. Subsequent to the on-site review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE. *District review reports focus primarily on the system's most significant strengths and challenges, with an emphasis on identifying areas for improvement.*

## Site Visit

The site visit to the Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical School District was conducted from April 8 through 11, 2013. The site visit included 30 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 45 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted one focus group with nine academic teachers, five vocational technical teachers, and one guidance counselor.

---

<sup>1</sup> Districts selected were in Level 3 in school year 2012-2013; all served one or more schools among the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving common grade levels pursuant to 603 CMR 2.05(2)(a). The districts with the lowest aggregate performance and least movement in Composite Performance Index (CPI) in their respective regions were selected for review from among those districts not exempt under Chapter 15, Section 55A. A district was exempt if another comprehensive review was completed or scheduled within nine months of the review window.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 14 academic classrooms and all 13 vocational program areas. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

## District Profile

Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical School District is a regional vocational school district representing 19 towns. There are 24 members of the school committee and they meet once monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 1, 2012. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent/principal, and the business manager. The district has one principal leading a single school district. There are three other school administrators, including the academic and vocational curriculum director; the coordinator of pupil services, special education, and guidance; and the dean of students. Administrative positions have been mostly stable over the past five years, although the school committee, acting favorably on the superintendent’s recommendation, has recently approved adding one new administrative position and splitting the position of the academic and vocational curriculum director into two supervisory areas, one for academic and the other for vocational programs. There are a total of 54.8 teachers in the district.

As of 2012, 518 students were enrolled in the technical school:

**Table 1: Franklin County RVTSD  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Franklin County Technical	High School	9-12	518
*As of October 1, 2012			

Between 2008 and 2012 overall student enrollment has been relatively stable. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were 7.3 percent higher in fiscal year 2011 than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 18 vocational districts of similar size (less than 1,000 students): \$21,476 compared with \$20,018. Actual net school spending has been well above what is required under state law, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district’s level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6) annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for the district and for

schools and student subgroups that have at least four years of sufficient data and are therefore eligible to be classified into an accountability and assistance level (1-5). “Sufficient data” means that at least 20 students in a district or school or at least 30 students in a subgroup were assessed on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests for the four years under review.

Four-and two-year trend data are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. Data on student performance is also available in Appendix B. In both this section and Appendix B, the data reported is the most recent available.

**1. The district is in Level 3<sup>2</sup> at the 18<sup>th</sup> percentile.**

- A. The Franklin County Technical High School is among the lowest performing 20% of high schools based on its four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other high schools.<sup>3</sup>

**2. The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.**

- A. The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students and for high needs<sup>4</sup> students is less than 75 for the district. The district’s cumulative PPI<sup>5</sup> is 70 for all students and 63 for high needs students. The district’s cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 64 (low income students) and 67 (White students).

---

<sup>2</sup> Due to the district’s Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of “Needs Technical Assistance (NTA).” This serves as an indication that while areas of the district’s performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues.

<sup>3</sup> A district is classified into the level of its lowest-performing school unless it has been placed in Level 4 or 5 by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education independent of the level of its schools.

<sup>4</sup> The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

<sup>5</sup> The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district’s, school’s or subgroup’s cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group’s annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale.

<sup>6</sup> The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school’s performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades.

- 3. The school's English language arts (ELA) performance is very low<sup>7</sup> relative to other districts and its growth<sup>8</sup> is moderate.<sup>9</sup>**
- A.** The school met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities and White students.<sup>10</sup>
  - B.** The school met its annual growth targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, and White students.
  - C.** The school earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for students with disabilities and White students.
  - D.** In 2012 the school demonstrated very low performance in grade 10 relative to other high schools.
  - E.** In 2012 the school demonstrated moderate growth in grade 10.
  - F.** Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful<sup>11</sup> gains in grade 10 in the CPI and in the percentage of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

---

<sup>7</sup>All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state's measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: "very high", "high", "moderate", "low" or "very low". In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts' CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools' CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department's School and District Profiles website: [http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state\\_report/mcas.aspx](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx).

<sup>8</sup>Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student's or group of students' achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student's MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles ("academic peers"). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group's progress toward proficiency based on the group's current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group's progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates "moderate" or "typical" growth if the group's median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles.

<sup>9</sup>For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a.

<sup>10</sup>A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target.

<sup>11</sup>The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially

**4. The school's mathematics performance is very low relative to other schools and its growth is low.<sup>12</sup>**

- A. The school did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.
- B. The school did not meet its annual growth targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, and White students.
- C. The school did not earn extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for any reportable subgroup. The school earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for all students, students with disabilities, and White students.
- D. In 2012 the school demonstrated very low performance in grade 10 relative to other districts.
- E. In 2012 the school demonstrated low growth in grade 10.
- F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 10 in the CPI and the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced. Most of the declines were attributed to its performance over both periods except for the SGP, which declined the most between 2011 and 2012.

**5. The school's science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is low relative to other schools.<sup>13</sup>**

- A. The school met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students and White students; the school did not meet its annual improvement targets for high needs students and low income students.
- B. The school earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, high needs students, low income students, and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for all students, high needs students, and White students.

---

meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa.

<sup>12</sup> For mathematics trends in the aggregate see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b.

<sup>13</sup> For STE trends in the aggregate see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c.

- C. In 2012 the school demonstrated low performance in grade 10 relative to other high schools.
  - D. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated both gains and declines in the CPI and the percentage of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* that were not potentially meaningful. Between 2011 and 2012, the percentage of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* remained constant (70 percent).
- 6. In 2012, the district met its annual improvement targets for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate, the five-year cohort graduation rate, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate.<sup>14</sup> Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available<sup>15</sup>, the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate declined, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased.<sup>16</sup>**
- A. Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 3.1 percentage points, from 87.6% to 90.7%, an increase of 3.5 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 2.2 percentage points, from 92.9% to 90.7%, a decrease of 2.4 percent.
  - B. Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate increased 1.1 percentage points, from 94.4% to 95.5%, an increase of 1.2 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it increased 2.0 percentage points, from 93.5% to 95.5%, an increase of 2.1 percent.
  - C. Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased 0.6 percentage points, from 1.4% to 2.0%, an increase of 40.0% percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it increased 1.6 percentage points, from 0.4% to 2.0%, an increase of 390.0% percent.
- 7. The district's rates of in-school suspensions and out-of-school suspension in 2011-2012 were significantly higher than the statewide rates<sup>17</sup>.**

---

<sup>14</sup> All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state's federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher.

<sup>15</sup> Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote.

<sup>16</sup> For annual dropout rate trends for the last three years available see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available see Tables B7a and B7b.

<sup>17</sup> Statistical significance based on one sample T test.  $P \leq .05$

- A. The rate of in-school suspensions for Franklin County RVTSD was 17.8 percent, almost three times the state rate for grades 9-12 of 6.5 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Franklin County RVTSD was 17.6 percent, almost twice the state rate for grades 9-12 of 9.0 percent.
- B. There was not a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for in-school suspensions, but the rates were higher than the state rates<sup>18</sup>. The in-school-suspension rates for reportable groups were: 21.4 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 26.7 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 17.1 percent for White students.
- C. There was not a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for out-of-school suspensions, but the rates were higher than the state rates. The out-of-school-suspension rates for reportable subgroups were: 28.6 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 20.0 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 17.1 percent for White students.
- D. There were high rates of in-school suspensions without significant difference for both high needs students and non high needs students (20.2 percent and 14.2 percent), low income students and non low income students (21.5 percent and 14.3 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (18.0 percent and 17.8 percent).
- E. There were high rates of out-of-school suspensions without significant difference for both high needs students and non high needs students (20.5 percent and 13.2 percent), low income students and non low income students (24.4 percent and 11.3 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (13.3 percent and 19.1 percent).
- F. On average students in the Franklin County RVTSD missed 3.5 days per disciplinary action<sup>19</sup>, slightly higher than the state average of 3.1.

---

<sup>18</sup> Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square.  $P \leq .05$

<sup>19</sup> Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting.

# Franklin County RVTSD District Review Findings

---

## Strengths

### *Leadership & Governance*

- 1. The designation of Franklin County Technical School as a Level 3 school spurred the principal to “more carefully examine our academic curriculum,” and provided the impetus for the school to move forward in math instruction, program coordination, and personnel evaluation.**
  - A.** The school committee approved the adoption of the Math180 Program in November, 2012. (See the following finding.)
    1. An additional math teacher was hired in January, 2013.
    2. “[P]ull-out math courses for all 9<sup>th</sup> and 10th grade students during their vocational week” were initiated beginning in February, 2013.
    3. “Adaptive math software packaged [sic] . . . was developed and implemented as part of the math pull-out program” in February, 2013.
  - B.** Additionally, at the time of the review an MCAS academy was to be held on four Saturdays before the administration of the math MCAS exam “to review content and test taking strategies as a means to close the achievement gap.”
  - C.** The budget for fiscal year 2014 includes a requested appropriation for the newly created position of vocational coordinator to share the job responsibilities of the existing position of academic and vocational director in order to initiate, expedite, and complete improvements in curriculum development and teacher evaluation.
    1. The presence of two coordinators, one for the academic program and one for the vocational program, mirrors the structure at many other vocational schools.
    2. The additional position of vocational coordinator enjoys the support of a broad constituency, including:
      - a. The school committee
      - b. The superintendent
      - c. Financial leaders and administrators from the towns
      - d. School council
  - D.** Under a Memorandum of Understanding with the teachers’ association, the school began the implementation of the new educator evaluation system developed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The

implementation began during the summer of 2012 with administrator training. Teacher training in the new system has been the focus of professional development during full and partial professional development in-service days for a total of 17.5 hours by the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

1. Beginning in 2009, the school began to place a greater emphasis on teacher evaluations because “Previously there were minimal observations for teachers as it pertains to instruction, assessment, and learning.” This perspective was shared by the representatives of the teachers’ association who noted, “The previous evaluation system was terrible.”
2. The four member evaluation team is composed of the principal, the dean of students, the curriculum director, and the coordinator of pupil personnel services. In interviews with the district review team, each member of the teacher evaluation team was easily able to detail the number of teachers he had been assigned to evaluate, as well as the number of self-assessments reviewed, the number of SMART Goals submitted, and finally, the number of walkthroughs conducted.
3. The principal expressed confidence that the mid-cycle formative evaluations would be completed by June, 2013 for the first group of educators to be evaluated; and he expressed a similar confidence that by June, 2014, the summative evaluations for those educators would be done, and the formative evaluations for the rest of the staff would also be completed.
4. Administrators noted that the teachers’ association was very cooperative about the new teacher evaluation system. Representatives of the teachers’ association expressed the opinion that good feedback (on teacher performance) was being provided, that the principal took evaluations seriously, and that “the new system is [was] better.”
5. Members of the teacher focus group said that although there was some variation among evaluators, the “teachers seem to like the evaluations . . . when they are done and given feedback.” Other teachers, in a curriculum and instruction interview, said that they were “getting lots of feedback,” and that the evaluator “sends notes . . . this is great . . .”

