

District Review Report

Hudson Public Schools

Review conducted March 10-13, 2014



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and

Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Hudson District Review Overview.....	1
Hudson District Review Findings.....	6
Hudson District Review Recommendations.....	32
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule	43
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	45
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	56

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



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

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.

© 2014 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



Hudson 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, with reference to the six district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE): 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 2013–2014 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance. 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 reviews 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 onsite 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 Hudson school district was conducted from March 10-13, 2014. The site visit included approximately 30 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 65 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students at the high school, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 16 elementary school teachers and paraprofessionals from 3 schools, 3 middle school teachers, and 5 high school teachers and paraprofessionals.

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, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 57 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Hudson has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected by committee members. There are seven members of the school committee and they meet bi-weekly. At the time of the site visit, the school committee had one vacancy.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2009. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment and the finance director. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past five years. The district has five principals leading five schools. There are other school administrators, including four assistant principals and special education and athletic directors at the high school. There were 238 teachers in the district in 2013–2014.

As of October 1, 2013, 2,947 students were enrolled in the district’s 5 schools:

**Table 1: Hudson Public School District
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2013–2014**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Farley Elementary School	ES	PK-4	526
Forest Avenue Elementary School	ES	K-4	334
Mulready Elementary School	ES	PK-4	286
Quinn Middle School	MS	5-7	688
Hudson High School	HS	8-12	1,113
Totals	5 schools	PK–12	2,947
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2010–2011 and 2013–14 overall student enrollment decreased by 46 students or 1.5 percent. 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 higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 48 local school districts of similar size (2,000–2,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: \$13,330 as compared with \$12,246 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required under state law, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Hudson is a Level 3 district because the C.A. Farley Elementary school is in Level 3.

- C.A. Farley, at the 18th percentile of elementary schools, is in Level 3 because it is among the lowest performing 20 percent of schools. It had a cumulative progressive performance index (PPI) score of 51 for all students and 47 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Mulready, at the 42nd percentile of elementary schools and Kennedy, at the 47th percentile of middle schools, are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing goals for all students and high needs students. Hudson High, at the 64th percentile of high schools, is in Level 2 for not meeting its gap narrowing goals for high needs students.
- Forrest Avenue, at the 59th percentile of elementary schools, is in Level 1 with a cumulative PPI of 97 for all students and 83 for high needs students; the target is 75.

The district did not reach its 2013 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets for ELA, math, and science.

- ELA CPI was 87.1 in 2013, below the district's target of 90.3.
- Math CPI was 79.5 in 2013, below the district's target of 82.9.
- Science CPI was 75.4 in 2013, below the district's target of 77.0.

ELA proficiency rates in Hudson were lower in 2013 than 2010 for the district as a whole and for every tested grade except the 5th and 10th grades, which significantly improved.

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 71 percent in 2010 and 69 percent in 2013, equal to the state rate of 69 percent.
- In 2013 ELA proficiency was lower than the state rate by 3 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 6 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 5 percentage points in the 7th grade, and by 1 percentage point in the 8th grade.
 - ELA proficiency rates were lower in 2013 than 2010, by 11 percentage points in grade 3, by 4 percentage points in grade 6, by 14 percentage points in grade 7, and by 5 percentage points in grade 8.
- In 2013 ELA proficiency was higher than the state rate by 9 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 1 percentage point in the 6th grade, and by 6 percentage points in the 10th grade.
 - ELA proficiency was higher in 2013 than 2010, by 12 percentage points in the 5th grade and by 11 percentage points in the 10th grade.

In 2013 math proficiency rates were below the state rate for the district as a whole and for every grade except the 10th grade.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district were 59 percent in 2010 and 58 percent in 2013, 3 percentage points below the state rate of 61 percent.
- Math proficiency in 2013 was lower than the state rate by 1 to 4 percentage points in the 3rd, 5th, 6th, and 8th grades, 9 percentage points lower in the 4th grade, and 8 percentage points lower in the 7th grade.
 - Math proficiency was lower in 2013 than 2010, by 9 percentage points in the 7th grade and by 12 percentage points in the 8th grade.
- Math proficiency in the 10th grade was 90 percent in 2013, 10 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 80 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 80 percent.
 - Math proficiency was higher in 2013 than 2010, by 4 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 5 percentage points in the 4th grade, and by 2 percentage points in the 5th grade.

In 2013 science proficiency was below the state rate and was lower in 2013 than in 2010 in the 5th and 8th grades but was above the state rate and higher in 2013 and 2010 in the 10th grade.

- 5th grade science proficiency was 39 percent in 2013, 11 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 50 percent, and 12 percentage points below the state rate of 51 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency was 35 percent in 2010 and 33 percent in 2013, 6 percentage points below the state rate of 39 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency was 72 percent in 2013, 10 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 62 percent, and 1 percentage point above the state rate of 71 percent.

Hudson met the 2014 four year cohort graduation rate target of 80.0 percent and did not meet the five year cohort graduation rate target of 85.0 percent.^{1 2}

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 88.6 percent in 2013, 6.2 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 82.4, and above the 2013 state rate of 85.0 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate was 83.7 percent in 2012, 3.4 percentage points lower than the 2009 rate of 87.1 percent, and below the 2012 state rate of 87.5 percent.

¹ 2014 graduation rate targets are 80 percent for the four year and 85 percent for the five year cohort graduation rates and refer to the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rate.

² Whether the 2014 graduation rate targets are met is determined based on the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rate. ESE's 2014 accountability determinations have not yet been released.

- The annual dropout rate for Hudson was 3.0 percent in 2010 to 1.7 percent in 2013, compared to the statewide rate of 2.2 percent.

Hudson District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. Central office administrators, principals, and teachers identified the ability of the staff to adapt to change as a major strength of the district.

- A. Central office administrators, principals, and teachers indicated the ability of staff to adjust to the implementation requirements of numerous local and state mandated education program changes as the primary strength of the district.
 - 1. The superintendent stated that administrators, teachers, and support personnel as well as their capacity and willingness to accept and adjust to the education policy changes in the last few years to serve students better are the strength of the school district. Another central office administrator echoed the sentiments of the superintendent about the strength of the staff and their willingness to adapt to change.
 - 2. The principals agreed that the staff and their adaptability to a variety of changes are strengths of the district.
 - 3. When asked about the strength of the school district, the leaders of the Hudson Educators Association (HEA) identified the teachers, support staff, the superintendent, as well as other central office administrators.
- B. Interviewees spoke about the number of changes originating locally and from ESE that the staff has accepted and adapted to.
 - 1. Administrators said that the high school schedule changed from core courses meeting 4 times for 90 minutes in a 7-day rotation to meeting 5 times for 70 minutes in the 7-day rotation. According to the superintendent, this schedule change, which was implemented at the start of the 2013–2014 school year, allowed teachers to engage with students more frequently.
 - 2. A second local change was the opening this year of a new state-of-the-art middle school. At the same time, grade 5 was added to the middle school as a result of the reconfiguration of kindergarten and grade 5 across the district. Previously, grade 5 was housed at each of the 3 elementary schools.
 - 3. A third local change was the grade reconfiguration of the three elementary schools. The superintendent said that concomitant with the move of grade 5 from the elementary schools to the new middle school, kindergarten was relocated from the early childhood center to the 3 elementary schools. The reconfiguration provides a full-day kindergarten

option and reduces the number of grade transitions for students as they progress through the school system. Other administrators and principals concurred with this information provided by the superintendent.

4. The fourth local change was the collaboration between the superintendent and the leadership of the HEA, with the assistance of other administrators and teachers, to conduct a smooth reassignment of staff as a result of the grade reconfiguration. The superintendent stated that he worked closely with the HEA, and that preference surveys were used, teacher focus groups were conducted, teachers were coached on licensing, and “Ninety five percent got what they wanted.”
5. Another local change was the introduction of a literacy coaching model at the elementary schools. Interviewees stated that as the result of the implementation of a literacy initiative two literacy coach positions were established at the elementary level.
6. In addition to local changes and initiatives, interviewees stated the district is also implementing initiatives required by ESE. They stated that the new educator evaluation system, collaboratively developed with the HEA, was in the second year of implementation. In addition, the interviewees indicated that they were progressing with enrolling teachers in Rethinking Equity and Teaching of English Language Learners (RETELL) cohorts and refining the Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) to identify students who need support and intervention. Furthermore, the district has embraced working with the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) in response to the district being identified as Level 3.

Impact: The willingness of the administrators, teachers, and support staff to accept and adapt to numerous local and state changes and initiatives will benefit students and the staff. It is likely the high school schedule change, the new middle school facility, the reconfiguration of grades, the reduction in school building transitions, and the institution of a full-day kindergarten program option will improve student achievement. Also, the new educator evaluation system and RETELL assist all administrators and teachers to improve the quality of instruction in the classroom, attain the goals of the district/schools, and improve educator competency.

Curriculum and Instruction

The team observed 57 classes throughout the district: 15 at the high school, 14 at the middle school, and 28 at the 3 elementary schools. The team observed 30 ELA classes, 16 mathematics classes, and 11 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. Review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- 2. The district has implemented a model of instructional leadership that promotes and supports effective teaching practices, particularly in literacy.**

- A. The superintendent and assistant superintendent have established the expectation that the principals are responsible for curriculum and instruction within their schools, a shift from prior years.
 - 1. The three elementary principals reported that they work collaboratively at the K-4 elementary level to implement a high quality research-based literacy program. They co-lead professional development with the staffs of all three schools once each month. They described a shared process of planning the 90 minute meetings together, in collaboration with the literacy and mathematics coaches and the elementary curriculum director. Principals attend the break-out sessions with teachers.
 - 2. The middle and high school principals reported that they are committed to developing strong models of teaching literacy in grades 5-12, but they, and district leaders, acknowledged that they are not as advanced as the K-4 schools.
 - a. Each secondary principal reported initiatives at their schools that focused on improving student literacy. The middle school listed as one of its primary school improvement objectives, "To continue to build additional literacy instructional skills." These skills included "adopting and adapting the Reader's Workshop model practiced by grade 5 teachers."³ In one teacher focus group, a science teacher described working with the ELA teacher to help students learn how to complete a five paragraph analytical essay synthesizing information from one resource. At the high school, interviewees said that the focus was on strengthening writing skills, particularly after analyzing students' MCAS open responses. At the high school, teachers reported that ELA and social studies teachers were very collaborative and both content areas were led by one humanities curriculum director.
- B. The district is committed to instructional improvement through its instructional support structure of curriculum directors and coaches who work at the elementary (K-4) or secondary (5-12) levels.
 - 1. The district has a director of secondary curriculum for mathematics and science, a director of secondary curriculum humanities, a director of elementary curriculum, two literacy coaches, and an ELL coach. The assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment meets weekly with the core content directors.
 - 2. Directors and principals share in the observations of teachers, alternating assignments bi-monthly.
 - 3. District and school leaders and directors evaluate the impact of coaches in the classroom. In the fourth grade, for example, every other week is a coaching week, followed by an evaluation week. The purpose of the evaluation week is to determine whether the coaching is being used properly; leaders said that teachers are working well with this model and look forward to the coaching. Teachers at every level reported that curriculum directors are

