District Review Report

Norwood Public Schools

Review conducted January 21-24, 2014

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Norwood Public Schools District Review Overview 1

Norwood Public Schools District Review Findings 6

Norwood Public Schools District Review Recommendations 23

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule 30

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures 32

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory 43

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
Published August 2014

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

Norwood Public Schools 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 systemwide 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 Norwood School District was conducted from January 21-24, 2014. The site visit included 27.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 70 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups with six elementary school teachers, one middle school teacher, and two high school teachers. On day two of the site visit, schools had a delayed opening because of a snowstorm. For this reason, there were no interviews on the morning of day two. All events scheduled for that time were rescheduled for later in the onsite.

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 64 classrooms in 7 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Norwood has a town manager form of government and the school committee elects the chair of the school committee. The school committee has five members and meets bi-monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2009. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the business manager, the special education director, the technology director, the grants coordinator, and eight principals. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past six years. The district has eight principals leading eight schools. There are four other school administrators: an assistant principal and deans at the high school and an assistant principal at the middle school. There were 274.3 teachers in the district in 2013-2014.

In the 2013-2014 school year, there were 3,471 students enrolled in the district's 8 schools.

Table 1: Norwood Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2013-2014

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Willett	EES	PK-K	388
Balch	ES	1-5	275
Callahan	ES	1-5	232
Cleveland	ES	1-5	364
Oldham	ES	1-5	228
Prescott	ES	1-5	235
Coakley Middle School	MS	6-8	712
Norwood High School	HS	9-12	1,037
Totals	**8 schools**	**PK-12**	**3,471**
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2010 and 2014 overall student enrollment increased by 1.0 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 32 K-12 districts of similar size (3,000-3,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: $13,181 compared with a

median of $12,194 (see District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance[1]

Norwood is a Level 2 district because its lowest performing schools are in Level 2.

- The cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) for the district was 70 for all students and 67 for high needs students, with the target being 75.
- Four of the district's five elementary schools were Level 1 schools.
    - Callahan is in the 85th percentile, Prescott is in the 66th percentile, Cleveland is in the 64th percentile, and Oldham is in the 47th percentile of elementary schools.
- Three of the district's seven schools with reportable data are Level 2 schools.
    - Balch is in the 33rd percentile of elementary schools with a cumulative PPI of 48 for all students and 59 for high needs students.
    - Coakley Middle is in the 50th percentile of middle schools with a cumulative PPI of 62 for all students and 54 for high needs students.
    - Norwood High is in the 48th percentile of high schools with a cumulative PPI of 81 for all students and 83 for high needs students.
        - Norwood High would be a Level 1 school but is in Level 2 for low MCAS participation for students with disabilities.

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

- ELA CPI was 90.4 in 2013, below the district's target of 92.3.
- Math CPI was 83.2 in 2013, below the district's target of 84.8.
- Science CPI was 79.4 in 2013, below the district's target of 81.1.

The district's ELA proficiency rates were above or at the state rate for all students and each grade tested, except for grade 8.

[1] See also student performance tables in Appendix B.

- The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in English was 71 percent in 2010 and 75 percent in 2013, above the state proficiency rate of 69 percent. ELA median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) was moderate at 51.
- ELA proficiency rates in 2013 were above the state rates by 15 percentage points in grade 3, by 5 percentage points in grade 4, by 10 percentage points in grade 6, by 11 percentage points in grade 7, and by 1 percentage point in grade 10.
    - ELA proficiency was higher in 2013 than 2010 by 5 percentage points in grade 3, by 12 percentage points in grade 7, and by 11 percentage points in grade 10.
- In 2013 ELA proficiency in grade 5 was 66 percent, equal to the state rate; ELA proficiency in grade 8 was 77 percent, 1 percentage point below the 2013 state rate of 78 percent.
    - ELA proficiency in grade 8 was lower in 2013 than 2010 by 4 percentage points.

Math proficiency rates were higher in 2013 than in 2010 for the district as a whole and in every tested grade, except for grade 6.