**Impact:** The decision to examine the academic curriculum in response to the district’s Level 3 designation, coupled with the adoption of programs and administrative restructuring to improve student performance and teacher effectiveness, has enabled the district to begin to address the circumstances that gave rise to the Level 3 designation.

## ***Curriculum and Instruction***

**2. The principal has acted strategically by analyzing student assessment data and by providing additional academic support in math to all grade 9 and 10 students. For students not yet on track to proficiency, the principal and school leaders created the Saturday MCAS academy to provide additional instructional time and support for students taking the spring 2013 MCAS assessments.**

- A.** As a response to the school being designated as a Level 3 school and to an analysis of MCAS math data, the principal presented the Math180 Turnaround Plan in the 2011-2012 School Improvement Plan.
1. The principal presented the Math180 Turnaround Plan to the school committee, to the finance committee and also to the school council. All aspects of the program were shared with teachers.
  2. The Math180 Turnaround Plan included a eight-step initiative.
    - a. Beginning in October 2012 regular department meetings were held to review instructional practices, aggregated data, and alignment to MASSCORE and the new Common Core Standards.
    - b. Beginning in December 2012 a data team was organized with the goal of analyzing student performance; however, at the time of the review the district did not have any curriculum benchmarks or benchmark assessments in place.
    - c. A math software program ALEKS (Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces) was purchased and a new math lab with 24 computers was set up. Students have access to the ALEKS program at school and at home. In interviews the principal described ALEKS as a diagnostic assessment tool that finds learning gaps and provides guided instruction in math. The principal said that he hoped that students and parents would engage in the program at home. Students began using the program in February 2013.
    - d. A math instructor was reassigned in January 2013 to teach and monitor the program.
    - e. Interviews with school leaders and teachers confirmed that during shop week all grade 9 and 10 students were scheduled for the ALEKS for one period per shop week in addition to a double math period during their academic week.
    - f. In December 2012 math instructors had professional development on the ALEKS program.
    - g. Instructional activators, math MCAS skills practice for five minutes every day, were implemented in October 2012.
    - h. An experienced math teacher was hired in January 2013 to replace the math teacher who moved to the ALEKS lab.
- B.** An additional academic support was made available to students for the spring 2013 MCAS mathematics testing.

1. In interviews the review team was told that the school would use an academic support grant to offer a MCAS Academy for four consecutive Saturdays to 50-60 students before the 2013 MCAS mathematics testing. The focus of the classes, which were to be held for 2 and one-half hours each Saturday, was to be on number sense and test taking strategies.
2. The MCAS academy would also be available for students who scored below 240 in the previous tests.

**Impact:** Through the creation and implementation of a plan to provide additional math support to all grade 9 and 10 students through the ALEKS math program, and through the added benefit of the MCAS Academy, students who experience math learning challenges are to receive additional support. Both the ALEKS math program and the MCAS Academy have the potential to help students achieve at higher levels in mathematics.

- 3. The principal has required that all teachers in both the academic program and in the career/vocational and technical program keep daily lesson plans and has implemented an effective way to monitor and offer feedback on those plans.**
  - A.** During the three years before the review, the principal assumed greater responsibilities in the area of curriculum and instructional leadership focusing on accountability in lesson planning.
    1. Before the principal's arrival lesson plans were not required, nor were they reviewed by the administration.
    2. In an effort to have more consistency and a more systematized approach to lesson planning each teacher was given a green binder for the purpose of keeping daily lesson plans and was asked to use them for lesson plans.
      - a. Training for writing lesson plans was given during a faculty meeting and after school. If teachers did not meet expectations in writing lesson plans, they were required to attend a mandatory training after school.
      - b. Interviews with teachers and school leaders and a review of documents showed that lesson plans were now required to be kept in the green binder.
      - c. District documents and interviews with teachers and school leaders confirmed that there were minimum requirements for lesson plans: Outcomes/objective/goals; DESE standards/strands; materials/resources; method/instructional practices; assessments; and a reflection/self-assessment.
  3. Green binders containing lesson plans are collected each trimester and reviewed by administrators with teachers receiving written comments. In addition, each time an administrator does a walkthrough, lesson plans are checked to see if they are up-to-date, include the minimum requirements, are complete, and represent every instructional day.

- a. Interviews with teachers and school leaders and a review of district documents showed that the green binders contained teachers' daily lessons with unit titles, objectives, standards, agendas, instructional practices, and lists of assessments. Teachers may also upload their lessons on TeachPoint.
  - b. When teachers were asked if administrators looked at their lesson plans, they said, "They look at the green book when they come in. They look at our plans and write comments in the book."
- B.** The implementation of the new evaluation tool has had a positive impact on the frequency and quality of feedback teachers are receiving on their lesson planning.
- 1. Teachers told the team that compared to "prior evaluation process" which they described as "lacking" they were receiving more frequent feedback under the new evaluation system and described the feedback as "good."
  - 2. In interviews teachers told the team that "all teachers are getting feedback."

**Impact:** The school has created a consistent system for monitoring and giving feedback on lesson plans in both the academic and the career/vocational and technical programs.

## ***Assessment***

- 4. Student clubs and competitive skills events constitute multiple forms of authentic assessment that give fullness to curriculum taught in shop classes.**
- A.** Ninth grade students began work on instructional portfolios during the 2011-2012 school year. There is an identified rubric that requires specific artifacts demonstrating authentic learning outcomes, and students are expected to carry forward the maintenance and improvement of the portfolios for their entire high school careers.
  - B.** For several years, 12<sup>th</sup> grade students have been required to complete "capstone" projects to qualify for graduation, demonstrating acquisition of essential vocational skills. Administrators described numerous projects, including such things as construction of storage sheds on municipal property, community improvement projects of all kinds, and health related projects in area nursing homes. Team members witnessed students working on their capstone projects in several shops during classroom visits.
  - C.** All students are encouraged to participate in Skills USA, Future Farmers of America (FFA) and Business Professionals Association (BPA) competitions and activities throughout the school year, with the district assuming some of the expenses related thereto. At the time of the review student awards were displayed in the superintendent's office and other prominent places throughout the school building. A slide show featuring demonstration projects and award presentation ceremonies was continuously highlighted in a display case in

the main lobby during the school day. Pictures of competition winners and highly creative capstone projects are prominently featured on the district's web site home page.

**Impact:** Schools are more than buildings where students are helped to become "proficient or advanced." They are places where young people grow and develop into young adults and future citizens. The social, interpersonal, and occupational skills learned in the student organizations such as Skills USA, Business Professionals of America, the Future Farmers Association, and similar groups are a valuable source of enrichment, providing fullness to the curriculum and allowing students to demonstrate the acquisition of both vocational and academic skills. Skills such as interviewing, estimating job costs, and contract negotiation complete the curriculum in many practical ways while encouraging team building and socialization skills valuable in the 21st century workplace.

### ***Human Resources and Professional Development***

#### **5. The Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical School District, a Race to the Top district, has made progress in the implementation of the recently enacted educator evaluation regulations.**

- A.** School administrators and teachers spoke positively about the implementation of the new educator evaluation system.
  - 1. School administrators said they were making good progress in implementing the new educator evaluation process.
  - 2. Teachers did not express any major complaints and said that they were receiving good feedback from walkthroughs.
- B.** The district has formed the school administrative evaluation team and the teacher evaluation work group.
  - 1. The school administrative evaluation team consists of the principal, vocational and academic curriculum coordinator, director of pupil and personnel services, and dean of students/assistant principal. Each administrator has 10 to 12 academic and vocational teachers to evaluate. The principals said that the teachers' association has been very cooperative. The principal said that he has been able to have good dialogue with the teachers' association about the evaluative process and felt a sense of trust and momentum.
  - 2. The teacher evaluation work group consists of the principal, vocational and academic curriculum coordinator, academic teacher/association vice president, vocational teacher, and the career enhancement teacher. The purpose of the work group is to get feedback on the evaluation process. An in-house survey was created and distributed In December, 2012.
- C.** The district has taken the following steps in the educator evaluation implementation process.

1. A one year MOU was signed in July, 2012. The district and the teachers' association agreed to adopt the ESE model with the understanding to accept best practices.
  2. Teachers in the current half of the two-year evaluation cycle being used by the district, 40 teachers, were to participate in 2012-2013. All teachers are to participate beginning in 2013-2014.
  3. The principal attended four to five ESE training workshops in summer of 2012, then provided training for other administrators at lunch group meetings. In September 2012, teachers received three hours of training on the evaluation system and self-assessment and goals. The principal developed his own self-assessment at a teacher training workshop; this was followed by departmental small group self-assessment.
    - a. Teachers' association representatives expressed concern that the training was not totally clear on self-assessment and that the model suited larger districts with a lot of professional development time.
  4. School administration selected TeachPoint software to implement the educator evaluation process. The software provides an opportunity to create a walkthrough for vocational teachers. Teachers receive quick feedback on walkthroughs via TeachPoint software. Teachers' association members expressed some concerns about software operation; however, a lot of support has been given. Teacher evaluation information is stored in the TeachPoint online software.
  5. At the time of the district review visit from April 8 -11, 2013, according to administrators, more than 30 self-assessments and sets of goals had been completed and 225 walkthroughs had been performed, including some for teachers not yet under the new evaluation system.
  6. The review team did not find any new educator evaluations in administrator or teacher personnel files except the superintendent's self-assessment and goals.
- D.** At the time of the review, the principal said the following about implementation of the educator evaluation system:
1. The principal expected to conduct at least three walk-throughs for each teacher in the first evaluative cycle.
  2. Mid-cycle formative evaluations for 40 teachers, including all teachers without professional teacher status (PTS), would be completed by June 2013.
  3. The principal expressed confidence that teachers in the current half of the evaluation cycle would complete their summative evaluations and teachers in the second half of the evaluative cycle would complete their formative evaluations by June 2014.
- E.** The district is not following the terms of the model contract it adopted, which require that educators without PTS have their evaluations completed at least annually (Article 16B).