- frequent visitors to the classroom and work collaboratively with teachers to improve instruction.
4. Coaching targets specific instructional strategies. For example, one director noted that teachers were not scanning the room when working with small groups; the director told the team they realized that further professional development was needed regarding this instructional practice. The director also noted that, if an evaluation of a teacher highlighted the need for improvement in a specific area, a strategy for improvement would be integrated into the coaching model to help the teacher improve.
- C. In classroom observations using ESE's instructional inventory, the team found clear and consistent evidence that instructional leadership and support are resulting in effective teaching practices in several areas.
1. The team found that in 75 percent of observed classrooms, teachers clearly and consistently planned and implemented lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations. The evidence was strongest in the elementary grades (82 percent), followed by the middle grades (79 percent) and the high school grades (60 percent).
 - a. Examples of lessons that reflected rigor included: an elementary grade 4 writing lesson that asked students to explore why and how accurate punctuation helped bring clarity to readers; a grade 5 science lesson that required students to define the various states of matter and, in addition, to describe what was needed to change the states; a high school ELA lesson about *The Great Gatsby* that required students to analyze how specific words, syntax, and elements of style helped the author achieve his purpose.
 2. The team found clear and consistent evidence of teachers using appropriate instructional strategies well-matched to learning objectives and content in 74 percent of the classes observed; in the elementary and middle schools the frequency was higher (86 percent) than in the high school (40 percent). Elementary teachers were skilled in effectively using centers for reading and writing instruction. At all levels, many teachers effectively used turn and talk and clarified key vocabulary terms with students.
 3. The team found clear and consistent evidence of teachers using questioning techniques that required thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding in 72 percent of the classes observed; the evidence was strongest in the elementary grades (75 percent), followed by the high school grades (73 percent) and the middle grades (64 percent). Elementary teachers asked students to make predictions and used wait time to promote thoughtful responses. Secondary teachers pushed students to back up responses, to explain how they had arrived at their answers, and to show the evidence to support their claims.
 4. The team found clear and consistent evidence of teachers conducting frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction in 73 percent of the classes observed; the evidence was strongest in the middle grades (79 percent), followed by the elementary grades (75 percent); and the high school grades (60 percent). These assessments took many forms. For example, some teachers asked students to move to one side of the

room if they agreed with a particular answer and then to explain why they had made their decision; some teachers used small white boards and then checked student answers; and many used exit tickets, both verbal and written. Teachers frequently asked questions to gauge class understanding (“Who doesn’t get this?”) or asked for thumbs up or down as indicators. When there were additional adults in the room they were observed questioning students about their work.

5. In nearly 100 percent of visited classes, teachers and students create a positive learning environment.
 - a. The review team found clear and consistent evidence of a positive and respectful tone between teachers and students in 95 percent of all classes observed. The team noted clear and consistent evidence that behavioral standards were clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably in 91 percent of visited classrooms.

Impact: The model of instructional leadership and teacher support in place in the district has begun to create a more cohesive and unified school district that is focusing on high quality instructional practices. In particular, the three elementary schools, through their principals, elementary director, and coaches, are moving toward a consistent reading and writing program that targets improving instruction and student learning. Because of the success of this model, the district is now patterning its plan for the revision of mathematics teaching to the workshop model.

Assessment

3. The district has begun to establish systems and practices to create a culture of assessment, using data from formative and benchmark and summative assessments to inform instruction.

- A. The district has in place an accurate, balanced set of assessments used for school, educator, and student improvement. Administrators have been strategic in their commitment to data use, building capacity, and supporting teachers’ use of data to make decisions about student placement and improving student learning.
 1. At the elementary level, educators use formative, benchmark, and summative data (MCAS) to guide decisions and have built in time and opportunities to discuss data and build capacity around its use.
 - a. Elementary teachers use formative assessments such as “turn and talk” to gauge student knowledge before introducing a topic, and a data-gathering protocol called “messy sheets” for tiered grouping and regrouping students in Reader’s and Writer’s workshops.⁴ The review team clearly and consistently saw teachers using formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction in 75 percent of the

elementary school classes observed.⁵ An administrator stated that to ensure that teachers were supported using assessments to guide instruction, teachers were provided professional development focused on using formative assessment data effectively.

- b. Interviewees reported that the district created a grade 4 mathematics assessment used by all elementary schools. School leaders at the Farley Elementary School, a Level 3 school, used MCAS results and results from the local mathematics assessment to pinpoint areas for improvement in instruction.
 - c. The district will purchase *Star Enterprise* next year for universal screening and progress monitoring in mathematics.
 - d. Interviewees stated that elementary data teams made up of teachers, administrators, and specialists meet three times a year to review student data. Last year data teams focused on establishing common scoring and testing protocols to develop meaningful data analyses results.
 - e. Interviewees reported that the district used a variety of assessments at the elementary and secondary levels. For example, at the elementary level, examples of literacy assessments include DIBELS, DRA, the Teacher’s College High Frequency Word Assessment, and Lucy Calkins running records. In mathematics, elementary assessments include mostly district-based assessments, but the district has budgeted to purchase the Star Enterprise mathematics assessment for next year. At the secondary level, examples of assessments include the Star Renaissance Learning assessment for literacy, a local shared assessment for eighth through tenth graders in the academic literacy course, and assessments related to the Next Generation Science standards for middle school students.
2. At the secondary level, educators are also using formative and summative data to track the progress of students and guide instructional decisions; however, use of assessments at the secondary level is more uncoordinated and less organized than at the elementary level.
 - a. Administrators and teachers at the middle school use Next Generation Science, a K–12 benchmark assessment based on international standards, to conduct gap analyses to guide instructional modifications.
 - b. Middle school teachers work in teams and use data to modify instruction.
 - c. The review team observed teachers clearly and consistently using formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction in 79 percent of the middle school classes; however, the use of formative assessment was lower incidence at the high school level where the team observed clear and consistent use of frequent
-

formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction in 60 percent of the high school classes observed.

- d. The middle school used an analysis of MCAS data to inform the decision to purchase a new mathematics program and to place students in mathematics courses at the high school.
 - e. Administrators reported that educators use common mathematics assessments in grades 5 to 7 and for all core mathematics and science classes at the high school.
 - f. The high school implemented a data tracking system that provides monthly behavioral data that identifies students at risk of dropping out. The data is used to inform decisions about the need for interventions and parent meetings.
3. Administrators reported that teachers at all levels use data from embedded assessments to make instructional decisions in literacy and mathematics classrooms. For example, elementary schools have all been using Lucy Calkins running records and data gleaned from this formative assessment to create and implement curriculum embedded benchmark assessments (CEBAs).
- a. An example of a literacy CEBA, based on an ESE Model Curriculum Unit, was a visit by students to Plimoth Plantation and Wampanoag Village to gather data and write stories from the point of view of either Pilgrim or Native American children. CEBAs were included together in a book available in elementary school libraries.
4. Interviewees stated that data teams exist across all levels and include curriculum team members, para-professionals, and learning specialists. At the elementary level, data teams are working on vertically aligning curriculum, and setting SMART goals (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action-Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused; and Timed and Tracked) for students.
- a. First grade teachers have been examining the results of grade 4 literacy assessments to better understand what is expected at the grade 4 level and do backwards planning to identify instructional strategies to support those expectations. Teachers have asked that the same activity be undertaken in examining the results of grade 4 mathematics assessments.
 - b. Data teams sometimes convene during departmental meetings, during 90-minute curriculum meetings, or during full and partial professional development days.
5. The district was a pilot site for developing a SIF-enabled Student Information System.
6. District staff at all levels, including specialists, received EWIS training in the summer of 2013. Interviewees reported that administrators used EWIS student data to develop an

intervention strategy to support students in an elementary school who are close to moving up a level on MCAS.

Impact: The progress the district has made on developing a culture of assessment indicates some success in the use of data to inform instructional decisions to meet the needs of its students. For example, a team-based approach with strategic capacity-building at the elementary level has created a culture of assessment in which teachers are active participants in understanding data and using it to make changes to instruction and to regroup students. The team structure for teaching at the middle school supports some team-based use of assessments and results to inform interventions and instructional changes. The less coordinated approach to assessment use at the high school indicates that instructional decisions based on data may be less responsive to student needs than at the other levels, with higher priority given to monitoring student data to identify students at risk of dropping out.

Human Resources and Professional Development

4. The district, in collaboration with the Hudson Education Association, negotiated and effectively implemented the new educator evaluation system in 2012-2013 as required for Race to the Top participants.

- A. As a recipient of a Race to the Top grant and in accord with the new educator evaluation regulations, the district began implementing an educator evaluation system aligned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's new educator evaluation framework in 2012–2013. The district is now in its second full year of implementation.
 - 1. The district and the Hudson Education Association (HEA) had included as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) the collective bargaining agreement, an article that showed that the district and the HEA agreed to “continue their joint committee work and negotiations on educator evaluation with a goal of implementation in September 2012.” A review of school committee minutes showed that the district adopted the educator evaluation contract language on August 21, 2012, and the HEA ratified the agreement of September 12, 2012. ESE's Office of Educator Preparation, Policy, and Leadership reviewed the ratified educator evaluation contract language on October 30, 2012.
 - a. During the first year of implementation, approximately half of the staff started the new evaluation process. All teachers without professional status were assigned to Developing Educator Plans.
 - b. The district and HEA agreed that observations would last a minimum of 10 minutes and unlimited walkthroughs could be conducted by evaluators.
 - c. District leaders told the HEA that the walkthrough would be conducted using a coaching model and that type of model continues now.

2. District leaders told the team that they knew that the district's evaluation system had not been aligned with the new evaluation regulations, so the district began planning and training early to implement the new regulations. The district engaged an external consultant to train administrators and HEA representatives. The training was conducted as a partnership between the district and HEA to create teams of administrators and teachers to train teachers at school sites on the components of the evaluation system.
 - a. District leaders told the team that training is ongoing, and recently high school portfolios were reviewed to find exemplars of evidence.
 - b. Inter-rater reliability and norming is conducted through a team walkthrough process that includes a debriefing of what individual observers saw.
 3. The district uses TeachPoint software to collect and manage educator evaluation documents, evidence, and other artifacts, according to district and school leaders.
- B. The team reviewed documents for 20 teachers and 15 administrators in the district's TeachPoint evaluation management system. The reviewed showed the files rich in documents and evidence and included self-assessments, information from walkthroughs, summaries of walkthroughs, goals and action plans, summative evaluations, and numerous artifacts and other examples of evidence. A sampling review of information in the documents showed that formative and summative evaluations were informative and instructive.
1. All teacher files reviewed showed that student learning and professional practice goals were developed. As an example, a new teacher had set a learning student learning goal (team) of improving writing in ELA and social studies classes through the use of more structure words. All administrator files showed that student learning, professional practice, and school improvement goals had been developed. For example, a central office administrator had set a school improvement goal to disaggregate survey data.
 2. A review of 2012-2013 ESE educator evaluation ratings for Hudson showed that 153 educators were evaluated; 90.8 percent were rated proficient, 5.2 percent were rated needs improvement, and none were rated unsatisfactory. An exemplary rating was given to 3.9 percent of all educators, including 6.9 percent of teachers with professional status.