- The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was 58 percent in 2010 and 62 percent in 2013, a point above the state rate of 61 percent. Math median Student Growth Percentile (SGP) was moderate at 46.0.
- Math proficiency rates were above the state rate by 10 percentage points in grade 3, and 2 to 3 percentage points in grades 4, 5, and 10.
    - Math proficiency was higher in 2013 than 2010 by 1 to 4 percentage points in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 and by 7 percentage points in grade 10.
- Math proficiency was below the state rate by 1 and 2 percentage points, respectively, in grades 6 and 7, and by 8 percentage points in grade 8, located at Coakley Middle.

Science proficiency rates for the district were lower in 2013 than 2010 except in grade 10.

- The percentage of students scoring proficient or higher was 54 percent in 2010 and 51 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 53 percent.
    - Grade 5 science proficiency was 55.0 percent in 2013, lower than the 2010 rate of 64 percent; above the state rate of 51 percent.
    - Grade 8 science proficiency was 32.0 percent in 2013, lower than the 2010 rate of 41 percent, and below the state rate of 39 percent.
    - Grade 10 science proficiency was 64 percent in 2010 and 2013, below the state rate of 71 percent.

Balch Elementary School's proficiency rates were lower in 2013 than in 2010 in ELA, math, and science and were significantly lower than the district's other elementary schools in ELA and math.[2]

- ELA proficiency for all students was 50 percent in 2013, lower than the 2010 rate of 56 percent, 17 percentage points lower than Cleveland's 67 percent proficiency rate in 2013.
- Math proficiency for all students was 53 percent in 2013, lower than the 2010 rate of 61 percent, and 11 percentage points lower than Oldham's 64 percent proficiency rate in 2013.
- Science proficiency for all students was 39 percent in 2013, 31 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 70 percent, and 4 percentage points lower than Oldham's 43 percent proficiency rate in 2013.

Norwood met the 2014 four year cohort graduation rate target of 80.0 percent and the five year cohort graduation rate target of 85.0 percent.[3]

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 92.3 percent in 2013, 3.3 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 89.0 percent, and above the 2013 state graduation rate of 85.0 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate was 91.6 percent in 2012, 4.1 percentage points higher than the 2009 rate of 87.5 percent, and above the 2012 state graduation rate of 87.5 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for Norwood was 1.6 percent in 2010 and 1.8 in 2013, below the 2.2 percent statewide annual dropout rate.

[2] Comparisons for Balch's ELA, math, and science proficiency rates are to the district school with the next lowest proficiency rate in that subject.
[3] 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.

Norwood Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. **The superintendent is open, transparent, and collaborative with his administrative team, the school committee, town officials, the teachers' association, teachers, and parents.**

   A. Principals indicated in interviews that the central office is supportive, positive, and collaborative. They expressed the view that they can call anytime and ask for help.

   B. School committee members described the superintendent as being approachable, easy to talk with, and an excellent communicator.

   1. One school committee member said that the superintendent is available, accessible, proactive, and maintains good open communication with the committee.

   2. The superintendent reported that he produces a weekly report for the committee showing his schedule and keeping the committee updated on happenings in the district. He told review team members that he treats the committee as a "committee of the whole" rather than dealing strictly with the school committee chair.

   C. Town officials and the superintendent reported a positive relationship between the town and the school department.

   1. Town officials said that while there is not always agreement, both the school department and the town are in a cooperative and collaborative relationship, all with the same goal. That goal is a balanced budget.

   2. Further, town officials said that they see the superintendent as being transparent in the budget process and noted his collaborative participation as a member of the townwide budget committee. This nine-member committee comes to agreement on the town's anticipated revenues. They then review shared expenses in such areas as health premiums and debt service and collaboratively determine the allocation percentages for the school department and for general government. The traditional allocations have been 55 percent for the schools and 45 percent for general government.

   3. The superintendent indicated that the working relationship between the school committee and the town has become smoother. He reported that when he first came to Norwood, there was friction and mistrust. He noted that the committee is trying to be more collaborative with the town.

   D. Representatives of the Norwood Teachers' Association (NTA) indicated their respect for the collaborative style of the superintendent.