**Impact:** The district has succeeded in creating a vehicle with the potential to significantly improve the quality of teaching and learning in the district, a vehicle whose value is recognized by teachers. When the system is fully and properly implemented, for instance with its non-PTS teachers receiving evaluations at least annually and two-year evaluation

plans being reserved for teachers with higher ratings, it will promote the development and overall effectiveness of professional staff.

### ***Student Support***

- 6. The district offers a wide range of supplemental instructional services and supports for students with disabilities. The district uses a data driven approach and multiple sources of information to identify students with disabilities who are not achieving proficiency or performing at grade level. It also has a pre-vocational curriculum.**
- A.** At Franklin County Technical School (FCTS), administrators and teachers look at multiple sources of data to review students below grade level on an individual basis and provide support services for those students with mild or moderate disabilities or behavioral needs.
    - 1. At FCTS academic intervention services for students with disabilities are available through additional developmental reading and math, technical reading, organizational supports or from a continuum of special education placements in academic resource rooms, counseling, or a combination of programs.
  - B.** There are comprehensive attempts to meet the needs of students with severe developmental disabilities through pre-vocational training programs and fostered transitions to employment.
    - 1. In the pre-vocational curriculum instruction is individualized in literacy, math and other developmental areas.
    - 2. To address social and emotional or other needs, behavioral modifications strategies are used to teach social skills, and related services for speech, language, and physical and occupational therapy are provided in this setting.

**Impact:** The variety of supports available for students with disabilities is likely to raise their level of achievement; it has perhaps contributed to proficiency rates for the school's students with disabilities being higher in 2012 than those of students with disabilities statewide in two out of three subjects tested on MCAS, ELA and science.

### ***Finance and Asset Management***

- 7. The annual budget document provides an understandable picture of the financial needs of the regional school district to the member communities' municipal officials, and the financial management of the district is considered excellent by the municipal officials.**
- A.** The annual budget document includes a report of actual expenditures to date for the current fiscal year, highlights personnel changes, renovations, and initiatives in fiscal year 2013, and proposed personnel changes and initiatives for fiscal year 2014. It provides detailed budget functions and line item funding with four years of data, as well as the requested and approved funding for the new budget year.

- B. It provides clear explanations for major budget changes in areas such as district administration, instructional services, transportation and food services costs, and energy and employee insurance (in which there were savings.)

**Impact:** The district school committee said that town meetings passed the budget most times without any questions, and that all 19 municipalities of the regional school district have responded by supporting the requested district budget during the recent difficult economic times. Municipal officials indicated that a trust factor has evolved within the regional school district as a result of the comprehensive budget document and the financial information communicated in an open and timely manner.

## **Challenges and Areas for Growth**

### ***Leadership & Governance***

#### **8. The district does not engage in long range, multiple year planning, and development of comprehensive systems.**

- A. The planning needs of the district are confined to a School Improvement Plan (SIP) and a Technology Plan.
  - 1. The 2013-2014 SIP was presented and adopted by the school committee on April 10, 2013.
    - a. Timelines for accomplishing each of the five goals during the 2013-2014 school year are clearly established.
    - b. Parties responsible for meeting each goal are identified.
    - c. A 2012-2013 Progress Report on the SIP for the current school year is incorporated into the 2013-2014 SIP.
  - 2. The cover sheet for the Technology Plan has a timeframe of 2011-2014.
    - a. Neither an identifiable year nor a responsible party is listed for achieving any of the seven listed goals.
- B. The superintendent of schools began his employment with the district in June, 2012.
  - 1. The superintendent has not formulated an entry plan.
- C. The district does not have comprehensive, multi-year plans for professional development, curriculum development, and student support.
  - 1. A participant in the teacher focus group said: "There is no vision regarding professional development. Everyone agrees that the money and support is there for professional development, but that there is no overall guidance."
  - 2. District leaders said that although curriculum guides have been updated, that process did not take place "regularly or according to a comprehensive protocol." They added: "There is a process for review of the curriculum that is neither ongoing nor regular."

3. A participant in a student support interview said: “We do a lot of meaningful individual work with students but not systemwide.” It was also noted: “A lot of the work we do is reactive and not proactive. . . . With changes in administration there is a lack of continuity with vision. There needs to be a focus on what the vision will be and how we deal . . . with things as a community. If communication were stronger we would all be on the same page.”

- D. Teachers’ association members noted that they were “getting to know” the new superintendent, but said “no vision [had been] expressed.”

**Impact:** The district’s approach to visioning limits the ability of staff members to commit to a program or an innovation beyond the short term and prevents staff from working together in a coordinated way toward long-term goals.

### ***Curriculum and Instruction***

- 9. The district has begun to restructure curricular leadership but does not have a fully developed curriculum or an established cycle for curriculum review and revision. Teachers have limited formalized structures to collaborate and revise curriculum during the school day.**

- A. The district has begun to address existing curricular practices by recognizing the need to provide sufficient curriculum leadership in the academic and in the career/vocational and technical (CVTE) programs.

1. The director of curriculum and instruction oversees both the academic and CVTE programs. The job description lists 28 different responsibilities that are not limited to curriculum and instruction. In interviews, school leaders said that the position has become overwhelming for one person.
  - a. The district does not have lead teachers or department heads who might share in some the supervision and curriculum revision work.
  - b. At the time of the review the district did not have any teachers on curriculum committees to address curriculum issues. Nor did the district have an established cycle for curricular review and revisions.
2. In an interview the superintendent described the need to restructure the position of director of curriculum and instruction.
  - a. The position of director of curriculum and instruction will be eliminated. Two administrative positions will be created, an academic coordinator and a coordinator of career and technical education, allowing for a stronger supervision model to enhance the curricula school wide.
  - b. Plans are underway to hire a coordinator of career and technical education in the spring of 2013 who will assume responsibility for the CVTE program including the implementation of the Common Core State Standards across the CVTE curricula beginning in the 2013-2014 school year.

- c. The academic coordinator will focus on curriculum and instruction, academic departments, teacher evaluations, the alignment to the 2011 Curriculum Frameworks, and curriculum mapping.
- B. There are limited formalized structures for teachers to meet to work on curriculum revisions or to collaborate during the school day.
  1. Teachers do not have common planning time. When teachers were asked what teachers needed to do their job better, they said that common planning time was needed.
  2. Although academic teachers meet by departments and the director of curriculum and instruction and the principal might attend the meetings, meeting times are not formalized with most meetings taking place before school or during the delayed start on professional development days which take place six times a year. In interviews teachers told the team that the English department met weekly for 30 minutes on Wednesdays before the start of school, the science department also met weekly, and the math department met 1-2 times a month.
  3. The district does not have any regularly scheduled faculty meetings after school. Time to meet as a faculty takes place during the professional development days.
- C. Curriculum materials vary in format and content. Although there has been recent work on curriculum materials, cohesive curriculum documents including district benchmarks have not been developed in content areas.
  1. Updates to ELA curriculum materials were completed in the spring of 2013.
    - a. Interviews with teachers and school leaders and a document review showed that two members of the English department were contracted to work outside of regular school hours to update the ELA scope and sequence for all regular English classes in grades 9-12 during the 2012-2013 school year under the supervision of the director of curriculum and instruction.
    - b. The ELA scope and sequence final draft spans grades 9-12 and covers each trimester listing by week with an overview that outlines the four ELA strands (Reading, Critical Reading, Writing, Listening/Speaking and Grammar) with topics to be covered in each grade. The ELA scope and sequence final draft is aligned to the Mass Curriculum Framework (Common Core State Standards).
  2. In addition to the ELA scope and sequence, the Writing Strand for grades 9-12 was also completed with topics identified by trimester with alignment to the Mass Curriculum Framework (Common Core State Standards).
  3. The newly completed ELA scope and sequence was presented to the English department, the special education department, and the entire faculty at the April 15<sup>th</sup> professional development day.
  4. The math department has curriculum maps which in interviews teachers and school leaders described as scope and sequence documents. This was confirmed by a review of the documents. The curriculum maps include timelines, units to be covered, indicators/topics, book chapters, and content standards listed by

letters and numbers. In interviews teachers said that math was aligned to the Common Core State Standards and said they relied on textbooks (Pearson) which were aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

5. The science department uses a variety of curriculum materials. For biology, teachers use a Prentice Hall Biology text, the teacher's guides, and electronic textbooks, and have designed curriculum units with assessments and power point presentations. The Engineering program uses the Project Lead the Way curriculum, which is a STEM curriculum aligned to the Common Core State Standards, while Physics uses a project-based curriculum.
  6. Additional curricular materials are posted on TeacherShare, a teacher resource link on the school website. Syllabi for most courses in both academic and vocational programs are on the site.
  7. Many teachers have uploaded updated daily lesson plans which are a requirement (see Curriculum and Instruction Strengths finding) and in some cases unit plans have been uploaded.
- D. The 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan focuses on the full implementation of the Common Core Standards and improved curricular practices.
1. The principal reviewed the goals of the School Improvement Plan for the School Council at an April 9, 2013, meeting.
    - a. Goal 1 focuses on implementing the 2011 Frameworks in ELA and Math: creating units of instruction, well-structured lessons, measurable outcomes, common benchmark assessments, formative assessments, scope and sequence, resources, and student exemplars. It further states that professional development and training will be provided to all staff to implement the Common Core State Standards within all academic and vocational areas.
    - b. Goal 2 focuses on the implementation of the Common Core Standards within the disciplines and technical and vocational programs and outlines a plan to develop interdisciplinary Common Core Standards based assessment and research papers each trimester.
    - c. Goal 3 calls for the continued implementation and training of the new teacher evaluation model.
    - d. Goal 4 focuses on enhancing rigor and relevance of the curriculum to develop scope and sequence that is aligned with honors and advanced placement courses for core content areas.

**Impact:** When curricular practices have not been fully developed to ensure that all content areas have consistent, written plans for instruction including curriculum guides with common components, access to high quality curriculum cannot be guaranteed for all students.

**10. High quality instructional practices that meet the needs of all students are not consistently in place across the district.**

The team observed 23 classes throughout the district: 14 academic classes and 9 career/vocation and technical education classes. The team observed 5 ELA classes, 7 mathematics classes, and 2 science classes. Among the classes observed were two special education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members used ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. The data from the observations is presented in Appendix C.