Impact: The district collaborated with the HEA to plan and implement the new educator evaluation system. If district and school leaders continue to be attentive to monitoring the quality of the components of the system and provide continuous training to administrators and teachers, the impact will likely be improved staff competency.

5. The district has developed and implemented a solid mentoring program for both teachers and paraprofessionals.

- A. The 2008–2011 collective bargaining agreement, amended by a memorandum of understanding (MOU) agreed to by the Hudson School Committee and the Hudson Education Association on May 1, 2012, and signed on May 15, 2012, states that all first year teachers or teachers new to

Hudson are required to participate in an orientation, mentoring, and induction program. Interview with district leaders and a document review showed that Hudson has been supporting a teacher mentoring program since 1998 and recently revised the program, retrained mentors, and developed a handbook.

1. The teacher mentoring program is managed by a mentoring (induction) coordinator, an elementary lead mentor, and a secondary lead mentor. A review of school committee minutes and the district curriculum accommodation plan showed that new teachers attend a three-day orientation in late summer and meet their mentors. Mentors and mentees receive 15 professional development points annually and mentors are compensated \$600 to mentor one teacher and \$350 for each additional teacher.
 2. A review of the teacher mentoring handbook showed that the program has a defined mission and goals. Mentors have specific roles and responsibilities. For example, mentors must meet with the lead mentor at least two times a year and attend training to reflect on and share practices. In addition, they must schedule a weekly meeting of 30 to 60 minutes to work with the mentee on issues such as the specific needs of the mentee, classroom management, school culture, and specific student needs.
 3. Examples of mentee roles and responsibilities include participating in a multi-day orientation program before the start of the school year, attending monthly new teacher meetings during the first year of employment, scheduling weekly 30 to 60 minute meetings to work with the mentor, and setting up non-evaluative observations with the mentor. Mentees must also complete logs to document mentor meetings.
 4. A review of 2014 TELL Mass data showed that 96 percent of 24 new teacher responders were assigned a mentor and 100 percent of 24 new teacher responders attended a new teacher orientation. However, only 37 percent of 24 new teacher responders indicated that formal time was provided during school hours to meet with their mentors.
- B. The district also has developed a paraprofessional mentoring program. The program is managed by the district's induction coordinator and a lead paraprofessional mentor. According to the paraprofessional mentoring handbook, mentors and mentees receive 15 professional development points annually and mentors are compensated \$200 to mentor one paraprofessional and \$100 for each additional paraprofessional.
1. A review of the paraprofessional mentoring handbook showed that the paraprofessional mentoring program has characteristics similar to those new teacher mentoring program. It has a mission and goals and mentors and mentees have roles and responsibilities such as meeting monthly or as needed.

Impact: A strong and structured mentoring program creates a climate of support that assists new teachers and other academic staff by providing counsel and guidance. A structured induction program for new teachers and paraprofessionals helps them to be autonomous and assured and will likely enhance staff morale and limit staff turnover.

Financial and Asset Management

6. The district has maintained and renovated older schools and constructed new schools as part of a long term plan that ensures that facilities are clean, safe, and conducive to educational purposes.

- A. The town and the district collaborated to allocate capital funding to renovate older but satisfactory schools and replace unsatisfactory schools with new schools.
 - 1. A new middle school was opened in 2013. Mulready Elementary was renovated in 2006.⁶ A new high school was opened in 2003. Farley Elementary was fully renovated with an addition in 2000. Forest Avenue Elementary was renovated in 1998.
 - B. All schools have facilities that are conducive to teaching and learning.
 - 1. All schools have a gymnasium, a cafeteria or a cafetorium, an auditorium, a library, a playground, and technology facilities.
 - 2. Walkthroughs of the schools by team members showed that they were clean and well maintained.
 - 3. Schools and facilities are highly rated by several sources.
 - a. All schools are rated level 1 (the highest rating) by the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) for general environment, all have average space use (neither overcrowded nor underused), and all except Farley are rated 1 for condition. Farley is rated 2.
 - b. Hudson staff who responded to the 2014 TELL Mass survey generally agree or strongly agree that facilities and resources are satisfactory. The level of agreement is uniformly higher than state averages in the same categories. For example, of teachers who responded (n=197), 93 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “The physical environment of classrooms supports teaching and learning,” compared with the state rate of 80 percent. Of teachers who responded (n=186), 91 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about facilities and resources,” compared with the state rate of 76 percent.
 - c. Team members found clear and consistent evidence that the physical arrangement of the classroom ensured a positive learning environment in 93 percent of the classes observed.
 - C. The district and the town have a well planned capital budgeting program.
-

1. The school department annually prepares a long term capital improvement budget.
 - a. The budget request is prepared by the facilities director with input from the principals and department heads. The request is reviewed by the Superintendent's Advisory Team and submitted to the school committee and then presented to the town for approval.
 - b. Projects included in the capital budget are prioritized over a five-year period.
2. The town annually funds projects from the capital budget that help to maintain the condition of the schools. In recent the high school's HVAC system has been substantially upgraded, and a new roof membrane on the Forest Avenue Elementary School is currently funded.
3. The district and town submit a Statement of Interest (SOI) to MSBA for the funding of major maintenance projects. The current SOI concerns replacing the roof and removing abated asbestos at the Mulready Elementary School.

Impact: The district's long-term capital planning and facilities management has contributed to a positive learning environment for staff and students. The district's maintenance procedures ensure that educational and program facilities are clean, safe, secure, well lit and well-maintained. Long-term planning means that maintenance problems are likely to be limited in the future. This long-term planning affords the district and town cost-effective resource management and allocation.

7. In response to the tragedy in Newtown, Connecticut, the district embarked on a program to enhance the security and safety of its schools.

- A. The Hudson Schools re-evaluated security procedures and trained staff, students, and parents in these procedures.
 1. Safety and security measures in all schools were reviewed. A school perimeter survey was conducted. Emergency Response Guidelines were reviewed and an employee photo identification system was implemented.
- B. School security equipment was reviewed and enhanced.
 1. All school doors were locked and equipped with Fob entry systems. Main doors were equipped with entry cameras and intercom/door release systems where needed. Exterior cameras with DVRs and panic buttons were installed where needed. Exterior doors were upgraded where needed. The district obtained \$100,000 in budget funds to purchase the needed equipment.
- C. Parents indicated to the review team that they had become more comfortable about their children's safety and students and staff indicated that the district had improved safety in the schools.

Impact: Hudson significantly improved the safety and security in its schools thus enhancing the learning environment. The parents became more comfortable about their children’s safety. The children and staff feel more secure and are able to concentrate on learning.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

Leadership and Governance

8. The district does not have a District Improvement Plan for 2013–2014.

- A. The district did not prepare a District Improvement Plan (DIP) for school year 2013–2014.
 - 1. The superintendent stated that there is no 2013–2014 DIP, but that some draft sections for the 2014–2016 DIP have been developed. The principals said that at their monthly meetings with the superintendent they discuss matters pertaining to the development of the DIP.
- B. All the schools have 2012–2014 School Improvement Plans (SIPs) that focus on the district goals approved by the school committee in 2011.
 - 1. The SIPs address the first four district goals. The goals are: (1) continuous improvement of student achievement, (2) continuous improvement of a safe and supportive school environment, (3) increase parent and community engagement with our schools, and (4) continuous improvement of health and wellness. The fifth district goal, increase the clarity of strategic direction and continuously improve infrastructure, is not a program category included in the SIPs.
 - 2. The schools used a common SIP template. The sections of the template are program categories, program objectives, benchmark[s], key performance indicator[s], improvement strategies/activities, and data collection and reporting.
 - 3. The SIPs are out of cycle with the DIP because the SIPs are prepared before the development of the DIP. In addition, the SIPS are out of cycle with the budget process and do not include budget information. The superintendent told the team that he recognizes the need to reverse this process and to have the SIPs more fiscally aligned with the DIP.
- C. Central office and school level administrators stated that they are collaborating on the development of a DIP for 2014–2016.
 - 1. The superintendent said that the Superintendent’s Advisory Team (SAT), composed of the central office administrators, principals, assistant principals, and curriculum directors, is participating in developing the DIP. The principals concurred with this statement.
 - 2. The superintendent said that the DSAC is assisting the SAT with the development of the draft DIP. Also, because Hudson is a Level 3 district and is working with the DSAC on the development of the DIP, the draft District Improvement Plan uses the Accelerated Learning Plan (ALP) format and template used by the DSAC.

3. The superintendent said that the draft 2014–2016 DIP focuses on three goals: (1) grounding instruction in research-based practices and insights gained from collaborative analysis of common assessment of student progress toward acquiring the knowledge and skills outlined in a rigorous, relevant, and viable curriculum, (2) developing a culture of rigorous, high expectations for achievement and behavior, and (3) developing a districtwide culture of respect and appreciation of differences.
 - a. For each goal, the DIP template includes the objectives along with four questions that need to be addressed: (1) What are the action steps? (2) Who will lead? (3) What is the timeline? (4) What evidence will show that we are progressing as a district?
4. The superintendent told the review team that the district expects to incorporate the results from surveys, student achievement results, and the findings and recommendations from the review team’s report into the final DIP draft before it is presented to the school committee. Two surveys shared with the review team were the Vision, Values and Involvement Survey and the Strategic Plan Survey.
5. As part of the process to develop a 2014–2016 DIP, the SAT drafted a new vision statement and values that included input from staff, parents, and members of the community.

Impact: The absence of a District Improvement Plan leads to uncertainty among stakeholders about the methods the leadership of the district proposes to move the district forward. Using aligned goals and common formats and templates for the DIP and the SIPs will create a consistent approach to district and school improvement.

9. During the past six years the school committee has experienced substantial turnover, and some positions have been left vacant.