1. NTA representatives indicated that they expect the administration to honor the teachers' collective bargaining agreement and that the superintendent has been most collaborative with the association.

2. NTA representatives described a positive relationship over the last four years with the administration in general, and with the superintendent in particular. They reported that the superintendent tries whenever possible to resolve issues without going through the grievance process. They noted that this is also characteristic of principals. As a result, a minimal number of written grievances move to the school committee level.

E. In a teacher focus group, the superintendent and the assistant superintendent were described as being "wonderful and positive" about implementing the new educator evaluation system. The superintendent indicated that to lead the way with the new system he had the school committee use it to evaluate him last year.

F. School Council parents reported that the superintendent initiated a Superintendent's Advisory Council. While the Council met only three times in the 2012-2013 school year, it was scheduled to meet monthly in 2013-2014. This gives parents access to the superintendent and a venue for sharing thoughts and information.

Impact: By making a concerted effort to be open, transparent, and collaborative with his administrative team, the school committee, town officials, the teachers' association, teachers, and parents, the superintendent has helped to create an atmosphere of trust and cooperation among all the district's constituencies, gathering support for the school district and its initiatives.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. Norwood has curriculum documents and materials for all content areas, which are easily accessible on the district's shared drive.

A. Interviews with central office staff, teachers, and school-based support staff and a review of materials provided to the review team showed that the district has fully documented its curriculum.

1. The district's teachers developed curriculum overviews, pacing guides, and curriculum maps for elementary reading and writing.

2. Also, teachers developed curriculum overviews, pacing guides, and curriculum maps for elementary mathematics.

3. Science educators from the science center provide instruction, online science lesson plans, and complementary videos.

4. Middle and high school course overviews include segments for course description, learning experiences, content outline, and resources used. In addition, there are aligned curriculum maps for ELA and mathematics.

B. Curriculum documents are aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

1. According to Norwood staff and a document submitted to ESE, the district's mathematics and ELA curricula have been aligned to the 2011 frameworks.

C. Curriculum documents and materials are accessible to all staff.

1. Central office administrators and staff members told the review team that all teachers have their discipline's curriculum materials in a hard copy "binder."

2. All teachers have access to their discipline's curriculum materials via the shared drive. The shared drives contain most curriculum related materials including assessments.

3. Parents and community members can access curriculum overviews via the district's website.

Impact: Norwood's staff and students benefit from having a well-documented curriculum that addresses state requirements and provides teachers with a detailed framework within which to plan their instruction. With most curriculum documents and related instructional materials on the shared drives, they are easily accessible. While some files are read-only, others function as online, open source resources to which contributions can be made. Also, modifications to the state frameworks and changes to the district curriculum become immediately available.

3. Review team members found a high incidence of some characteristics of positive classroom environments in their observations of the district's classrooms.

The team observed 64 classes throughout the Norwood school district: 25 at the high school, 23 at the middle school, and 16 at the elementary schools. The team observed 17 ELA classes, 18 mathematics classes, 12 science classes, 15 social studies/history classes, and 2 other classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All 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.

A. In most of Norwood's observed classrooms, reviewers found effective learning environments. The following characteristics were widely observed throughout the district's schools.

1. In 92 percent of the classrooms observed, team members found that interactions between teachers and students were positive and respectful.

2. In 88 percent of visited classrooms, team members observed established standards of behavior. Disruptions, if any, were managed effectively.

Impact: Creating and maintaining a positive learning environment means that teachers can teach with limited interruptions for misbehavior and that students have a greater opportunity to learn.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

4. The district has in its elementary language arts program a model of an effective system of integrated curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

A. When the district introduced balanced literacy as its elementary ELA program it did so with training from Tufts University, where the system originated.

1. Balanced literacy in the district is supported by a comprehensive written curriculum recently updated to reflect the Common Core standards.

    a. The written curriculum includes detailed, day-by-day documentation of curriculum and instructional activities.

2. A literacy specialist in each elementary school supports teachers in the implementation of balanced literacy and in the analysis of formal and informal assessments.