- A.** In both academic classes and in career/vocational and technical education classes (CVTE) the team observed a positive learning environment, but not all characteristics under the category of learning environment were rigorously and consistently adhered to.
1. The review team characterized interactions by teachers and students to be very positive. Students were respectful and teachers made encouraging comments to students as observed in one class where the teacher said, "I like what you did," acknowledging a student's contribution. The team observed clear and consistent evidence of this practice in 100 percent of the observed classes in both the academic and the CVTE classes.
  2. In 100 percent of observed CVTE classes and in 93 percent of observed academic classes standards of behavior were clearly and consistently either posted or communicated.
  3. Students followed established classroom and safety procedures clearly and consistently in 100 percent of observed CVTE classes and in 86 percent of observed academic classes. In one shop class, expectations that reflected industry standards were posted and routines were written and orally reinforced by the teachers. Students were very aware of the rules and even reminded one review team member not to forget safety glasses.
- B.** While the team saw clear and consistent evidence of lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations in 78 percent of observed CVTE classes, the practice was clearly and consistently in place in only 43 percent of observed academic classes. Students in CVTE classes followed the guidelines and steps for professional licensure and industry standards by which they were being evaluated.
1. In 89 percent of observed CVTE classes and in 71 percent of academic classes the review team saw clear and consistent evidence that rituals and routines were clearly established and created a safe intellectual environment in which students could take academic risks. In one academic class students shared their personal experiences and related them to the story they were discussing.
  2. A variety of resources designed to meet the learning needs of all of the students were seen clearly and consistently in 50 percent of academic classes and in 67 percent of CVTE classes, where students had more resources available to meet their diverse learning needs. In one shop students had access to a substantial number of machines and all students were totally engaged; in another class, not enough work stations were available so that not all students were engaged. While the review team saw examples of a variety of resources in academic classes such as computers, laptops, digital recordings, CAD programs, SMART Boards,

PowerPoint presentations and videos, it also saw more traditional approaches where one activity was used for all students.

3. In 100 percent of CVTE classes, the review team saw clear and consistent evidence that the physical arrangement of the class ensured a positive learning environment and allowed students total access to learning resources. In most cases shop facilities replicated industry standards. Clear and consistent evidence of this practice was seen in 64 percent of academic classes.
- C. The team observed inconsistent implementation of effective teaching practices in both the academic classes and in the career/vocational and technical classes observed.
1. In 44 percent of CVTE classes, clear and consistent evidence of a strong knowledge of the subject was demonstrated; such evidence of the practice was observed in 57 percent of academic classes.
  2. Although teachers are required to include learning objectives in lesson plans, in observed classes learning objectives were not consistently communicated to students. Clear and consistent evidence of communication of clear learning objectives was observed in 44 percent of CVTE classes and in 57 percent of academic classes. In one academic class students received a weekly syllabus, which listed the student learning objectives.
  3. In 67 percent of CVTE classes the team saw clear and consistent evidence of varied instructional strategies matched to the content and learning objectives, but such evidence seen in only 36 percent of academic classes. The review team observed a range of instructional activities in academic classes. One class was working in groups to design a set for a story they were writing.
  4. The practice of requiring students to engage in higher order thinking skills enabling them to think critically and to work collaboratively and/or individually on challenging content was seen clearly and consistently in 56 percent of CVTE classes and in 50 percent of academic classes.
  5. The use of varied questioning techniques that engage students in higher level thinking to promote a deeper understanding of content was seen clearly and consistently in only 11 percent of CVTE classes and in 43 percent of observed academic classes.
  6. In 67 percent of observed CVTE classes and in 50 percent of academic classes lessons were clearly and consistently paced to engage all learners and to promote understanding.
  7. The use of frequent checks for understanding to ensure that all students comprehend and to make adjustments in instruction was seen clearly and consistently in 56 percent of observed CVTE classes and in only 43 percent of academic classes.
  8. Although the review team observed outstanding examples of teachers using technology to enhance student learning, the practice is not consistently in place. In 67 percent of CVTE classes and in only 50 percent of academic class the team observed clear and consistent evidence of the use of technology by teachers to help students deepen their understanding of content.

9. While students had more opportunities to experience effective, research-based teaching practices in CVTE classes than in academic classes, such practices require further development to be consistently in place in both academic and in career/vocational and technical classes.
- D.** The review team saw clear and consistent evidence that students were engaged in productive learning routines and pursued their own path to learning in 78 percent of observed CVTE classes, but there was a lower incidence of such evidence (64 percent) in academic classes.
1. Most academic classes observed were teacher led with students having limited opportunities to assume responsibility for their learning, while in shop classes students were taking charge of their learning experiences. The team saw clear and consistent evidence of students assuming responsibility for their own learning in 89 percent of CVTE classes, but only 36 percent of academic classes, where the majority of classes were teacher directed.
  2. In 89 percent of observed CVTE classes students consistently made connections to prior knowledge and real world experiences while the practice was seen clearly and consistently in 71 percent of observed academic classes.
  3. In 56 percent of observed CVTE classes and 43 percent of observed academic classes students were clearly and consistently engaged in challenging academic tasks.
  4. Students clearly and consistently articulated their thinking and reasoning verbally or in writing, either individually, in pairs or in groups, in 67 percent of observed CVTE classes but 50 percent of observed academic classes.
  5. In 22 percent of CVTE classes and in 36 percent of academic classes students clearly and consistently responded to questions with elaboration about content and ideas.
  6. Student use of technology as a tool that leads to new learning was seen clearly and consistently in 63 percent of observed CVTE classes, but 43 percent of observed academic classes. One example in an academic class was in ALEKS (Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces), a computer assisted math class, where the students interacted with an individual math program for an entire class period. In another math class students were independently working with CAD software in a computer lab, but in a majority of observed academic classes students were not using technology to enhance their own learning.
  7. Student work displayed in CVTE classes reflected higher level thinking skills and served as exemplars for other students. In 78 percent of observed shop classes the review team saw clear and consistent evidence of this, while high quality student work was displayed clearly and consistently in only 7 percent of observed academic classes. The review team saw many examples of student exemplars on display in shop classes, such as in the Cosmetology class where student projects were on display and served as models for other students, but few exemplars were on display in observed academic classes.

**Impact:** When effective instructional practices have not been rigorously and consistently developed so that they are strongly adhered to across both the academic classes and the career/vocational and technical education classes, students are not having the benefit of consistent high quality instruction in all of their classes.

## ***Assessment***

- 11. The recently created district data team has begun working, but is still setting and redefining its goals and discovering the scope of its work as it relates to student learning and achievement. It has not yet realized its potential of assisting teachers and administrators in the timely analysis of data to improve student achievement.**
- A.** The Professional Development Plan for 2012-2013, under the heading of “District and School Improvement Planning,” lists “Formulate Data Teams to analyze data for the purpose of improving student performance. Currently ongoing and successful. Begin December 2012.” At the time of the review, there had been several meetings of the team, but meaningful analysis of student achievement data had not yet begun, according to administrators.
1. In response to a question about how data is analyzed by the data team, administrators mentioned correlating shop selection data with student achievement data to answer such questions as “What shops are attracting the higher level kids?” and gathering data on comparative teacher salary schedules for negotiating purposes.
    - a. Administrators said that there was not a system in place at that time to use data to measure student progress. Another administrator, in a separate interview, when asked by review team members how the district assesses its students, said “We don’t do much for decisionable data.”
    - b. According to an assessment matrix submitted to the review team before the onsite visit, the only assessment instruments routinely administered to students were the Stanford 10 assessments for ELA and math, which are used primarily for course placement of incoming 9<sup>th</sup> grade students, the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) administered mostly to students in grade 10, and the Accuplacer, used for some students in grades 11 and 12 to determine achievement levels. In most schools where it is used, Accuplacer is used as a tool for community college placement purposes. The special education department, however, does offer a full range of individual assessments as required by regulations and as reported in the district’s most recent Coordinated Program Review report.
    - c. Teachers said that they receive results from the Stanford 10, but the results are not timely by the time they are received, they are not closely related to the curriculum, and not all students are tested.
- B.** Administrators said that teachers wanted to use data more effectively to inform their instruction, but were unable to “get into the data deeply enough.” Aggregated data was presented to all in faculty meetings, but only special education teachers disaggregated the data. In a focus group conducted by the review team, teachers said that they wanted to increase their capacity to use data more effectively to improve their teaching.
- C.** Results of the Stanford 10 assessment were shared with teachers, according to administrators. The results were “gone over closely” with academic teachers, and e-mailed to vocational teachers. The district did not have a mechanism in place to determine which teachers actually made use of the data.

**Impact:** By creating a data team, the district has begun the development of what can be a valuable tool for providing and analyzing data and training staff members on using data to improve practice.

**12. The district does not have a consistent, formalized, system of formative evaluation to monitor the effectiveness of instruction.**

- A. Administrators said that there was “nothing in place at this time” to use data to determine if students were making adequate progress.
  - 1. Administrators did say that the mathematics teachers were using common tests to determine relative progress.
  - 2. In the teacher focus group, teachers enthusiastically agreed that they regularly and consistently used formative assessment practices, but then mostly described improvised, informal, verbal formative assessment techniques. Some teachers described classroom quizzes used for formative assessment, but did not mention any circumstances where the results of those quizzes were used to change instructional strategies or outcomes. While these classroom practices are commendable, with the exception of the ALEKS system teachers did not describe any formal systems within which records could be kept and cumulative results charted that would allow for data-based changes to curriculum and instructional practices.
- B. The ALEKS system of assessment is a formative assessment system for analysis of progress in mathematics. It was initiated in February of 2013, and at the time of the visit, had not been in place long enough to have had an impact on instructional practices in mathematics. The hope of the instructional staff was that the effective use of the ALEKS program would lead to improved student achievement results in mathematics.
- C. The ninth grade portfolio, competitive student clubs, and senior capstone project can all be used as vehicles of formative assessment if teachers are properly trained to do so, and if the rubric for each type of project is appropriately designed with sufficient levels of teacher intervention and support. As currently constituted, however, there is little evidence that academic teachers are using them to inform instructional strategies or practices.

**Impact:** Formative assessments are valuable in determining progress of student learning, and in combination with a benchmark system can provide early indication of the effectiveness of instruction and of new curriculum initiatives and interventions, such as the Math180 program recently initiated. Without such a system, administrators are forced to wait for the results of summative assessments, typically administered less frequently.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**13. The district does not provide an adequate mentoring program for new teachers.**

- A. School administrative leaders expressed a need to “revamp” the current mentoring program.
  - 1. The mentoring program was described in interviews as a “weakness” and a “disappointment” that needs to be structured and formalized.