- A. The Hudson school committee, which consists of seven members, has seen multiple changes in membership in the last six years.
 1. A document titled “Hudson School Committee Members” lists the membership of the Hudson School Committee from 2008–2009 to the 2013–2014 school year. During this period, the following changes in membership of the school committee have taken place:
 - 2008–2009: Baseline year, 7 members;
 - 2009–2010: 1 new member and 1 other member resigned mid-term to become a selectman;
 - 2010–2011: 1 position vacant and 1 other member left mid-term;
 - 2011–2012: 2 new members and 1 other new member appointed to fill vacancy;
 - 2012–2013: 1 new member and 1 other member resigned mid-term; and

- 2013–2014: 2 new members appointed following the mid-term resignations of 2 members and 1 position is vacant.
- B. One school committee member said that school committee members receive training through the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC). The superintendent concurred, stating that the new members attend the MASC orientation program. However, the review team did not find evidence of other school committee training or retreats.
- C. Some school committee members said that the committee’s relationship with the superintendent was good, yet could improve. The superintendent told review team members that he has worked to build a strong relationship with the school committee. However, he said that there were times that he has had differences of opinion with school committee members.
- D. Some principals indicated that there were times when they perceived an absence of a school committee partnership with stakeholders. They indicated that there were instances when the school committee took positions that were perceived as not in the best interest of teachers, such as recommending that the superintendent strictly enforce Article 5c of the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement (CBA). This article describes times that teachers are to remain after school for meetings without receiving additional compensation.
- E. Some school committee members indicated that until last year the school committee had a positive relationship with the HEA.
1. When speaking about the change in this relationship, committee members cited issues such as the prolonged negotiations about Article 5c of the CBA.
 2. HEA representatives indicated that there was not a sense of mutual respect between the school committee and teachers.
 - a. HEA representatives gave examples of issues that have caused the relationship with the school committee to deteriorate, including the school committee’s choosing a new law firm, collective bargaining negotiations not starting with ground rules or on time, the turnover of school committee members, the absence of a resolution to Article 5c in the CBA, and two grievances that have now reached Level 4.

Impact: The turnover of the membership of the school committee, including mid-term resignations and positions left vacant, as well as the limited training of committee members, inhibits the development of collaborative relationships with various stakeholders.

Curriculum and Instruction

10. The district does not have fully aligned, documented, and cohesive curricula K–12 in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies.

- A. The district has made some progress in aligning its curricula and has sufficient staff to continue and complete the process.
 - 1. The district has an assistant superintendent of curriculum, instruction, and assessment whose responsibility it is to lead the district in curriculum alignment, documentation, and implementation.
 - a. The assistant superintendent has held the position for 1.5 years. District leaders said that before that “there were a lot of silos” in curriculum. Now the district is “going from nothing to something,” with the three-year goal to develop learning targets, alignment, collaboration, an adaptable living curriculum document, and teachers speaking a common language.
 - b. At the elementary and secondary levels the district has content directors who are responsible for the alignment and documentation of curriculum in the core content areas and for monitoring for the fidelity of curriculum implementation. The district has literacy coaches K–5 who support teachers in implementing the ELA curriculum. The district has changed past practice and is in the process of making curriculum implementation a shared responsibility between school leaders and curriculum directors.
 - c. The district used a program entitled Build Your Own Curriculum, but that had been discontinued. The district plans to use ESE’s Edwin curriculum management program as soon as it is available. Currently, there is no districtwide method to record and document curriculum, although some teachers report using Google Docs and Dropbox to share curricular programs.
- B. Documentation and alignment of curricula varied by subject at each level, with greatest alignment at the K–4 level in ELA and the least in K–12 mathematics and science.
 - 1. District and curriculum leaders told the team that the district has aligned approximately 85 percent of the ELA curriculum to the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and documented its work. A significant amount of professional development time, as reflected in the professional development offerings listed on the district website, has been dedicated to completing the K–12 ELA curriculum.
 - 2. The status of mathematics alignment to the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks varied at each level.
 - a. Until the 2013–2014 school year, the position of K–12 mathematics and science director had been vacant for 1 to 2 years.
 - b. District leaders said that “math was a hole in the curriculum.” For example, the elementary schools were aligning the current mathematics program as they were using it and were beginning the process of curriculum review to replace their current

mathematics program; the middle school had begun working on aligning its curriculum, but purchased a mathematics series that was not aligned. At the high school, mathematics curriculum was approximately 50 percent aligned.

- c. The district has established a mathematics leadership committee to replicate the curriculum review and alignment process achieved in literacy.
3. The science curriculum had similar disparities in alignment. At the elementary level, teachers used Foss science kits. At the middle school the science curriculum was well documented but changing, and at the high school, curriculum alignment and documentation were behind ELA and social studies.
 4. In the middle school, the social studies curriculum was about 60 percent aligned. Alignment in other subject areas varied by department, with the alignment of history on hold because of the change in scope and sequence.
 5. Classroom observations showed low incidence of elementary and high school teachers clearly and consistently communicating verbally or in writing clear learning objectives for their lessons. For example, while 100 percent of middle school teachers observed by the team communicated learning objectives for every lesson, only 50 percent of elementary teachers and 47 percent of high school teachers used the practice. At all levels, the learning objectives were rarely identified as being connected to standards. Alignment with WIDA was in the beginning stages, with the model performance indicators being added to the curriculum embedded benchmark assessments.
 - a. Observations of instructional practices revealed low incidence of appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities, such as explicit language objectives, presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity, and differentiation of content, process and/or product differentiation. Clear and consistent evidence of attention to the curricular and instructional needs of English language learners and students with disabilities was observed in 61 percent of elementary classes, in 50 percent of middle classes, and in only 13 percent of high school classes. In a review of the curriculum documents provided by the district, while essential questions and enduring understandings were identified, the documents provided no guidance for differentiation.
- C. Currently the district is using a curriculum review model based on the AIMS approach, described by an interviewee as “based on the work teachers and students are supposed to do.”

Impact: While the district has sufficient curriculum leadership, without documented and aligned curricula it is limited in its ability to ensure consistency, standard alignment, and effective delivery. The district cannot guarantee that all students have equitable access to the curriculum. For example, at the elementary levels, there is currently variation in the math programs used at some schools. While there has been some vertical alignment in ELA, this has not yet happened in the math, science, or social

studies content areas from K to 12. Gaps or overlaps in curriculum have not been determined. Standards and criteria for determining professional development in core subject areas may be difficult to determine when curriculum standards are not clearly delineated from K to 12.

Assessment

11. The positive strides made across the district on assessment and the use of data in ELA have not been replicated across all content areas.

- A. A unified district plan for a K–12 system of assessment and data use across all levels and content areas has been hampered by the absence of a unified K–12 curriculum model.
- B. At the elementary level, a systematic focus on mathematics initiatives and assessments has not been as strong as the focus on literacy.
 - 1. Administrators indicated that discussions about vertical alignment among data teams have not taken mathematics assessments into account, although there is interest and plans to do so in the future.
- C. New leadership in oversight of the mathematics and science curricula has not cultivated the use of as strong a system of balanced assessments and the data as is used in ELA.
 - 1. Electronic portfolio assessments in mathematics have not been implemented at the high school level.
 - 2. The superintendent told the team that, after five years of strong focus on using literacy assessments to inform improvements in ELA instruction, the district needs to segue to a similar focus on mathematics.

Impact: The absence of a districtwide focus on mathematics assessments has been a barrier to creating unified vertical alignment of assessing students’ mathematics progress and using progress data to guide and inform instruction.

Human Resources and Professional Development

12. District responsibilities related to personnel matters, such as implementing and monitoring the educator evaluation system and mediating contractual disputes, have increased. With no human resources director, most of these responsibilities have been absorbed by members of the Superintendent’s Advisory Team.

- A. The district has approximately 500 employees, including approximately 380 teachers and staff responsible for classroom instruction. Most employees, including teachers, nurses, custodians, and secretarial personnel, are members of bargaining units.

1. The superintendent said that the district used to have a human resources director to manage all human resources activity, including discipline, disputes, negotiations, background checks, teacher recertification requirements, implementing of initiatives, and benefits. Now these responsibilities are spread over several central office administrators.
 2. At the same time, the district has recently implemented several major initiatives with implications for human resources. For example, the district is implementing the new educator evaluation system; the assistant superintendent of curriculum, assessment, and instruction is leading the implementation. The district has also revised and implemented mentoring programs for teachers and paraprofessionals, RETELL training, and a new assessment system for students with disabilities.
- B. The district and the HEA have been unable to negotiate a new collective bargaining agreement (CBA) because of a dispute over section 5C, which may require teachers to stay after school.
1. The CBA that expired in 2011 was extended by MOU and ratified on May 15, 2012. This MOU expires on August 28, 2015.
 2. The team was told that the HEA is represented in bargaining by a new Massachusetts Teachers' Association representative and the district is represented by a new law firm.
 3. In interviews with HEA members, school committee members, and the superintendent the team was told that the quality of communication needed to resolve these issues is inconsistent. According to HEA representatives, the district and HEA are not currently bargaining.
 4. HEA members, the school committee, and the superintendent told the review team that grievances in the district have escalated and two are scheduled for arbitration. One HEA representative stated that more grievances were filed this year than in the past 20 years. The team was told that legal/accounting expenses in the district have increased from approximately \$110,000 in school year 2010–2011 to a budgeted amount of approximately \$231,000 for school year 2014–2015.
 5. Hudson Education Association (HEA) representatives reported that they have excellent communications with the superintendent and they worked collaboratively with the superintendent on the implementation of the new educator evaluation system and the reassignment of teachers for the grade reconfiguration in the fall of the 2012–2013 school year.

Impact: Responsibility for administrative personnel matters impedes the academic administrators' ability to perform their primary duties. Insufficient human resources expertise in the district may also contribute to disputes about union contracts, which can increase costs.

Student Support

13. Classroom teachers do not regularly employ the strategies necessary to make content accessible to all students in their classes. In addition, Tier 1 and 2 interventions vary by school, and some supports are not available to students.

- A. Tier 1 interventions vary from classroom to classroom and from school to school.
 - 1. Tier 1 support strategies in the regular education classroom such as differentiated instruction, accommodations, and sheltering practices were clearly and consistently observed in 17 percent of classes visited at the high school, in 50 percent of the classes at the middle school, and in 61 percent of classes at the elementary school level.
 - a. In the elementary school, even where these instructional strategies were used in observed classes, often push-in teachers rather than classroom teachers delivered the differentiation, accommodations, or modifications.
- B. While the elementary schools are able to provide targeted help to identified at-risk students, the district offers limited Tier 2 supports at the secondary level.
 - 1. Staff reported that the elementary schools employ a variety of reading and mathematics specialists, Title I literacy and mathematics support, special education teachers, and supervised paraprofessionals who supply push-in support to students with disabilities and others who are struggling academically.
 - a. Response to Intervention (RTI) is more developed for literacy than for mathematics.
 - b. The elementary schools have a homework club for English language learners.
 - 2. The middle school offers most of its Tier 2 support during FLEX block.
 - a. During FLEX block, students can receive a double dose of mathematics or work on literacy. The double dose of mathematics is recommended for some students while others electively participate. Those who do not need additional support take an elective such as music during that block.
 - b. The middle school also has a homework club.
 - c. The school runs an integrated learning program in grades 5 and 6 for students who have gaps in ELA and mathematics skills.
 - 3. Hudson High School offers limited Tier 2 support options.
 - a. The high school has a writing club, which functions similarly to the homework club at the middle school.
 - b. The school offers academic literacy classes and MCAS preparation courses.