B. The district uses the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) three times a year as an assessment system complementary to balanced literacy.

1. The DRA provides a clear picture of each student's strengths and weaknesses as a reader or writer.

2. This data enables the teacher to determine which students are at benchmark and to place each student at an appropriate level in the benchmark literacy program.

3. Teachers use running records with frequency for additional assessment information on individual student progress.

C. The combination of balanced literacy with its accompanying detailed curriculum, the DRA, and running records provides teachers with a well-integrated curriculum, instruction, and assessment system.

1. Balanced literacy requires detailed data on individual student progress to enable teachers to assign students to the correct level in the program.

2. The DRA and running records provide teachers with the data needed to place each student appropriately in the instructional system in place in the district.

Impact: As a result of this effective integration of complementary elements of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, the district provides students with an elementary English language arts program that

promotes and supports their literacy learning. The elementary English language arts program can serve as a model for the district for the effective integration of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Human Resources and Professional Development

5. The Norwood Public Schools have adopted a new educator evaluation system and at the time of the onsite were on track in implementing Massachusetts' new educator evaluation regulations.

A. As required by the state's new educator evaluation regulations, and with the superintendent's support, the district has collaboratively negotiated and subsequently ratified a new educator evaluation system that it is currently in the early stages of implementing.

1. Interviews with the superintendent, administrators, and teachers' association representatives confirmed that a joint task force worked throughout much of the previous school year (2012-2013) to successfully negotiate the necessary amendment to the teachers' collective bargaining agreement (CBA). The new CBA was ratified in September 2013.

2. Administrators and teachers' association representatives indicated that their new educator evaluation agreement was appropriately aligned with the key components of the state's model framework. At the time of the onsite the district was awaiting ESE review of its new educator evaluation language.

3. Interviewees and professional development records confirmed that, using a combination of external consultants (Teachers 21) and internal trainers, the district completed all ESE required training in support of the new evaluation system in the fall of 2013. Interviewees also concurred that additional and ongoing training for both teachers and administrators was needed to ensure the success of the system.

4. The district has purchased and is effectively using a comprehensive software program (TeachPoint) to support, facilitate, and manage the extensive volume of data and documents generated by the new evaluation system. Concurrently, the district hired a new educational technology director who is working to organize, streamline, and customize the process to make it more accessible, useful, and efficient for both teachers and evaluators. Additionally, the review team was told that the district has provided all administrators and evaluators with iPads to facilitate their efforts to record and monitor all evaluative documentation in an appropriate and timely manner.

5. Although both teachers and administrators expressed varying degrees of understanding of the many steps and stages of the new system, interviewees reported and district documents confirmed that, in general, a genuine effort is being made to follow all of the initial requirements and timelines of the regulations. These include self-assessment, goal setting, educator plans, and evidence documentation for both teachers and evaluators. The district

submitted to ESE a pilot plan for District-Determined Measures (DDMs) for 2013-2014, as required.

6. Administrators indicated that all teachers without professional teacher status and half of all staff with professional teacher status were scheduled to receive summative evaluations in 2013-2014. Formative assessments were to be completed by February 1, 2014, and therefore were not available at the time of the onsite for review for timeliness or quality.

7. Teachers expressed qualified support for the new evaluation system. They cited as initial benefits of the system increased administrative visibility in classrooms, improved feedback, and expanded conversations about teaching and learning, as well as more frequent and substantive professional collaborations with colleagues.

8. Administrators were more ambivalent in their support of the new evaluation system. Reasons for their ambivalence ranged from a belief that the district's former educator evaluation system was effective to concerns about evaluator capacity. Some principals said that the demands of the evaluation system were overly burdensome and would compete with their many other professional responsibilities. This was particularly true at the elementary level where principals expressed concern that there were too few evaluators to meet the expanded supervision and evaluation requirements of the new ESE regulations.