2. The length of mentoring is limited to one year. The mentor receives a stipend of \$450 for each mentee. Mentor training is not provided.
  3. The principal meets with mentors and mentees at the start of school. Mentors are expected to meet with mentees at least once per month.
  4. Mentors complete a contact form to record mentor/mentee meetings. Administrators expressed the need to better control and monitor the quality of meetings.
- B.** Teachers expressed a need to formalize the mentoring program.
1. Teachers who are mentors have not necessarily been mentees.
  2. Meeting time with mentees is difficult to find during the day.
  3. Mentors said that they felt unsuccessful in meeting the intent of a mentoring program; however, some mentees said that they have been helped by having a mentor.
- C.** Two teachers were requested by the superintendent to develop a mentoring program as part of the RTTT grant. A draft action plan had been completed at the time of the onsite review.
1. Elements of the proposed New Teacher Induction Plan include: vision & purpose, stakeholders, financial resources, program components, program evaluation and plan for building a community.
  2. Administrators said that they expected that the new mentoring program would be started in 2013-2014.

**Impact:** Without an adequate mentoring program, the district is missing opportunities for teachers to reflect on and improve their teaching practices, learn professional responsibilities, and build a learning community with other teachers, possibly leading to higher retention rates.

**14. The professional development program provides few opportunities for districtwide activities and is not sufficiently informed by educators' needs.**

- A.** There are few opportunities for teachers to participate in districtwide common professional development activities.
1. Professional development meetings for the full staff are limited to one day before the opening of school for "meetings and workshops," an in-service day in October, and delayed openings of two-and-one-half hours in September (Chamber of Commerce Breakfast), December, January, March, and two hours in May. According to administrators, the content of these meetings to date has largely been devoted to new educator evaluation regulations and practices this year (2012-2013).
    - a. The professional development plan for 2012-2013 details many available professional development opportunities, such as conferences and workshop providers, under Goal #1: Expanding educators' knowledge of subject matter. The plan does not indicate what has been taken by particular teachers, or

that multiple teachers ever took the same course, and does not identify a districtwide professional development initiative other than the educator evaluation training.

- b. Goal #4: Bully awareness training states that faculty will receive “training throughout the year” that “focuses on assessing and improving the culture of respect towards others.” It does not provide any further details on length of duration, scope, or scheduling of the training. It makes similar references to other types of state mandated training, such as de-escalation training, restraint training, and others.
- c. Goal #10: Professional Development identifies a “focus” to “align professional development activities that promote teaching and learning with the teachers Educator’s Plan, SMART goals, and Self-Assessment in conjunction with their IPDP (Individual Professional Development Plan).” It then indicates that “teacher evaluation trainings, implementation of Common Core Standards, classroom management, lesson planning, site visits to vocational areas, safety procedures and pedagogy are all part of our delayed openings meetings and trainings.” Again, specifics are not provided. Teachers are reminded of contractually available reimbursements for courses taken individually.

**B.** Teachers said that they did not believe that their access to student achievement data was meaningful or sufficiently helpful to improve student learning.

- 1. In a teacher focus group, teachers agreed that they did not have sufficient information on their students. One teacher said that she saw results from the Stanford 10 assessment, but has not been shown how to use that to help her students.
- 2. Administrators said that finding sufficient time for the professional development activities needed by teachers was something that they were “struggling with.”
- 3. Teachers’ association representatives said in interviews that they did not have a role in the development of professional development goals or plans, despite the fact that there were three teachers identified as members of the school council.

**C.** Administrators, teachers, and parents agreed that professional development opportunities were not sufficient to effectively train teachers in all of the areas required.

- 1. One administrator said that in the previous two contract negotiation cycles the administration tried unsuccessfully to increase professional development time before and after the school year for teachers.
- 2. Another administrator in a separate interview said that there were not enough professional development hours available to train teachers appropriately. He described the deficiency as a “hole.”
- 3. During a school council meeting attended by review team members, parents expressed concern that teachers would not be able to handle several goals in the 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan.

**Impact:** Without increasing the opportunities for teachers to collaborate professionally with each other, as well as increasing common professional development activities, aligning them with school and district goals, and giving teachers

a voice in the related planning and delivery systems, the district will not be able to improve teachers' professional competence and capabilities substantially.

### ***Student Support***

#### **15. The district does not have a tiered system of support in place to assist regular education students who experience difficulty mastering content in the general curriculum.**

- A. In interviews administrators reported that tiered support is not in general practice at Franklin County Technical School. Students who are admitted to grade 9 may already have an IEP, a 504 plan or be receiving Title I services. Otherwise, the only next step for students experiencing learning challenges identified by an administrator was an evaluation for special education services, and the development of an IEP for a student after enrolling at FCTS was characterized as "very rare."
- B. The district does have a curriculum accommodation plan, and administrators reported that it was used by academic teachers to modify instruction. During classroom observations in academic classes, however, review team members saw compelling evidence that varied strategies were used to accommodate differing student needs in only 36 percent of the classes observed.
- C. In recognition of the need for more formal support for students in the regular education environment, the district adopted the Math180 program with levels of computerized support in February of 2013 and scheduled an MCAS Academy to begin in March of 2013.
- D. The proportion of FCTS students with disabilities is higher than the state rate (25 percent in 2012 compared with 17 percent). According to ESE data, in 2010-2011 100 percent of Franklin-County Technical School (FCTS) students with IEPs were served in partial inclusion programs, with 0 percent in full inclusion, compared with the statewide rates of 57.9 percent in full inclusion and 20.1 percent in partial inclusion.

**Impact:** As until very recently there has been little in place to assist students in the regular education environment who require more than standard classroom instruction, the school has been missing an opportunity to help all of its students reach higher levels of achievement.

#### **16. The district has continuing problems with discipline, which is a concern for administrators and teachers. Discipline policies, while spelled out at length in the student handbook, are not uniformly applied throughout the district.**

- A. Data from ESE, a document review, and parent and student interviews indicate the district has high rates of suspensions from school and detentions, as well as unclear and inconsistent discipline implementation.
  - 1. According to ESE data, the number of criminal, drug or tobacco-related, and violent incidents resulting in suspensions in the district fluctuated from 8.2 per 100 students in 2007 to 8.4 in 2008 to 7.0 in 2009 to 13.3 in 2010 to 9.6 per 100 students in 2011 to 15.1 in 2012.
  - 2. The district's rates of in-school suspensions and out-of-school suspension in 2011-2012 were significantly

higher than the statewide rates<sup>20</sup>. The rate of in-school suspensions for Franklin County RVTSD was 17.8 percent, almost three times the state rate for grades 9-12 of 6.5 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Franklin County RVTSD was 17.6 percent, almost twice the state rate for grades 9-12 of 9.0 percent.

- B.** A document review and interviews with administrators, teachers, and students indicated that the language in the student handbook was “unclear,” “vague,” “punitive,” and “outdated” and that discipline was implemented inconsistently causing many students to be suspended and lose precious instructional time as a result of behavioral concerns.
1. Administrators said that they were aware that many suspensions were the result of unclear written policies.
  2. Teachers said that the district did a lot of meaningful work with students but did not have a systemwide approach to behavior.

**Impact:** When discipline is problematic, the district is not providing the positive social and emotional environment students need to succeed in their academic and vocational classes, and students’ learning time is reduced.

### ***Finance and Asset Management***

**17. While the district has adequate financial resources, there is insufficient planning and curriculum review, with resources gaps that affect the quality of programs offered to students. The district’s Machine Technology program does not have sufficient resources for the instruction of students.**

- A.** The Machine Technology program has recently been criticized by industry leaders for training and educating students on obsolete equipment. Industry representatives, program teachers and administrators agreed that there was a need to purchase up to date computerized lathes, millers and grinders.
1. A dozen manually operated machine lathes were used for basic machine instruction. Teachers said that over 50 percent of these machines were not operational resulting in an insufficient number of student work stations. However, federal, state and private sector funds were expected to address the issues in the Machine Technology program in the near future in response to the efforts of local manufacturers.
  2. The advanced manufacturing sector in Franklin County is an area with significant employment opportunities; at the time of the review, one local company had four jobs open for machine programmers with salaries between \$60,000 and \$80,000, as well as entry level jobs.

---

<sup>20</sup> Statistical significance based on one sample T test and Chi Square.  $P \leq .05$

B. Other concerns included the electrical and business technology programs. The principal expressed concern about stock inventory and purchasing in vocational areas, and teachers' association members said that they shared that concern. As an example, a purchase order for supplies and sharpening service remained unfilled for months.

**Impact:** Without comprehensive planning and review, and a budget process based on these processes, the district will not have up-to-date equipment and adequate supplies in its vocational programs and cannot prepare students adequately for successful careers.

# Franklin County RVTSD District Review Recommendations

---

## ***Leadership and Governance***

- 1. The district should engage in long range, multi-year planning through a District Improvement Plan (DIP), setting out the steps to create interrelated systems to accomplish the critically important tasks of developing the curriculum, supplying needed professional development, providing student support, and crafting the budget.**
  - A.** The district already has in place some of the fundamental elements which, after review and discussion by appropriate stakeholders, can serve as the basis for a long range, multi-year District Improvement Plan that will guide the district in establishing systems that will help it improve instruction and enhance student achievement.
    1. The district has framed a mission statement: “It is the mission of Franklin County Technical School to prepare all students to achieve a future of successful careers, technical and intellectual curiosity, healthy life choices and strength of character.”
    2. The district has identified four goals:
      - a. “To foster the talents, skills and potential of all students.”
      - b. “To ensure that staff and programs are conducive to instructional excellence.”
      - c. “To use technology as an integral component of teaching, learning, and management.”
      - d. “To provide facilities that meet staff, program and community needs.”
    3. The district has a well-articulated educational philosophy which states in part: “It is our task to nurture students into mature, young adults capable of life-long learning and curiosity. We achieve that by providing the professionally trained technical and academic teachers who are accomplished in reaching all students. We focus on support and individual instruction in those areas students will need for full, successful lives.”
  - B.** The district should develop and put in place a long-range DIP that articulates the district’s approach to curriculum, professional development, technology, and student support and the steps it will take in each of these areas to help it to achieve its goals.
    1. The district’s Technology Plan can be incorporated into the DIP.
    2. The DIP can also be used to respond to other recommendations in this report.
    3. All portions of the DIP should have goals, objectives, benchmarks, persons responsible, timelines, resources, and outcome measures.
  - C.** Other plans, including the School Improvement Plan (SIP), should be aligned with the district’s DIP.

**Benefits:** By implementing this recommendation the school district will establish a framework that integrates and provides guidance for all the essential functions of the district, including:

- Curriculum development
- Professional development
- Student support
- Budget development

Engaging in a comprehensive planning process will enable the district to carry out these functions in a purposeful way and to create a concrete and cohesive school improvement strategy.