- c. In the absence of other supports, the leveling (academic, honors, AP), which begins in mathematics in grade 5, is considered to be part of the structure of student support.
- C. Hudson High School has identified 8 to 10 percent of its incoming student body as at-risk. The school is working to reduce students' risk of dropping out but provides limited resources for credit recovery.
 1. In 2013, the grade 9 retention rate was 8.2 percent, or approximately 20 students, and 14.2 percent of 9 grade students were chronically absent, the highest for all grades except for grade 12.
 - a. Staff members told the review team that Tableau, Hudson's new data collection and management tool that works with EWIS, has identified 34 at-risk grade 7 students this year. The high school believes that Tableau, which will be used to produce quarterly tracking reports, will be a great advance for the district in terms of identifying at-risk students, tracking their progress, and enabling a prompt response to student needs.
 2. Administrators and staff said that many in this at-risk group fail grade 9 two or three times and ultimately drop out.
 - a. In an effort to reduce the number of dropouts, the high school has instituted co-taught, substantially separate, and some general education classrooms.
 3. The high school offers limited options for credit recovery and does not have a dropout prevention or recovery program.
 - a. Hudson High School does not have a summer school. The high school accepts credits from the summer school at Assabet Valley Regional Technical School.
 - b. Last summer several students at the high school enrolled in an online program called Adventa. However, the school does not intend to continue this program.
 - c. Students may use Virtual High School for enrichment and for credit recovery in any but core subject areas.
- D. English language learners (ELLs) do not always receive the recommended hours of English language development or sheltered instruction in content areas.
 1. Although the district provides content area instruction for all ELLs primarily in the mainstream classroom, many ELLs are taught by teachers who do not have adequate training in sheltering instruction.
 - a. Eighteen teachers are taking an in-district RETELL course this year with two more cohorts planned for next year. Administrators said that, even so, not everyone who needs training will receive it.

- b. Beginning ELLs currently travel as a cohort and are taught by subject area teachers in mathematics, science, and social studies who work as a team and meet with the director once per month. Next year, ESL teachers will co-teach two science and two history courses for intermediate level students.
2. Staff acknowledged that elementary students who are beginning ELLs do not receive the recommended hours of English language development.

Impact: Districts know that many factors affect students' ability to learn, including different learning styles, disabilities, obstacles with control of language, family difficulties, emotional or behavioral problems, or occasional academic setbacks. When teachers do not adequately differentiate learning for general education students, some begin to fall behind. When students with disabilities and ELLs are educated in the general education classroom by teachers who do not use appropriate accommodations or who do not make content sufficiently accessible, those students cannot achieve to the best of their abilities.

14. Services for students with disabilities are not consistent districtwide. Services for students with disabilities are provided as required rather than by staffing a structured program that supports a student from evaluation through exit.

- A. Although services for students with disabilities and those with emotional/social issues not associated with an IEP may not be well articulated between schools, the district has made an effort to provide staff, training, and wraparound services.
 1. The review team observed that the push-in model of instruction used to provide services in the elementary school means the presence of two to four trained adults (teachers, specialists, paraprofessionals) in classrooms.
 2. Hudson High School has invested in a co-teaching model for the substantially separate classes for students with disabilities and for some inclusion classes. Two special education and two regular education teachers have been trained as co-teaching coaches.
 3. This year the district initiated a new wraparound program for social services with the Assabet Valley Collaborative. The Family Success Partnership serves 15 families from the Forest Avenue and Mulready elementary schools.
 4. The district has undertaken an extensive and continuing process to train its paraprofessionals.
- B. Services for students with disabilities depend upon what services are available school by school. Staff reported that special education personnel differed from school to school and that sometimes services or programs did not have appropriate options for continuing within the school when a student was ready to exit from one level of service to another.

1. At the Mulready Elementary School children with autism are served by ABA therapists. At other schools, children with autism are assisted by a paraprofessional or are provided services by the special education department staff overseen by a district board certified behavioral analyst. At the high school, students with autism are placed in the Strive program, which also serves Life Skills children.
 2. Students with social/emotional problems are supported at one school by a special education teacher or by a guidance counselor, at another school by the social worker, and at a third by special education teachers, a therapeutic intervention specialist, and an adjustment counselor.
- C. Interviews with administrators showed that before the arrival of a new director of pupil services, special education staff members were not thoroughly acquainted with the nature of services in sending or receiving schools, which had an impact on the appropriateness of placement.
1. This year, in order to improve the efficacy of the placement process, the district released staff from their schools to visit other schools. Administrators said that the special education department will test the clarity and validity of these criteria once they examine the success of the placement process next fall.
- D. The special education department is currently working on exit and entry criteria for programs as suggested by the Walker Report of 2013. They are creating a continuum of academic services pre-K through grade 12.
- E. The district provides special education services in different formats at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels.
1. Although the elementary schools pull students out of class for special education services and have a limited number of substantially separate programs, district policy is to provide as much of the supplementary support as possible in the regular education classroom.
 2. The high school has implemented co-teaching classes for substantially separate classrooms and for several inclusion classrooms. It also has an academic support class, which develops study skills and provides content area tutoring.
 3. Neither the push-in model employed at the elementary schools nor the co-teaching model used for some high school classes is available at the middle school. At the middle school, each team has a special education teacher and a paraprofessional assigned to it. Students also receive support at academic centers. School teams are centered on the cognitive, behavior, or autism academic centers.
- F. The special education department does not offer a therapeutic program for students with behavioral and social/emotional issues.

1. Staff members across the district noted the increasing numbers of students with mental health problems and social/emotional disorders.
 2. An outside evaluation commissioned by the district, the Walker Report, highlighted student needs such as social/emotional and mental health that were not adequately met by the district.
- G. While the special education department provides education in a full inclusion setting for its students at a greater rate than the statewide rate, it also has a higher rate of out-of-district placements.
1. According to ESE data, in the 2011–2012 school year 68.9 percent of students with disabilities received services in full inclusion, compared with the state rate of 58.1 percent. In 2011–2012, 9.0 percent of students with disabilities were enrolled in out-of-district placements, compared with the state rate of 6.8 percent.
 2. Special education and other school staff attribute the rate of outside placement at least in part to students whose mental health issues have worsened with the onset of adolescence and whom the district does not have the therapeutic means to serve.
- H. Administrators reported that most grade 9 students who were retained were students with disabilities or mental health challenges. These students, if they failed classes repeatedly, often dropped out of school.
1. According to ESE data, the dropout rate for students with disabilities reported in the four-year cohort graduation data for 2013 is 15.7 percent, close to the state rate of 12.1 percent; however, the dropout rate for students with disabilities reported in the five-year cohort graduation data is 50 percent higher than that of the state rate, 20.8 percent compared with 12.7 percent.

Impact: The absence of a well-sequenced, consistently staffed program with vertical alignment and services for all students prevents the district from providing a continuum of services for many children.

Financial and Asset Management

1. **The budget document does not include a narrative that addresses educational goals and objectives. The budget document lacks the information needed for the public to understand it.**
 - A. The budget document does not align money budgeted with specific educational goals and objectives or assessment results. However, principals are requested to provide this data when requesting new courses or programs. Principals consider enrollments and other data when making their requests and district goals are discussed in the Superintendent’s Advisory Team

(SAT) meetings. Data submitted by principals is included in documents used to create the budget.

- B. There is no District Improvement Plan (DIP) and the School Improvement Plans are not aligned with the budget.
 - 1. There are district goals in place of a DIP.
 - a. The superintendent and the SAT are creating a DIP.
 - b. The SIP cycle is being altered to be in sync with the DIP and the budget cycle.
 - 2. While SIPs are planned and discussed with the school council, they do not include budget information.
 - 3. During the budget discussion the superintendent comments on the alignment of the budget with district educational goals and objectives.
- C. The budget document contains only financial data in a spreadsheet format.
 - 1. The financial data is well organized in a programmatic manner; operating expenditures are organized programmatically; a system of Comments explains the contents of budget lines; personnel FTEs are not shown in the budget, but some FTE information is contained in the Comments; and the budget lines include the previous year's budget and three years of expenditure history.

Impact: When the budget document does not address goals, set objectives, or align the budget with the curriculum and other needs, it cannot be demonstrated that the budget is appropriately allocated. Without this data in the document, there is no transparent link that assures the public that financial resources are being properly used.

16. The district does not have a written agreement with the municipal government detailing amounts and rates of school-related costs accounted for in the municipal budget and charged back to the district.

- A. The town submits data to the district for inclusion on Schedule 1, Section II.B., and Schedule.19, Section A.2, of the ESE End of Year Financial Report.
 - 1. In fiscal year 2013, Hudson reported costs assigned by the municipality to net school spending in administration, operations and maintenance, benefits and fixed charges, and out-of-district tuition. Of the in-district categories, only per-pupil spending on administration is above the state average.
 - 2. The town's director of finance stated that the town has a document that details how the charges are determined and that methodology has been used for many years.

- a. There is no written agreement related to this document, according to the superintendent, a school business official, and town officials.
- b. The district was cited for not having an agreement in its last three compliance audits.
- c. The new executive assistant to the board of selectmen is committed to reaching an agreement.
- d. Hudson spends far more on administration when compared to the state average; costs assigned by the town may have an impact on this spending. While the town has a methodology for assigned costs, there is no formal agreement between the town and the district to this methodology, as cited by several past audit reports.

Impact: Because there is no written agreement it is not known whether the town is allocating costs correctly, and therefore it is not known whether actual net school spending is correctly calculated. Without a written agreement it is unclear how town resources are directly and indirectly allocated to the schools.

Hudson District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

- 1. The Superintendent’s Advisory Team should continue to work with the DSAC to develop a DIP for 2014–2016. Each school should update their SIPs based on the district’s DIP framework.**
 - A. The Superintendent’s Advisory Team (SAT) should continue working with the DSAC to develop a DIP for 2014–2016. The SAT should continue with the drafting of the DIP’s strategic initiatives and objectives. The SAT should consider including in the DIP the resources needed for each objective.
 - B. Once the draft DIP is presented to and approved by the school committee, it should be shared with all school employees and other stakeholders.
 1. The superintendent should report regularly to the school committee, school staff, and the community on progress made on each of the DIP goals.
 2. The superintendent and school committee should consider aligning some goals in the Superintendent’s Educator Plan (as part of the district’s educator evaluation system) with DIP goals.
 - C. The SIPs should be prepared by the principals, in consultation with their school councils, following the completion and approval of the DIP. The goals in the SIPs should be SMART goals (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action-Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused; and Timed and Tracked) that are aligned with the DIP goals.
 1. Once the SIPS have been approved by the superintendent and school committee, principals should share their SIP with staff and parents.
 2. Principals should update the staff, school council members, parents, and other stakeholders regularly on the progress made toward each SIP goal.
 3. Each principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan under the district’s educator evaluation system, and as evidence during implementation.