Impact: The district's genuine efforts with respect to the adoption and implementation of Massachusetts' new educator evaluation system are evidence of a new commitment to comprehensive and systemic school improvement through educator evaluation. (See second Human Resources and Professional Development challenge finding below.) The new system is designed to provide educators with the kind of meaningful and continuous feedback, support, and direction required to enhance classroom instruction, improve and expand competencies, and promote student learning and academic achievement. It can significantly improve the professional skills of teachers and administrators and create a culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation.

If the superintendent and his administrative team remain committed to full and faithful implementation of the new evaluation system, holding themselves and other members of the school community accountable for meeting their well-defined responsibilities, the likely outcome will be continuous improvements in learning opportunities, educational programs, and academic outcomes.

Student Support

6. The district offers a range of instructional services and supports for students with disabilities.

A. The district uses multiple sources of data to identify students with disabilities who are not meeting developmental benchmarks or performing at grade level and need additional support or services.

1. At each school K-12, administrators and specialists in Student Study Teams (SSTs) look at multiple sources of data (MCAS, DRA, and district-based ELA and math assessments) to identify students who need targeted intervention in the regular education program.

2. If interventions in the regular program are unsuccessful, SSTs reconvene and use multiple sources of data to identify students who may need placement in an appropriate special education program.

    a. The district's programs for students with disabilities include a continuum of programs from early childhood to adulthood to address health, academic, and behavioral needs, from Transition from Early Intervention (from 3 years) to Life Skills (18-22 years).

    b. The district provides K-12 self-contained classes with specialized instruction services for students with moderate disabilities, including Language Based Learning Disabilities (LBLD) and Therapeutic Academic Support Class (TASC) for learning, behavioral, and emotional needs.

    c. The district provides the following special education classes and services for students with severe disabilities: Pragmatic Learning Center for communication, academics, and social needs (for students with autism); Practical Application of Curriculum Skills (PACS) (for students with cognitive delays); and the LEAD Program (Live, Engage, Achieve, Develop) for adult development of transitional life skills (for students 18-22 years of age).

Impact: The district provides instruction and supplemental services for students with mild, moderate, and severe disabilities in inclusive classrooms as well as in self-contained programs. These various programs serve the district's students well, with programming for students with severe disabilities reducing the need for students to be placed out of district.

Financial and Asset Management

7. The budget development process includes district and school leaders, the school committee, and the town finance commission. The process is open and transparent with comprehensive and clear documentation, and it has created a climate of trust and cooperation between school and town leaders.

A. The development of the budget includes ample opportunities for district and school administrators and school committee members to present school and district needs.

1. The superintendent's preliminary budget has typically been presented by December.

    a. Administrators reported that the development of the budget is based on needs proposed by department heads, principals, and district administrators as well as on

enrollment data, collective bargaining, and fixed costs. Teachers suggest budget needs through their department heads and principals.

i. School and district needs are discussed in meetings of department heads, principals, and district administrators and are submitted in writing to the district office.

ii. Principals discuss budget needs as part of their presentation of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) to the school committee in January.

iii. Principals also reported that they had input in administrative discussions when cuts in the proposed budget had to be made.

2. The town clerk and accountant present projected town revenues to selectmen, the finance commission, and the school committee in January. The revenues include an estimate of 55 percent of available revenues earmarked for schools as a starting point.

3. Town revenues, along with school budget needs, are then discussed from January to May by a town budget subcommittee consisting of selectmen, school committee members, finance commission members, and school and town administrators.

   a. In recent years, the town budget subcommittee has reached a consensus on the school budget, which it then presents to the school committee, finance commission, and town meeting with little opposition.

4. Parents provide input on proposed budgets at school committee meetings during the time for open participation.

B. Proposed budget documents are clear, comprehensive, and responsive to stakeholders' needs for information and data.

1. The superintendent's preliminary budget documents include detailed information about revenues and proposed expenditures.

   a. The superintendent's preliminary budget document is made public and includes goals, technology and capital plans, and a summary of expenditures for each account for three preceding years, as well as the proposed budget for each account. It also highlights increases such as proposed new staffing.

   b. In addition, school committee members and finance commission members are given administrators' detailed submissions for each budget line, a personnel list, enrollment data, projected revenues for major revolving funds, and town and state contributions for education. Finance commission members have requested additional reports such as estimated and past circuit breaker revenues, special education expenses, and personnel savings. These reports are also made available to school and municipal boards and are available to the public.