### ***Curriculum and Instruction***

**2. The district should continue with its plans to provide curricular leadership in the academic and career/vocational and technical education programs and implement them to the fullest extent. In order to further improve curricular practices the district should fully develop a high-quality set of curriculum materials in all content areas. The district should also establish a process for curriculum review and revision.**

The review team commends the district for addressing the need to provide curricular leadership in both the academic and in the career/vocational and technical education (CVTE) programs and for the 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan, which describes a comprehensive approach for the implementation of the 2011 Curriculum Frameworks in the academic and CVTE programs.

- A.** The district should continue with plans to provide curriculum leadership to both the academic and to the CVTE programs by reconfiguring positions so that the district has an academic coordinator and a CVTE coordinator.
- B.** The district should move forward with the full implementation of the 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan, communicate the elements of the plan to all stakeholders, and provide regular progress updates to the district community.
- C.** The district should develop a cohesive, usable set of curriculum materials.
  - 1. The materials should include curriculum units, standards, objectives, resources, instructional strategies, pacing guides, and a balanced set of assessments.
  - 2. The Pioneer Valley District and School Assistance Team is a valuable resource and has the expertise to help organize existing curriculum materials into a cohesive format and to assist with the needed curriculum development and documentation.

3. The ESE presentation *How to Develop Curriculum Maps to Support a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum that Guides Instruction* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) provides definitions and examples of curriculum maps.
  4. ESE's *Sample Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/sample.html>) are high-quality examples of curriculum units that incorporate Massachusetts frameworks and have embedded curriculum maps and performance assessments.
- D.** The district should establish a timely curriculum review and revision process with teacher input, based on assessment results including district benchmark results. The person(s) responsible for leading this process should be identified.
1. ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
  2. District and school leaders should consider enlisting the assistance of the Pioneer Valley District and School Assistance Team to identify districts that can serve as exemplars for the curriculum review and revision process in both the academic and the CVTE programs.

**Benefits:** By providing sufficient curriculum leadership, a cohesive, aligned, and usable 21<sup>st</sup> century curriculum, and a system for ensuring that the curriculum is revised in a timely way, the district will strengthen the quality of education and promote higher levels of student achievement.

**3. Concurrent with its long-range planning and its work to ensure consistent, high-quality instruction in all classrooms, the district should identify specific instructional priorities and establish a strategy for supporting and monitoring teachers as they continually grow in those areas.**

- A.** Given the findings of the review team, the district might decide to focus on:
1. Rigorous instruction that engages students in challenging tasks and incorporates higher-order thinking in order to appropriately challenge all students;
  2. The use of varied instructional strategies and frequent checks for understanding to ensure that instruction addresses all learners; and
  3. Strategies that develop independent learners and thinkers by requiring students to elaborate on their own ideas and promoting students' responsibility for their own learning.

However, additional data, as well as input from teachers, should be considered

- B.** *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning. This resource might be a useful reference as the district identifies and communicates specific instructional elements. It is part of ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>).

**Benefits:** By focusing supports and supervision on specific instructional strategies, the district will help to improve teaching in a systematic way, thus promoting improved student performance. In addition to its potential impact on student achievement, more effective instruction can also lead to improved student behavior by engaging students in meaningful, challenging tasks.

### **Assessment**

#### **4. The district should continue the work of its data team, formalize its role, and systematize its practices to analyze and publish data findings in a way that helps teachers to improve instructional practices and maximize student achievement.**

- A.** Providing data to staff members is only one function of an effective data team. Critical functions also include coordinating and correlating multiple sources of information, training teachers in how to use data to improve curriculum planning and classroom instruction, analyzing programs and student achievement gains, and instilling a culture in which data is used to inform decision-making.
1. To support this work, relevant data (such as student achievement findings, school climate survey results, and other quantitative information) should be collected in a centralized database that is available to all staff members.
  2. The first step in making a new data team a valuable resource is to formalize its role, practices, and procedures; professional development activities with teachers should be planned and conducted so that teachers are aware of the team and how it can help them in their teaching.
    - a. ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
    - b. ESE's District and School Assistance Centers are a rich resource of information and training to support data teams.
  3. Staff members at the school and classroom levels should be supported as they interpret different sources of data and use the data to inform instruction. To do this effectively will likely require extensive professional development, as well as sufficient common planning time.
  4. At the district and school levels, evidence should be used to analyze the effectiveness of programs and policies, and to support any proposed changes. Ineffective programs, practices, and projects should be discontinued, and resources should be reallocated to support more effective ones, based on thorough data analysis.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will lead to a more systematic approach to planning for continuous improvement. A fully functioning data team is a valuable tool for a school district to build its capacity to use data at the district, school, and classroom levels.

**5. The district should implement robust benchmark assessment systems to complement annual MCAS results, along with strategies to help teachers to use ongoing data to target their instruction to students' needs.**

- A.** The district should develop common benchmark assessments that are aligned with the curriculum, and should administer and analyze them regularly as a way to continually target instruction.
1. Benchmark assessments need not be expensive or time consuming. Well-placed and well-planned assessments can take a short amount of instructional time, and save as much or more in inefficient or ineffectively used instructional time. The use of the Vocational Technical Competency Tracking System (VTCTS) or a similar system can provide additional information by tracking vocational skills attainment. Good teaching requires good information.
  2. The district should ensure that all teachers have regular, frequent department and/or grade level common planning time.
  3. A protocol for common planning time that includes the analysis and use of benchmark and other data should be developed and communicated to all teachers. District leaders should develop a plan for supporting and monitoring the effective use of common planning time.
- B.** The district should ensure that teachers continually gauge students' understanding by providing a common definition of formative assessment, as well as professional development in formative assessment strategies.

**Benefits:**

- Implementing this recommendation will provide quicker, more nimble approaches to targeting instruction and meeting the needs of all students. Benchmark and formative assessments will allow teachers to identify students' specific strengths and needs, and to plan and deliver their instruction accordingly. Common benchmark assessments will also allow teachers to calibrate learning from one class to another and to identify effective instructional practices.
- The analysis of the results of benchmark assessments and vocational skills attainment will provide the data team with important information to inform the school improvement planning process. By expanding its system to measure student performance and growth, the district can also progress in its adoption of district-determined measures. Like all other districts in Massachusetts, Franklin County RVTSD will be required to report data from district-determined measures in the 2014-2015 school year.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**6. The district should follow through on its plans and implement a new teacher induction program in compliance with ESE guidelines to provide a systematic mentoring support structure for all new teachers.**

- A.** A teacher induction program should meet the requirements under ESE regulations, 603 CMR 7.12. It should do the following:

1. Provide an orientation for all beginning and incoming teachers.
  2. Provide at least a one-year induction for all new teachers.
  3. Assign a trained mentor to all beginning teachers.
  4. Provide a support team consisting of at least a mentor and an administrator who can evaluate the teacher.
  5. Provide release time for classroom observations and mentoring activities.
- B.** Two teachers were requested by the superintendent to develop a new teacher induction program as part of the RTTT grant.
1. A draft of the action plan was completed in April 2013.
  2. The draft action plan contains all of the necessary components required by ESE.
  3. Required financial resources should be completed.
- C.** The ESE guidelines for educator induction programs (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/>) should be consulted.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will build teachers' understanding of their role and will lead to an improvement in new teachers' practice, thereby increasing student learning. It will also provide veteran teachers with the opportunity to reflect on their own practice and to build a learning community with new teachers. A collaborative school environment can also result in higher teacher retention rates.

**7. The district should use its successful collaboration with its teachers' association in the implementation of educator evaluation as a model to investigate ways to increase professional development (PD) time and to ensure that teacher input informs the district's planning for professional development.**

- A.** The district and the teachers' association have shown a positive concern for students by working together on the educator evaluation system. This partnership should be leveraged to collaboratively identify ways to increase the time available for PD.
1. More time for districtwide PD – possibilities include before or after the school year or during early-release time – should be planned.
  2. In addition, time for faculty meetings should be planned as needed so that the district can maximize the use of PD time for professional growth.
  3. All necessary steps should be taken to provide common planning time for all teachers as part of a comprehensive approach to PD.

a. ESE's *Common Planning Time Self-Assessment Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CPTtoolkit.pdf>) is a guide to help districts raise student achievement by building districts' capacity to support effective teacher instructional teams.

4. The district should consider establishing or expanding other job-embedded, districtwide PD opportunities, such as modeling of instructional techniques by staff members and/or establishing professional learning communities (PLCs).

a. ESE's *Professional Learning Communities Guidance* document (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/PLCguidance.pdf>) is a set of reference tools to frame the work of developing and strengthening instructional teams at the school level.

B. During interviews, teachers said that they did not have a significant voice in influencing district policy or charting the course of their own PD. Staff input into districtwide PD content and structure is essential to delivering an effective PD program that is targeted to meet teachers' needs.

1. The district should use the DIP to broaden its PD planning process. Many districts set up PD committees that include teachers, administrators, and in some cases, parent representatives. Other districts seek the collaboration of the school council in designing each year's PD plan. In any case, PD planning should reflect the input of teachers and should be aligned with the DIP, the SIP, and with long- and short-term district goals.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will increase teacher participation and engagement in the PD process, align PD with district goals, build the district's capacity to support effective instruction, and improve student achievement.

### ***Student Support***

**8. It is recommended that the district train regular educators and paraprofessionals in research-based strategies as appropriate to accommodate students with mild learning and behavioral challenges so that more students can be successfully included for a larger proportion of the school day in regular education programs.**

A. Specifically, regular classroom teachers and paraprofessionals would benefit from specific research based training on creating inclusive classrooms; such training should include using strategies for co-teaching, co-planning, differentiated instruction, and assessments to better accommodate students with diverse learning styles and ability levels.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will provide more students education in the least restrictive environment; this can raise expectations and achievement for students with mild learning challenges who will have better access to the regular curriculum, instruction, and typical peers to learn with on a regular basis.