Recommended resources:

- ESE’s *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.

- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for districts as they develop or refine their DIP and SIPs.

Benefits: The DIP is an essential document for the district and all stakeholders because it provides information about the overall direction of the school system. Identifying the resources needed to implement the plan will provide the school committee and the community with information about any financial requirements necessary to accomplish the action steps in order to achieve the objectives and goals. The inclusion of SMART goals will make plans more focused and clear. Creating SIPs based on the objectives in the DIP will help to ensure that school-level strategies directly promote the achievement of the district's overall goals. By emphasizing communication and accountability for plan implementation at the district and school levels, the district will signal the critical importance of the DIP and SIPs as road maps to guide continuous improvement.

2. The school committee should analyze the reasons for frequent vacancies in school committee positions.

- A. The school committee should consider collecting information, perhaps through a survey of former school committee members, to determine the reasons for the vacancies in committee positions.
- B. After reviewing this information, the committee may wish to consider making adjustments, as appropriate, to promote greater stability in committee membership.
 1. Continued and/or increased engagement with the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC) could be helpful in this effort.

Benefits: By increasing continuity in membership, the school committee can help to ensure an ongoing focus on specific district goals. Continued collaboration with MASC can provide members, especially new members, with additional information about educational and governance matters beyond what is addressed by the MASC orientation.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district should continue its work in establishing an aligned, cohesive, and documented curriculum in the core content areas, and should ensure that classroom lessons are linked to the curriculum and address the needs of all learners.

- A. The district should work urgently to fully develop and align curriculum, particularly for K–12 mathematics.
 1. If necessary, the district should reallocate funds to ensure that any necessary professional development and curricular work can be completed as soon as possible.
 2. The district should continue to draw from ESE model curriculum units as they become available.
 3. The district should continue its practice of including teachers in the development of curriculum under the leadership of the content area directors and the assistant superintendent.
 4. The district should ensure that sufficient professional development is provided to teachers for new curricular units and that the coaches and directors are able to provide appropriate support and direction, particularly for the mathematics and science curricula at the elementary levels where there is less specialization.
- B. The district should develop a curriculum review process to ensure continuous improvement, with particular attention to maintaining rigor and to ensuring access to high quality curriculum for all students.
 1. Currently the district is using a model based on the AIMS approach. The district should ensure that this approach is comprehensive and rigorous in its evaluation of the aligned, delivered, and documented curricula.
- C. Principals and coaches should provide the necessary guidance and support to ensure that teachers' lessons:
 1. Communicate a learning objective that is standards-based and linked to the curriculum;
 2. Are designed in such a way that students' unique learning needs are effectively addressed.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvX_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *The Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.
- *ESE's Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/Candi/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
- Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
- *Mathematics Framework Exploration Activities* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/mathexplore/default.html>) are a growing set of activities designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education mathematics staff and educators. The activities can be accessed and used to promote discussion and collaborative inquiry.
- *Science and Technology/Engineering Concept and Skill Progressions* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/ste/default.html>) articulate of possible ways for students to progress through levels of understanding of concepts.
- *The World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards Implementation Guide (Part I)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/Guidance-p1.pdf>) provides general information about the WIDA ELD standards framework, expectations for district implementation, and available support.

- The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Download Library* (<http://www.wida.us/downloadLibrary.aspx>) provides resources and materials for ELL educators, including standards, guiding principles, sample items, and CAN DO descriptors.
- *Useful WIDA ELD Standards Resources from the Download Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/DownloadLibrary.html>) can be used as a type of recommended reading list for educators new to the WIDA ELD standards who are interested in developing a deeper understanding of the framework's components and how to apply them into classroom instruction and assessment.
- Presentations from WIDA discussions with district leaders (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-03MathLiaisons-ELLDirectors.pdf> and <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-01LiteracyLeaders-ELLDirectors.pdf>) provide information about developing and using Model Performance Indicators to support instruction.
- *Characteristics of a Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf>) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.
- *Connecting Math and Literature* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/instructional.html>, bottom of web page) is a resource for K-8 teachers for creating a math library for children to connect math and literature.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will help to ensure improved student learning as all students are provided access to high quality, aligned, and continuously improving curricula. Clarity and guidance for teachers in the use of appropriate and effective modifications and accommodations will help to provide all students with instruction that appropriately challenges and supports them, ensuring a guaranteed and viable curriculum for all students.

Assessment

4. The district should follow through on its plans to implement a balanced set of mathematics assessments and to increase the use of data to inform mathematics curriculum and instruction.

- A. Along with the development and alignment of mathematics curricula, district leaders should ensure that a complete, balanced set of mathematics assessments is utilized throughout the district.
 1. Data teams should use information about student performance to contribute to curriculum development and revision.

2. Data teams should use newly refined curriculum to identify meaningful assessments.
- B. Data teams should broaden their scope to ensure they have the capacity to support the use of mathematics data and vertical alignment of mathematics assessments.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation include expanding the culture of assessment in the district and promoting more vertical alignment of assessments, while contributing to improvement of instruction to meet the needs of all students.

Human Resources and Professional Development

5. **The superintendent and school committee should consider reallocating resources related to the human resources and personnel function and centralizing all personnel related functions under one person.**
 - A. District and school leaders should evaluate the essential role of the human resources function in the district and whether consolidating all personnel-related responsibility under one person would allow academic personnel to focus on improving teaching and learning rather than on personnel-related matters.
 - B. The superintendent, school committee, and leadership team should also consider other potential benefits of a centralized human resources/personnel unit:
 1. Operational redundancies and conflicts of interest could be eliminated, saving the district money, such as for legal fees;
 2. The implementation and coordination of performance improvement systems (such as professional development, educator evaluation, and teacher licensure and certification) could be improved;
 3. Conflict resolution could be strengthened, employee satisfaction could be enhanced, and support could be provided for the coordination of the collective bargaining process.

Student Support

6. **The district should ensure that classroom teachers use accommodations, sheltering, and differentiation as a regular part of instruction. Instructional strategies, placement guidelines, resources, and services should be understood, organized, and monitored to provide a system of assistance for all students.**
 - A. The district should provide continuing professional development for teachers to strengthen Tier 1 instruction in the general education classroom.
 1. Professional development might address the way disabilities affect how students learn.

- a. The district and schools should revise their curriculum accommodation plans to provide more specific suggestions for teachers and student support teams.
 2. The district should continue to provide RETELL training and, if possible and as appropriate, assign English language learners to general education classrooms with trained teachers.
 3. The district should ensure that differentiation, accommodations, and sheltering practices are in place by noting them through the observation and evaluation process.
- B. The district should identify its Tier 2 intervention services at each level to provide a consistent level of extra support for those students who require more help than is available through Tier 1 instruction.
1. While some services are in place, the district should focus in particular on having adequate services available at the secondary level in order to meet all students' needs.
 - a. These services may include specific remedial courses at both the middle and high school levels, extended day (after school) and extended year programs that have an instructional component, and continued literacy services.
- C. The district should provide a continuum of Tier 3 services for students with disabilities and for those with mental, social, or emotional challenges.
1. The district is encouraged to support the director of pupil services as she works to achieve a vertical alignment of services as well as to establish viable entry and exit criteria. The district should make the recommended changes in staffing, program location, and intensity of services necessary to eliminate gaps and ensure that students can benefit from a continuous web of support from kindergarten through graduation.
 - a. Services should be consistent across the district so that students experience a seamless transition from the type of services received in one school and those offered in the next.
 2. The district should identify the services needed by students with mental health, social, and emotional challenges.
 - a. These services may include assistance for students returning from hospitalization for transitioning back to the classroom.
 - b. Other support services could include counseling, individual monitoring by paraprofessionals, and the provision of areas where students can reduce their anxiety before returning to the classroom.
 3. The district has found a collaborative partner in the Family Success Partnership with Assabet Valley Collaborative to provide services to families of children in the Mulready and Forest Avenue Schools. If the collaboration is successful, the district may want to expand that

partnership. If not, the district may want to find other community partners among local health, social services, and child services organizations.

- D. The district should create a more complete program for college and career readiness.
 1. The district should create options for credit recovery, dropout prevention, and alternative education for students who are not succeeding in the regular classroom in order to provide them a path to work or to pursue post-secondary education.
 - a. The district should find resources to support credit recovery through local summer or after-school programs or online.
 - b. In particular, the district should carefully utilize data to ensure that students with disabilities receive the support they need in order to successfully complete high school.
- E. The high school should expand options and programs that will help students to transition to jobs and careers when post-secondary education is not their first choice.
 1. This might include hands-on experiential learning programs, service learning opportunities, and job placement services.
 2. The guidance department could devote a portion of courses taught within the Wellness time block to address the needs of students who are interested in apprenticeships, vocational programs, and two-year community school programs for job training.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

MTSS Self-Assessment Overview (includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*): <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/>

- The *Behavioral Health and Public Schools Framework* (<http://bhps321.org/viewframework.asp>) 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 potential.
- *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.
- The *Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ssce/mscamodel.html>) is a standards-based model for school counseling

outlining how school counseling programs can support student achievement and education reform objectives.

- ESE's *RETELL: Extending the Learning* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/courses.html>) provides a registry of SEI-related courses which have been reviewed and approved by the Department's Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. These courses provide opportunities for educators to extend their learning and practice beyond the Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) Endorsement course.
- *Your Plan for the Future* (<https://www.yourplanforthefuture.org/Ext/YPFC/Home/index.html>) is an online portal that integrates with multiple information systems and serves as a college and career planning resource for students and families.
- The *Massachusetts Work-Based Learning Plan* (<http://www.skillslibrary.com/wbl.htm>) is a diagnostic, goal-setting and assessment tool designed to drive learning and productivity on the job.
- *Moving Ahead - Pathways to Success on the MCAS* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/pathways/>) is a website designed to give students details on each of the programs and services available across the state to help guide their educational and professional pursuits.
- ESE's *Academic Support Program Examples* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/as/examples/>) provides a sampling of program products from the Collaborative Partnership for Student Success grant in addition to other documents received from the various Academic Support programs.
- The *Contextual Learning Portal* (<http://resources21.org/cl/default.asp>) is a searchable collection of contextual learning projects. Contextual learning projects engage students in academic work applied to a context related to their lives, communities, workplaces or the wider world.
- *Service Learning: Promising Practices*: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/csl/practices.aspx>; *Resources*: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/csl/info.html>
- ESE's *Alternative Education* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/alted/resources.html>) provides links to resource materials and websites with information, research, and guidance for alternative education programs.
- *Youth Voices - How High Schools can Respond to the Needs of Students and Help Prevent Dropouts* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/YouthFocusGroup.pdf>) is a report based on youth focus groups across the Commonwealth who shared their insight about what they liked most and least about school; why students drop out; and how schools should be improved.
- *Expanding Learning Opportunities for Students* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/LearningOpportunities.pdf>) is a compilation of research, school profiles and practical examples related to how schools have expanded learning opportunities for students.