2. Subsequent documents detailing the reductions from preliminary budgets and the final budget for each account as voted by the school committee are prepared for the school committee, the finance commission, and other town officials. The documents are made available to the general public and appear on the district website.

3. The superintendent prepares and publishes a Power Point presentation for town meeting highlighting school district achievements, goals, and revenues as well as elements of the proposed budget and increases because of enrollment, new programs such as technology and ELL, collective bargaining obligations, and changes in special education programs.

C. The district has made great progress in improving its dialogue with the town by moving to more transparent and open budget presentations and deliberations.

1. Town and school officials both emphasized improved collaboration, more trust for what they see, and increased transparency. One official stated that projected revenues and budget estimates were "suspicious" in the past, and school committee members as well as town officials noted that there was acrimony over the school budget in the past.

2. The superintendent and district administrators have been forthcoming in response to finance commission requests for additional information about school expenses such as collective bargaining and special education expenses and about revenues such as revolving funds (especially circuit breaker funding).

D. Trust and cooperation between school and town officials have contributed to town meeting support and funding for school programs.

1. School and town officials alike described the town funding of the school budget as the best that could be expected and fair.

2. ESE data shows that the town has supported its schools above the required net school spending level by more than 17 percent over the past three years (see Table B8 in Appendix B). Relative to other districts of similar size (3000-3999 students) Norwood is a high-spending district. In fiscal year 2012, it spent $12,770 per in-district pupil: 9 percent more than the median of $11,644. In fiscal year 2013, its spending per in-district pupil was $13,181, 8 percent more than the median of $12,194.

3. Additional funding for school fields ($108,000 in fiscal year 2014), technology ($444,100 in fiscal year 2014), and building needs and security (including a new high school in 2009), have been proposed and approved by the school committee, the finance commission, town meeting, and the voters. Town officials have also encouraged submission to MSBA for certain facility renovations in addition to the new high school in 2009, such as boiler replacements and HVAC improvements, with the understanding that the town would support them.

4. School officials and town officials reported that if the schools need additional funding for an unexpected and unfunded need such as special education or collective bargaining municipal leaders would support it.

Impact: The open and collaborative process for developing the budget and its resulting transparency have resulted in improved cooperation and trust between school and town officials. Town officials are receptive to and supportive of district needs for additional appropriations for building needs and technology.

8. The district has made a priority of updating and expanding its infrastructure for instructional technology and its use.

A. The new high school incorporated new instructional technology, including computer labs, wireless networks, and Smart Boards for classrooms.

B. The district has recently invested more in updated technology and training, particularly for K-8 schools.

1. The district is implementing a 2013-2017 technology plan to replace and expand technology in its K-8 schools.

   a. The town approved $444,100 for updated technology for the first year of the plan (2013-2014), and reviewers observed computer labs and Smart Boards in grade 1-8 schools.

   b. Administrators also reported using private donations to purchase classroom technology, including Smart Boards, document cameras, and new computers.

   c. Teachers and administrators reported the use of technology for a variety of purposes: Smart Boards and document cameras are used in classrooms; shared drive resources are used for curriculum and lessons; Teach Point, for teacher evaluations; Grad Point, for credit recovery; School Dude, for maintenance requests; websites and emailed assignments and progress reports, for communication with students and parents; and online courses and computer labs, for instruction.

   d. Teachers and administrators reported that training is being provided in the use of technology for instruction, and the district has recently provided stipends for technology specialists to support teachers.

2. Parents commented approvingly on their ability to monitor their children's assignments and progress online and via e-mails provided by teachers.

Impact: The increased availability of technology for instruction creates opportunities for reaching students in new and effective ways, for providing for varied learning styles, and for informing parents promptly about their child's schoolwork and progress.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

It is important to note that district review reports prioritize identifying challenges and areas for growth in order to promote a cycle of continuous improvement; the report deliberately describes the district's challenges and concerns in greater detail than the strengths identified during the review.