9. **The district leadership should review the new Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) model from ESE, design strategies to use it, and provide classroom teachers and paraprofessionals with specific training that includes strategies for effective classroom management.**
- A. Leaders should adapt the system from the MTSS model (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>), which outlines key components of tiered instruction and support.
- B. District leaders, teachers, specialists, and families should collaboratively investigate approaches to improving classroom and schoolwide climate and supporting positive behavior.
1. *Schoolwide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS)* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/ta/presentations/ESE\\_PBIS.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/ta/presentations/ESE_PBIS.pdf)) is a framework made up of systemic and individualized strategies for achieving important social and learning outcomes while preventing problem behavior.
  2. Social emotional learning (SEL) incorporates approaches that emphasize self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making.
  3. *The Behavioral Health and Public Schools Framework* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/student.html>) is a guidance document to help schools establish supportive environments with collaborative services that will enable all students—including those with behavioral health needs—to achieve at their highest potentials.
  4. *Safe and Healthy Learning Environments* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ssce/safety.html>) is a web page outlining a number of ESE programs and related resources that can help school districts and communities build safe and healthy learning environments for all students.
  5. *Addressing Students' Social, Emotional, and Health Needs* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/StudentsNeeds.pdf>) provides guidance and promising practices to help schools create a safe school environment and make effective use of a system for addressing the social, emotional, and health needs of its students that reflects the behavioral health and public schools framework.
- C. The district's regular classroom teachers (including the high school faculty) and paraprofessionals would benefit from specific training that covers:
1. strategies for effective classroom management techniques, including those that require students to take responsibility for their behavior and learning;
  2. assistive technologies; and
  3. data-driven behavior modification strategies.
  4. Recommended resources include those provided by ESE's Office of Digital Learning, which supports the expansion of digital learning capacity and literacy to advance learning for every student in the Commonwealth by providing policies, guidance, professional development and support. Relevant resources can be found at the following links.

Overview, Accessibility: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/assistive/>

Overview, Accessible Instructional Materials and the National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS): <http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/assistive/nimas.html>

Direct link, *Access to Learning: Assistive Technology and Accessible Instructional Materials*:  
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/assistive/AccessToLearning.pdf>

Overview, Resources on Assistive Technology and Accessibility:  
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/assistive/resources.html>

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation as appropriate will enable high needs students, including students with disabilities, to be better served in regular education programs; this will likely address continued proficiency gaps for these students and potentially reduce the number of suspensions, retentions, and dropouts.

**10. The district should work with faculty to review and rewrite its discipline policies; ensure that outdated and overly punitive policies are removed or revised; and ensure that the policies are clear, reasonable, and consistently applied.**

- A. The leadership should consider meeting with faculty or surveying them through electronic means to formulate a list of common behaviors that need to be addressed. Other stakeholders such as the school council and student advisory committee should also have an opportunity for input.
- B. The school should review the existing rewards for positive behavior and penalties for infractions. School policy should delineate an appropriate array of options for proactively addressing behavior that may include positive reinforcement, positive behavioral interventions and supports, teacher and school detentions, parental involvement, social-emotional interventions, and referral to outside agencies.
- C. Once in place, the discipline policy should be consistently implemented by administration and staff.
  - 1. *Youth Choices – How High Schools Can Respond to the Needs of Students and Help Prevent Dropouts* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccrt/YouthFocusGroup.pdf>) is based on youth focus groups across the Commonwealth and is helpful in understanding what students like most and least about school, why students drop out, and how schools should be improved. This resource can start a discussion on how to improve school climate.
  - 2. The district should consider using student management software and completely implementing the discipline modules that accompany it; many districts find that doing so allows better tracking of infractions of the student behavior code, which can be useful data when formulating climate and behavior management strategies. This data additionally allows administrators to readily and regularly report disciplinary measures to the faculty.
  - 3. If necessary, plans should be made to offer more thorough professional development on school climate and behavior management.

**Benefits** to the district from implementing this recommendation include the likelihood that staff will be able to spend more time and effort on instruction and less on discipline, and that the district's suspension rates will decrease.

- If policies are clear, reasonable, and mutually agreed upon, teachers can adhere to them in every classroom and administration can support teachers' use of the policies. Students will not be missing instructional time because of suspensions based on unclear or overly punitive policies.
- Reports to staff of disciplinary measures taken will allow teachers to recognize that the revised discipline code is being consistently applied and infractions fairly and consistently discouraged. This in turn will encourage wider and more consistent application by both teachers and administrators.

### ***Finance and Asset Management***

#### **11. The district should integrate budgeting with a strong district planning process based in part on program reviews that focus on industry standards, job trends, and workforce development.**

- A. The district's four overarching goals (noted in first recommendation above), along with the strategies identified in the DIP and SIP to achieve those goals, should drive budget priorities. Resources should be reallocated as necessary to support the district's improvement.
- B. Effective program advisory committees should exist for every program, and should be tasked with ensuring that each program is equipped to prepare students for success after graduation.
  1. The committees should include teacher representatives and should have input into the planning process.
  2. Also, the *Career/Vocational Education Advisory Committee Guide* ([www.doe.mass.edu/cte/resources/acguide.doc](http://www.doe.mass.edu/cte/resources/acguide.doc)) should be consulted.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will promote the best use of available resources to prepare students for careers, based on credible information on workforce development and job trends.

# Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit

---

## **Review Team Members**

The review was conducted from April 8 through April 11, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants and one ESE staff member.

1. Dr. Owen Conway, leadership and governance
2. Suzanne Kelly, curriculum and instruction
3. Dr. John Roper, assessment, review team coordinator and ESE staff member
4. Drs. Savoie and Roper, human resources and professional development
5. Dr. Evangeline Harris Stefanakis, student support
6. Dr. Fred Savoie, financial and asset management

## **District Review Activities**

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager, payroll accounts staff member, and treasurer.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: 5 current members with lengths of service varying from 3 to 24 years.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president, two co-vice presidents.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, business manager, and director of special education.

The team visited the following schools: Franklin County Regional Vocational Technical High School

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with the principal and a focus group with 14 teachers and one guidance counselor.

The team observed 23 classes in the district: 14 in academic areas and 9 in career and vocational/technical areas.

The review team analyzed multiple data sets and reviewed numerous documents before and during the site visit, including:

- o Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, program completion and attendance rates.

- Data on the district’s staffing and finances.
- Published educational reports on the district by ESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA).
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district’s end-of-year financial reports.
- All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

**Site Visit Schedule**

<b>Monday</b> April 8, 2013	<b>Tuesday</b> April 9, 2013	<b>Wednesday</b> April 10, 2013	<b>Thursday</b> April 11, 2013
Orientation with district leaders and principal; interviews with district staff and principal; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits for classroom and shop observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; interviews with town or city personnel; interviews review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to classrooms and shops for instructional observations.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to classrooms and shops for instructional observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to shops for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principal.

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

**Table B1a: Franklin County RVTSD  
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Asian	3	0.6%	56,517	5.9%
Afr. Amer./Black	1	0.2%	81,806	8.6%
Hispanic/ Latino	13	2.5%	156,976	16.4%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat.	12	2.3%	26,012	2.7%
Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl.	--	--	1,020	0.1%
White	487	94.0%	630,150	66.0%
<b>All students</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>954,773</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2012

**Table B1b: Franklin County RVTSD  
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Group	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	148	44.7%	28.6%	163,921	35.5%	17.0%
Low income	266	80.4%	51.4%	353,420	76.5%	37.0%
ELL and Former ELL	3	0.9%	0.6%	95,865	20.7%	10.0%
<b>All high needs students</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>462,272</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>47.9%</b>

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 518; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2: Franklin County RVTSD  
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending  
Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

	FY11		FY12		FY13
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated
<b>Expenditures</b>					
From school committee budget	9,298,995	8,563,868	9,392,000	8,606,645	9,448,279
From revolving funds and grants	---	2,169,998	---	1,923,954	---
Total expenditures	---	10,733,866	---	10,530,599	---
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>					
Chapter 70 state aid*	---	3,251,395	---	3,268,850	3,344,406
Required local contribution	---	3,565,201	---	3,635,743	3,823,257
Required net school spending**	---	6,816,596	---	6,904,593	7,167,663
Actual net school spending	---	7,785,594	---	7,903,701	8,777,049
Over/under required (\$)	---	968,998	---	999,108	1,609,386
Over/under required (%)	---	14.2	---	14.5	22.5

\*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.

\*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Sources: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports; Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website.

**Table B3: Franklin County RVTSD  
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil  
Fiscal Years 2010–2012**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Administration	\$1,205.23	\$1,244.69	\$1,256.56
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$1,087.26	\$1,202.86	\$1,188.58
Teachers	\$6,757.52	\$7,111.47	\$7,076.01
Other teaching services	\$691.40	\$793.07	\$797.07
Professional development	\$258.17	\$315.87	\$238.19
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$1,382.20	\$1,574.24	\$1,299.52
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$855.86	\$700.78	\$702.76
Pupil services	\$2,504.63	\$2,586.55	\$2,627.77
Operations and maintenance	\$1,693.40	\$1,535.08	\$1,529.52
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$4,274.46	\$4,411.72	\$4,529.58
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$20,710</b>	<b>\$21,476</b>	<b>\$21,246</b>

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

**Table B4a: Franklin County RVTSD  
English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
10	CPI	126	87.2	91.6	90.2	94.8	7.6	4.6	Yes	Very Low
	P+	126	67%	75%	74%	85%	18	11		--
	SGP	114	40.5	55.5	39.5	44.5	4.0	5.0		Moderate

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

**Table B4b: Franklin County RVTSD  
Mathematics Performance, 2009-2012**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
10	CPI	127	84.6	86.2	82.4	78.1	-6.5	-4.3	Yes	Very Low
	P+	127	60%	72%	60%	54%	-6	-6		--
	SGP	114	32.0	43.0	42.0	29.0	-3.0	-13.0		Low

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

**Table B4c: Franklin County RVTSD  
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
10	CPI	115	88.0	86.9	88.2	88.7	0.7	0.5	--	Low
	P+	115	71%	71%	70%	70%	-1	0		--

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above.