Benefits: By implementing these recommendations, the district will provide a comprehensive tiered system of support, which will improve the school system’s ability to identify and address the academic, social, and emotional needs of all its students. It will enhance the skills of teachers to meet students’ diverse needs and will make learning more accessible to everyone in the general education classroom. The district will be able to offer students with disabilities a true continuum of services. Also, the high school will be able to support all students as they explore their interests, develop their unique talents, and map a plan for job, career or vocational training.

Financial and Asset Management

7. The budget documentation and presentation should be driven by and articulate the goals and priorities in the SIPs and the DIP.

- A. As part of ensuring that the SIPs and the DIP provide direction and focus for the schools and district, goals and priorities from the plans should be included in the budget documentation and presentations, and funds should be allocated in accordance with them. The proposed budget should provide the financial resources necessary to implement short- and long-range plans for school improvement, district improvement, and any other major decisions for the district.
 1. As it allocates funds, the district should review the deployment of staff and the use of staff time and show that connection in the budget document. A complete staff listing should be included in the budget document and the reasons for those staffing levels should be connected to the SIPs and the DIP.
 2. Major initiatives of the district should reflect long-range planning and the priorities of the district and the budget should support them. School leaders should continue to meet with stakeholders when developing budget goals.
 3. SIPs should include budget information.

Recommended resources:

- The Rennie Center’s *Smart School Budgeting* (http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html); direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation include a clearer picture of the school’s priorities and of the resources allocated for them, as well as alignment of district spending with the school’s goals and priorities. This form of budget documentation and presentation will increase the transparency of the budget process for the public.

8. The town and the school committee should collaboratively develop a fair written agreement on the correct reporting, allocation, and documentation of expenditures by municipal agencies for educational purposes, in accord with 603 CMR 10.04.

- A. The school finance director and the town's director of finance should meet to review the methodology that the town is currently using.
 - 1. For those expenditure categories, such as "Administrative Services" where allocations of municipal expenditures are required, an allocation method should be agreed on and put in writing.
 - 2. For those expenditure categories where actual expenditures are reported, the method by which these actual expenditures are determined should be agreed on and put in writing.
- B. The agreement should be submitted to the appropriate parties.
- C. If the school district and municipal officials cannot agree on a methodology, they should notify ESE in accordance with the regulations.

Recommended resources:

- Education Laws and Regulations 603 CMR 10.04 Financial Accounting and Reporting: Other Municipal Departments: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html?section=04>
- ESE Chart of Accounts: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/accounting/eoy/ChartOfAccounts.pdf>
- Compliance Supplement for Massachusetts Schools: http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/accounting/compliance_supp.html

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will be in accord with the Code of Massachusetts Regulations and the Compliance Supplement for Massachusetts Schools. Having this agreement will clarify for the town and district how town expenditures for the schools are determined.

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from March 10-13, 2014, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. John Kulevich, leadership and governance
2. Christine Brandt, curriculum and instruction
3. Janet Smith, assessment
4. James Hearn, human resources and professional development, review team coordinator
5. Kathy Lopez-Natale, student support
6. David King, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: district director of finance, chair town board of selectmen, town director of finance, chair of the town's finance committee, and the town's executive assistant.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school Committee: chair, secretary, and a third member.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent; assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; pupil personnel director; director of elementary curriculum and instructional services; director of secondary curriculum for humanities; director of secondary mathematics and science curriculum; director of facilities; and the district literacy coach.

The team visited the following schools: Hudson High School (grades 8-12), Quinn Middle School (grades 5-7), Farley Elementary School (PK-4), Forest Avenue Elementary School (K-4) and Mulready Elementary School (PK-4).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with five principals and focus group[s] with 16 elementary school teachers and paraprofessionals, three middle school teachers, and five high school teachers and paraprofessionals.

The team observed 57 classes in the district: 28 at the high school, 14 at the middle school, and 15 at the 3 elementary schools.

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

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, 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

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
3/10/2014	3/11/2014	3/12/2014	3/13/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to secondary and elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to secondary and elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to secondary and elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to secondary and elementary schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Hudson Public Schools
2013–2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	29	1.0%	82990	8.7%
Asian	69	2.3%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic	177	6.0%	162647	17.0%
Native American	4	0.1%	2209	0.2%
White	2600	88.2%	620628	64.9%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	1007	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	68	2.3%	27803	2.9%
All Students	2947	100.0%	955739	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2013

**Table B1b: Hudson Public Schools
2013–2014 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	495	43.9%	16.6%	164336	34.8%	17.0%
Low Income	753	66.8%	25.6%	365885	77.5%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	173	15.4%	5.9%	75947	16.1%	7.9%
All high needs students	1127	100.0%	37.7%	472001	100.0%	48.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2013. 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 2,986; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,360.

**Table B2a: Hudson Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	208	87.4	87.9	86	82.8	83.3	-4.6	-3.2
	P+	208	65.0%	67.0%	62.0%	54.0%	57.0%	-11.0%	-8.0%
4	CPI	212	78.2	77.4	82.4	76.3	78.9	-1.9	-6.1
	P+	212	48.0%	46.0%	58.0%	47.0%	53.0%	-1.0%	-11.0%
	SGP	208	50	38	44.5	36.5	49	-13.5	-8
5	CPI	242	86.1	81.4	82.6	88.9	84.7	2.8	6.3
	P+	242	63.0%	56.0%	57.0%	75.0%	66.0%	12.0%	18.0%
	SGP	227	55	41	48	53	52	-2	5
6	CPI	223	88.2	89.4	81.6	86.7	85.1	-1.5	5.1
	P+	223	72.0%	73.0%	61.0%	68.0%	67.0%	-4.0%	7.0%
	SGP	220	54.5	58.5	49	53	52	-1.5	4
7	CPI	227	92.5	93.3	93.3	87.6	88.4	-4.9	-5.7
	P+	227	81.0%	80.0%	83.0%	67.0%	72.0%	-14.0%	-16.0%
	SGP	215	53	69	69	53	48	0	-16
8	CPI	213	92.5	92.9	92.1	89.7	90.1	-2.8	-2.4
	P+	213	82.0%	84.0%	80.0%	77.0%	78.0%	-5.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	189	54	53	50.5	46	50	-8	-4.5
10	CPI	181	95.4	95.9	98.5	99	96.9	3.6	0.5
	P+	181	86.0%	90.0%	96.0%	97.0%	91.0%	11.0%	1.0%
	SGP	160	44	45.5	59	56.5	57	12.5	-2.5
All	CPI	1506	88.6	88.3	87.8	87.1	86.8	-1.5	-0.7
	P+	1506	71.0%	71.0%	70.0%	69.0%	69.0%	-2.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	1219	53	50	53	49	51	-4	-4

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.

**Table B2b: Hudson Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	208	82.5	84.1	80.3	84.3	84.3	1.8	4
	P+	208	61.0%	64.0%	60.0%	65.0%	66.0%	4.0%	5.0%
4	CPI	215	74.5	75.8	78.5	75	80.2	0.5	-3.5
	P+	215	38.0%	37.0%	49.0%	43.0%	52.0%	5.0%	-6.0%
	SGP	210	43	44	49.5	43.5	54	0.5	-6
5	CPI	244	81	77	81.7	81.1	80.6	0.1	-0.6
	P+	244	57.0%	55.0%	61.0%	59.0%	61.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	228	63	54.5	58	54.5	54	-8.5	-3.5
6	CPI	223	80.6	80.8	69.2	79.1	80.3	-1.5	9.9
	P+	223	59.0%	59.0%	40.0%	57.0%	61.0%	-2.0%	17.0%
	SGP	221	51	53	24	43	50	-8	19
7	CPI	227	76	74.8	83.1	69.5	74.4	-6.5	-13.6
	P+	227	53.0%	49.0%	63.0%	44.0%	52.0%	-9.0%	-19.0%
	SGP	215	51	57	68	61	46	10	-7
8	CPI	215	81.3	74.7	73.7	74.5	76	-6.8	0.8
	P+	215	63.0%	53.0%	48.0%	51.0%	55.0%	-12.0%	3.0%
	SGP	191	64	51	47.5	37	50	-27	-10.5
10	CPI	184	92	90.3	94.4	95.8	90.2	3.8	1.4
	P+	184	80.0%	78.0%	87.0%	90.0%	80.0%	10.0%	3.0%
	SGP	163	45	46	42.5	37	51	-8	-5.5
All	CPI	1516	81.1	79.5	79.7	79.5	80.8	-1.6	-0.2
	P+	1516	59.0%	56.0%	57.0%	58.0%	61.0%	-1.0%	1.0%
	SGP	1228	55	51	48	46	51	-9	-2

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.

**Table B2c: Hudson Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	244	80.6	67	68.8	72.1	78.5	-8.5	3.3
	P+	244	50.0%	35.0%	35.0%	39.0%	51.0%	-11.0%	4.0%
8	CPI	215	70.1	68	69.1	68	71	-2.1	-1.1
	P+	215	35.0%	35.0%	40.0%	33.0%	39.0%	-2.0%	-7.0%
10	CPI	174	85	83.5	88.2	89.2	88	4.2	1
	P+	174	62.0%	59.0%	70.0%	72.0%	71.0%	10.0%	2.0%
All	CPI	633	77.9	72.4	74.2	75.4	79	-2.5	1.2
	P+	633	48.0%	42.0%	46.0%	46.0%	53.0%	-2.0%	0.0%

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.