**Table B5a: Franklin County RVTSD  
English Language Arts (Grade 10)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	79	81.1	89.2	85.8	91.8	10.7	6
		P+	79	53%	70%	65%	76%	23	11
		SGP	75	32.0	61.5	38.0	47.0	15	9
	State	CPI	29,809	83.2	83.3	86.9	91.0	7.8	4.1
		P+	29,809	60%	57%	67%	75%	15	8
		SGP	23,738	44.0	45.0	46.0	46.0	2.0	0.0
Low income	District	CPI	63	85.2	92.4	91.4	94.0	8.8	2.6
		P+	63	61%	79%	76%	83%	22	7
		SGP	59	35.0	62.0	40.0	47.0	12.0	7.0
	State	CPI	22,743	84.4	84.1	87.4	91.3	6.9	3.9
		P+	22,743	63%	60%	69%	77%	14	8
		SGP	18,051	45.0	46.0	46.0	45.0	0.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	36	65.0	75.8	69.2	84.0	19.0	14.8
		P+	36	25%	33%	30%	56%	31	26
		SGP	34	20.0	58.0	25.0	47.0	27.0	22.0
	State	CPI	11,604	76.0	75.7	80.2	85.8	9.8	5.6
		P+	11,604	43%	38%	50%	60%	17	10
		SGP	9,139	39.0	39.0	43.0	45.0	6.0	2.0
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	2	--	0.0	--	0.0	--	--
		P+	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	3,909	65.7	65.9	69.7	77.0	11.3	7.3
		P+	3,909	31%	28%	37%	47%	16	10
		SGP	2,001	53.0	55.0	56.0	59.0	6.0	3.0
All students	District	CPI	126	87.2	91.6	90.2	94.8	7.6	4.6
		P+	126	67%	75%	74%	85%	18	11
		SGP	114	40.5	55.5	39.5	44.5	4.0	5.0
	State	CPI	69,059	92.9	91.9	93.9	95.8	3.6	1.9
		P+	69,059	80%	78%	84%	88%	8	4
		SGP	59,884	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B5b: Franklin County RTSD  
Mathematics (Grade 10)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	80	79.4	81.0	75.7	69.7	-9.7	-6
		P+	80	49%	64%	47%	40%	-9	-7
		SGP	75	29.0	42.0	39.0	30.0	1.0	-9.0
	State	CPI	29,800	76.8	77.8	79.1	80.4	3.6	1.3
		P+	29,800	52%	54%	57%	59%	7	2
		SGP	23,668	47.0	47.0	48.0	48.0	1.0	0.0
Low income	District	CPI	64	83.0	88.3	82.3	73.4	-9.6	-8.9
		P+	64	52%	76%	57%	45%	-7	-12
		SGP	59	28.0	38.0	44.5	30.0	2.0	-14.5
	State	CPI	22,698	77.7	78.9	79.7	81.3	3.6	1.6
		P+	22,698	54%	56%	59%	62%	8	3
		SGP	18,006	46.0	47.0	48.0	47.0	1.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	37	68.8	61.7	57.5	52.7	-16.1	-4.8
		P+	37	40%	31%	23%	16%	-24	-7
		SGP	34	52.0	43.0	25.5	24.5	-27.5	-1.0
	State	CPI	11,646	69.4	69.4	70.1	71.4	2.0	1.3
		P+	11,646	37%	36%	39%	41%	4	2
		SGP	9,093	47.0	47.0	46.0	47.0	0.0	1.0
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	3,969	65.2	64.5	66.2	67.5	2.3	1.3
		P+	3,969	38%	36%	40%	42%	4	2
		SGP	2,023	50.0	55.0	59.0	59.0	9.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	127	84.6	86.2	82.4	78.1	-6.5	-4.3
		P+	127	60%	72%	60%	54%	-6	-6
		SGP	114	32.0	43.0	42.0	29.0	-3.0	-13.0
	State	CPI	69,015	88.1	88.8	89.4	90.0	1.9	0.6
		P+	69,015	74%	75%	77%	78%	4	1
		SGP	59,827	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B5c: Franklin County RVTSD  
Science and Technology/Engineering (Grade 10)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	71	80.9	82.5	84.3	83.5	2.6	-0.8
		P+	71	56%	64%	60%	58%	2	-2
	State	CPI	29,090	69.1	71.7	73.9	76.0	6.9	2.1
		P+	29,090	35%	39%	43%	46%	11	3
Low income	District	CPI	56	83.1	89.8	86.6	85.7	2.6	-0.9
		P+	56	60%	77%	64%	64%	4	0
	State	CPI	22,172	69.1	71.8	73.9	76.2	7.1	2.3
		P+	22,172	36%	41%	44%	47%	11	3
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	34	76.3	62.1	71.0	73.5	-2.8	2.5
		P+	34	47%	28%	32%	38%	-9	6
	State	CPI	11,665	63.9	65.2	67.1	68.8	4.9	1.7
		P+	11,665	25%	27%	30%	32%	7	2
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	3,304	54.5	55.8	59.3	61.8	7.3	2.5
		P+	3,304	18%	20%	23%	26%	8	3
All students	District	CPI	115	88.0	86.9	88.2	88.7	0.7	0.5
		P+	115	71%	71%	70%	70%	-1	0
	State	CPI	67,556	83.1	84.6	85.7	87.0	3.9	1.3
		P+	67,556	62%	65%	67%	69%	7	2

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B6: Franklin County RVTSD  
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012**

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
<b>All students</b>	1.4%	1.8%	0.4%	2.0%	0.6	40.0%	1.6	390.0%	2.5%

Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B7a: Franklin County RVTSD  
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	89	84.7%	89.0%	88.9%	88.8%	4.1	4.8%	-0.1	0.1%	74.1%
Low income	74	80.0%	89.4%	92.5%	87.8%	7.8	9.7%	-4.7	-5.1%	72.4%
Students w/ disabilities	41	82.2%	90.9%	85.2%	82.9%	0.7	0.9%	-2.3	-2.7%	68.6%
English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	61.1%
<b>All students</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>87.6%</b>	<b>90.2%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>-2.2</b>	<b>-2.4%</b>	<b>84.7%</b>

Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B7b: Franklin County RVTSD  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011**

Group	Number Included (2011)	School Year Ending				Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011		State (2011)
		2008	2009	2010	2011	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	63	88.9%	87.5%	92.7%	93.7%	4.8	5.4%	1.0	1.1%	76.5%
Low income	53	89.8%	84.0%	92.4%	96.2%	6.4	7.1%	3.8	4.1%	75.0%
Students w/ disabilities	27	86.8%	86.7%	93.9%	92.6%	5.8	6.7%	-1.3	-1.4%	70.8%
English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.2%
<b>All students</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>94.4%</b>	<b>89.3%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>	<b>95.5%</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>86.3%</b>

Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B8: Franklin County RVTSD  
Attendance Rates, 2009-2012**

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012	
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent
<b>All Students</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>93.7%</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>93.7%</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student's attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B9: Franklin County RVTSD  
Suspension Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State Rates for High Schools (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
In-School Suspension Rate	14.1	19.3	13.9	17.8	3.7	26.2%	3.9	28.1%	6.5%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	13.0	16.8	15.5	17.6	4.6	35.4%	2.1	13.5%	9.0%

Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

# Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

## Academic Classes

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	0	0	100%	(2)	14	100%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	1	7%
	HS	0	7%	93%	(2)	13	93%
3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.	ES				(0)	1	7%
	MS				(1)	1	7%
	HS	7%	7%	86%	(2)	12	86%
4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations.	ES				(0)	3	21%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	21%	36%	43%	(2)	6	43%
5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	2	14%
	HS	14%	14%	71%	(2)	10	71%
6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	7	50%
	HS	0%	50%	50%	(2)	7	50%
7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES				(0)	1	7%
	MS				(1)	4	29%
	HS	7%	29%	64%	(2)	9	64%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content.	ES				(0)	1	7%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	7%	36%	57%	(2)	8	57%
9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident.	ES				(0)	4	29%
	MS				(1)	2	14%
	HS	29%	14%	57%	(2)	8	57%
10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content.	ES				(0)	4	29%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	29%	36%	36%	(2)	5	36%
11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills)	ES				(0)	3	21%
	MS				(1)	4	29%
	HS	21%	29%	50%	(2)	7	50%
12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding.	ES				(0)	3	21%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	21%	36%	43%	(2)	6	43%
13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	6	43%
	HS	14%	43%	43%	(2)	6	43%
14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	14%	36%	50%	(2)	7	50%
15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction.	ES				(0)	4	29%
	MS				(1)	4	29%
	HS	29%	29%	43%	(2)	6	43%
16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning.	ES				(0)	5	36%
	MS				(1)	2	14%
	HS	36%	14%	50%	(2)	7	50%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	3	21%
	HS	14%	21%	64%	(2)	9	64%
18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES				(0)	3	21%
	MS				(1)	5	36%
	HS	21%	36%	43%	(2)	6	43%
19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	7	50%
	HS	14%	50%	36%	(2)	5	36%
20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.	ES				(0)	6	43%
	MS				(1)	1	7%
	HS	43%	7%	50%	(2)	7	50%
21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses).	ES				(0)	6	43%
	MS				(1)	3	21%
	HS	43%	21%	36%	(2)	5	36%
22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter.	ES				(0)	2	14%
	MS				(1)	2	14%
	HS	14%	14%	71%	(2)	10	71%
23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding.	ES				(0)	8	57%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	57%	0%	43%	(2)	6	43%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars.	ES				(0)	11	79%
	MS				(1)	2	14%
	HS	79%	14%	7%	(2)	1	7%

**Career, Vocational/Technical Classes**

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	0%	0%	100%	(2)	9	100%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	0%	0%	100%	(2)	9	100%
3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	0%	0%	100%	(2)	9	100%
4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	0%	22%	78%	(2)	7	78%
5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	1	11%
	HS	0%	11%	89%	(2)	8	89%
6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	0%	33%	67%	(2)	6	67%
7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	0%	0%	100%	(2)	9	100%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content.	ES				(0)	3	33%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	33%	22%	44%	(2)	4	44%
9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident.	ES				(0)	3	33%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	33%	22%	44%	(2)	4	44%
10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	11%	22%	67%	(2)	6	67%
11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills)	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	11%	33%	56%	(2)	5	56%
12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding.	ES				(0)	2	22%
	MS				(1)	6	67%
	HS	22%	67%	11%	(2)	1	11%
13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	11%	33%	56%	(2)	5	56%
14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	11%	22%	67%	(2)	6	67%
15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	11%	33%	56%	(2)	5	56%
16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	11%	22%	67%	(2)	6	67%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	0%	22%	78%	(2)	7	78%
18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	11%	33%	56%	(2)	5	56%
19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	1	11%
	HS	0%	11%	89%	(2)	8	89%
20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.	ES				(0)	1	11%
	MS				(1)	2	22%
	HS	11%	22%	67%	(2)	6	67%
21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses).	ES				(0)	4	44%
	MS				(1)	3	33%
	HS	44%	33%	22%	(2)	2	22%
22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter.	ES				(0)	0	0%
	MS				(1)	1	11%
	HS	0%	11%	89%	(2)	8	89%
23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding.	ES				(0)	1	13%
	MS				(1)	2	25%
	HS	13%	25%	63%	(2)	5	63%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars.	ES				(0)	2	22%
	MS				(1)	0	0%
	HS	22%	0%	78%	(2)	7	78%