**Table B3a: Hudson Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	571	77.3	76.6	76.6	74.8	-2.5	-1.8
		P+	571	47.0%	46.0%	47.0%	46.0%	-1.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	431	46	44	45	45	-1	0
	State	CPI	237163	76.1	77	76.5	76.8	0.7	0.3
		P+	237163	45.0%	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	180087	45	46	46	47	2	1
Low Income	District	CPI	373	79.9	78.9	79.3	78.8	-1.1	-0.5
		P+	373	52.0%	51.0%	53.0%	54.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	281	47	48	47	50	3	3
	State	CPI	184999	76.5	77.1	76.7	77.2	0.7	0.5
		P+	184999	47.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	141671	46	46	45	47	1	2
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	267	68.8	68.8	67.5	63.3	-5.5	-4.2
		P+	267	30.0%	33.0%	30.0%	27.0%	-3.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	208	40	37	41	41	1	0
	State	CPI	88956	67.3	68.3	67.3	66.8	-0.5	-0.5
		P+	88956	28.0%	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	64773	41	42	43	43	2	0
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	109	74.7	68.1	71.7	70.4	-4.3	-1.3
		P+	109	38.0%	34.0%	39.0%	39.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	68	66.5	45	56	53	-13.5	-3
	State	CPI	46676	66.1	66.2	66.2	67.4	1.3	1.2
		P+	46676	32.0%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	31672	51	50	51	53	2	2
All students	District	CPI	1506	88.6	88.3	87.8	87.1	-1.5	-0.7
		P+	1506	71.0%	71.0%	70.0%	69.0%	-2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	1219	53	50	53	49	-4	-4
	State	CPI	496175	86.9	87.2	86.7	86.8	-0.1	0.1
		P+	496175	68.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	395568	50	50	50	51	1	1

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 B3b: Hudson Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	576	65.5	62.4	65.2	63.1	-2.4	-2.1
		P+	576	32.0%	28.0%	32.0%	33.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	436	51	44	46	40.5	-10.5	-5.5
	State	CPI	237745	66.7	67.1	67	68.6	1.9	1.6
		P+	237745	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	180866	46	46	46	46	0	0
Low Income	District	CPI	377	68.5	64.8	68	66	-2.5	-2
		P+	377	38.0%	32.0%	36.0%	38.0%	0.0%	2.0%
		SGP	284	53	42.5	43	44	-9	1
	State	CPI	185392	67.1	67.3	67.3	69	1.9	1.7
		P+	185392	37.0%	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	142354	47	46	45	46	-1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	270	55.5	53.7	54	48.5	-7	-5.5
		P+	270	16.0%	17.0%	18.0%	14.0%	-2.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	210	42	38	45	33	-9	-12
	State	CPI	89193	57.5	57.7	56.9	57.4	-0.1	0.5
		P+	89193	21.0%	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	65068	43	43	43	42	-1	-1
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	110	70	62	65.9	63.6	-6.4	-2.3
		P+	110	38.0%	27.0%	32.0%	32.0%	-6.0%	0.0%
		SGP	69	64.5	58.5	58.5	53	-11.5	-5.5
	State	CPI	47046	61.5	62	61.6	63.9	2.4	2.3
		P+	47046	31.0%	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	31986	54	52	52	53	-1	1
All students	District	CPI	1516	81.1	79.5	79.7	79.5	-1.6	-0.2
		P+	1516	59.0%	56.0%	57.0%	58.0%	-1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	1228	55	51	48	46	-9	-2
	State	CPI	497090	79.9	79.9	79.9	80.8	0.9	0.9
		P+	497090	58.0%	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	396691	50	50	50	51	1	1

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 B3c: Hudson Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	217	66.1	55.7	59.7	59.1	-7	-0.6
		P+	217	28.0%	17.0%	23.0%	20.0%	-8.0%	-3.0%
	State	CPI	96902	64.3	63.8	65	66.4	2.1	1.4
		P+	96902	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	143	70.9	57.3	61.9	59.6	-11.3	-2.3
		P+	143	32.0%	21.0%	25.0%	24.0%	-8.0%	-1.0%
	State	CPI	75485	63.6	62.8	64.5	66.1	2.5	1.6
		P+	75485	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	4.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	101	57.2	50.9	51.6	51.2	-6	-0.4
		P+	101	14.0%	10.0%	14.0%	8.0%	-6.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	37049	59	59.2	58.7	59.8	0.8	1.1
		P+	37049	19.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.0%	0.0%
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	39	56	40	52.3	44.2	-11.8	-8.1
		P+	39	20.0%	5.0%	19.0%	8.0%	-12.0%	-11.0%
	State	CPI	16179	51.8	50.3	51.4	54	2.2	2.6
		P+	16179	16.0%	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	3.0%	2.0%
All students	District	CPI	633	77.9	72.4	74.2	75.4	-2.5	1.2
		P+	633	48.0%	42.0%	46.0%	46.0%	-2.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	209573	78.3	77.6	78.6	79	0.7	0.4
		P+	209573	52.0%	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-1.0%

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 B4: Hudson Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013**

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	3.0	2.4	2.8	1.7	-1.3	-43.3%	-1.1	-39.3%	2.2

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 B5a: Hudson Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	85	65.3%	69.1%	67.7%	76.5%	11.2	17.2%	8.8	13.0%	74.7%
Low income	53	66.7%	71.4%	63.3%	77.4%	10.7	16.0%	14.1	22.3%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	51	63.2%	66.7%	60.4%	64.7%	1.5	2.4%	4.3	7.1%	67.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	220	82.4%	85.8%	82.0%	88.6%	6.2	7.5%	6.6	8.0%	85.0%

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 B5b: Hudson Public Schools
Five-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 Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	93	77.4%	68.3%	73.4%	71.0%	-6.4	-8.3%	-2.4	-3.3%	78.9%
Low income	60	74.5%	68.2%	76.2%	65.0%	-9.5	-12.8%	-11.2	-14.7%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	48	74.5%	66.7%	72.9%	64.6%	-9.9	-13.3%	-8.3	-11.4%	73.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	6	100%	25.0%	11.1%	50.0%	-50.0	-50.0%	38.9	350.5%	68.5%
All students	233	87.1%	84.4%	88.4%	83.7%	-3.4	-3.9%	-4.7	-5.3%	87.5%

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 B6: Hudson Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.2%	95.5%	95.8%	95.7%	0.5	0.5%	-0.1	-0.1%	94.8%

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 B7: Hudson Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	--	0.0	--	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	4.8%	4.4%	4.4%	2.1%	-2.7	-56.3%	-2.3	-52.3%	4.3%

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.

**Table B8: Hudson Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

	FY11		FY12		FY13	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$31,697,821	\$28,913,232	\$34,177,749	\$31,034,475	\$35,527,830	\$32,568,813
By municipality	\$8,237,688	\$9,091,231	\$8,182,986	\$13,893,631	\$8,652,938	\$22,871,514
Total from local appropriations	\$39,935,509	\$38,004,463	\$42,360,735	\$44,928,106	\$44,180,768	\$55,440,327
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$5,520,516	--	\$5,235,012	--	\$4,861,113
Total expenditures	--	\$43,524,979	--	\$50,163,118	--	\$60,301,440
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$8,819,158	--	\$9,208,854	--	\$10,247,975
Required local contribution	--	\$16,204,219	--	\$16,175,387	--	\$16,738,223
Required net school spending**	--	\$25,023,377	--	\$25,384,241	--	\$26,986,198
Actual net school spending	--	\$32,371,058	--	\$34,281,297	--	\$36,181,614
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$7,347,681	--	\$8,897,056	--	\$9,195,417
Over/under required (%)	--	29.4%	--	35.0%	--	34.1%

*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

Data retrieved September 5, 2013

**Table B9: Hudson Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010-2013**

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012	2013
Administration	\$514	\$500	\$605	\$675
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$656	\$665	\$695	\$721
Teachers	\$4,735	\$5,238	\$5,390	\$5,736
Other teaching services	\$965	\$968	\$1,107	\$1,220
Professional development	\$325	\$314	\$318	\$347
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$197	\$228	\$302	\$320
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$358	\$395	\$396	\$437
Pupil services	\$1,243	\$1,316	\$1,341	\$1,401
Operations and maintenance	\$941	\$997	\$945	\$1,041
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,327	\$1,377	\$1,326	\$1,427
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$11,260	\$11,998	\$12,424	\$13,326

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

Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.	ES	0	0	28	#	0	3	54
	MS	0	1	13	%	0%	5%	95%
	HS	0	2	13	---	---	---	---
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	ES	0	1	27	#	1	4	52
	MS	0	2	12	%	2%	7%	91%
	HS	1	1	13	---	---	---	---
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0	0	28	#	0	4	53
	MS	0	0	14	%	0%	7%	93%
	HS	0	4	11	---	---	---	---
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	ES	2	3	23	#	3	11	43
	MS	0	2	12	%	5%	19%	75%
	HS	1	6	8	---	---	---	---
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	0	0	28	#	8	10	39
	MS	2	5	7	%	14%	18%	68%
	HS	6	5	4	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0	3	25	#	1	6	50
	MS	1	0	13	%	2%	11%	88%
	HS	0	3	12	---	--	--	--
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	1	4	23	#	1	13	43
	MS	0	3	11	%	2%	23%	75%
	HS	0	6	9	---	---	---	---
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	ES	14	0	14	#	22	0	35
	MS	0	0	14	%	39%	0%	61%
	HS	8	0	7	---	---	---	---
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	ES	1	3	24	#	2	13	42
	MS	0	2	12	%	4%	23%	74%
	HS	1	8	6	---	---	---	---
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products.	ES	6	5	17	#	19	12	26
	MS	3	4	7	%	33%	21%	46%
	HS	10	3	2	---	---	---	---
11. The teacher provides multiple opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	6	8	14	#	10	13	34
	MS	1	3	10	%	18%	23%	60%
	HS	3	2	10	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching (continued)	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	3	4	21	#	6	10	41
	MS	1	4	9	%	11%	18%	72%
	HS	2	2	11	---	--	--	--
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a learning environment where students can take risks--- for instance, where they can make predictions, make judgments and investigate.	ES	3	6	19	#	6	13	38
	MS	0	3	11	%	11%	23%	67%
	HS	3	4	8	---	---	---	---
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	0	4	24	#	0	13	44
	MS	0	2	12	%	0%	23%	77%
	HS	0	7	8	---	---	---	---
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	4	3	21	#	8	8	41
	MS	0	3	11	%	14	14	73
	HS	4	2	9	---	---	---	---
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	15	2	11	#	25	4	28
	MS	3	1	10	%	44%	7%	49%
	HS	7	1	7	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Learning	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	1	9	18	#	2	21	34
	MS	1	6	7	%	4%	37%	60%
	HS	0	6	9	---	---	---	---
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	ES	4	3	21	#	8	12	37
	MS	1	5	8	%	14%	21%	65%
	HS	3	4	8	---	--	--	--
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	8	4	16	#	11	17	29
	MS	0	7	7	%	19%	30%	51%
	HS	3	6	6	---	---	---	---
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	9	6	13	#	18	13	26
	MS	3	3	8	%	32%	23%	46%
	HS	6	4	5	---	---	---	---
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	11	5	12	#	19	12	26
	MS	1	4	9	%	33%	21%	46%
	HS	7	3	5	---	---	---	---
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	23	0	5	#	45	1	10
	MS	10	0	3	%	80%	2%	18%
	HS	12	1	2	---	---	---	---
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	1	4	23	#	5	13	39
	MS	1	2	11	%	9%	23%	68%
	HS	3	7	5	---	---	---	---
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	4	13	11	#	17	23	17
	MS	5	6	3	%	30%	40%	30%
	HS	8	4	3	---	---	---	---