Leadership and Governance

9. **The superintendent had not completed annual performance evaluations for district administrators for the past four years before the onsite.**

    A. The superintendent told the review team that he had not completed evaluations for administrators for the past four years as required by law, and the personnel files of administrators bore out his statement.

Impact: When he does not evaluate administrators, the superintendent does not fulfill one of his leadership responsibilities. Missing the opportunity to evaluate administrators means missing the opportunity to foster their professional growth and development and to set an example with respect to the importance of evaluation in the district. Effective evaluations of administrators, complete with recommendations, are a crucial factor in their ability to learn and grow in their positions.

10. **Though the district had a District Improvement Plan 2013-2015 aligned to the broad goals of its Strategic Goals 2012-2015 document, the DIP was incomplete and did not appear to be in use.**

    A. The district's strategic goal statements are, appropriately, broad. The DIP shown to the review team during the onsite has columns for SMART goals, action steps, persons responsible, success measures, timelines, and notes, to guide district personnel as to how they are expected to accomplish the goals.

    B. According to district leaders, however, the DIP is incomplete and work was not being done to complete it. It did not appear to be used by district staff.

Impact: The district's strategic goals do not provide district or school administrators with the direction they need to guide their work. Without a completed DIP with the detail to make strategic goals actionable, district administrators do not have clear and specific guidance for planning and implementing their work, and school administrators do not have clear and specific guidance for developing and implementing School Improvement Plans.

Curriculum and Instruction

11. In observed classes, team members found a low incidence of some characteristics of effective, standards-based instruction.

The team observed 64 classes throughout the Norwood school district: 25 at the high school, 23 at the middle school, and 16 at the elementary schools. The team observed 17 ELA, 18 mathematics, 12 science lessons, 15 social studies/history classes and 2 other classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All 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.

A. Observers found limited evidence of teachers using available technology to support instruction and enhance learning (characteristic #16). There was clear and consistent evidence of this in 25 percent of classes visited at the elementary level, in 22 percent of classrooms in the middle school, and in 36 percent of classes at the high school. (There was no evidence of this in 44 percent of observed classes in the elementary schools, in 48 percent of classrooms in the middle school, and in 60 percent of classes at the high school.) Observers found clear and consistent evidence of students using technology as a tool for learning (#22) in 6 percent of the classrooms visited in the elementary schools, in 4 percent of classes in the middle school, and in 12 percent of the classrooms at the high school.

B. Review team members also found limited evidence of students engaged in higher order thinking. There was clear and consistent evidence of students inquiring, exploring, applying, analyzing, synthesizing and/or evaluating knowledge or concepts (#19) in 31 percent of elementary classrooms visited, in 26 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 16 percent of high school classes. In addition, there was clear and consistent evidence of teachers planning and implementing lessons that reflect rigor and high expectations (#7) in only 38 percent of the classes observed at the elementary level, in 30 percent of classrooms in the middle school, and in 44 percent of the classes at the high school.

C. Classroom observers found limited evidence of students actively engaging with their lessons. There was clear and consistent evidence of students articulating their own thinking orally or in writing (#18) in 38 percent of the classrooms visited at the elementary schools, in 30 percent of the classes in the middle school, and in 52 percent of the classrooms at the high school. Clear and consistent evidence of students elaborating about content and ideas when responding to questions (#20) was also limited. Students did so in 31 percent of observed elementary classrooms, in 22 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 16 percent of high school classes.

Impact: The 24 characteristics in the instructional inventory are elements of effective instruction. The low incidence in observed classes of some key characteristics such as student engagement, higher order thinking, and the use of technology means that students do not have rich opportunities in their classrooms to grow as learners. This compromises the achievement of students at all ability levels.

Assessment

12. The district does not ensure that assessment results are consistently analyzed across the district and the analysis used to make appropriate changes in instruction.

A. Administrators, department heads, and specialists reported analysis of MCAS, DRA, and common locally developed assessments.

1. The assistant superintendent provides administrators and teachers with written reports about MCAS results.
2. The district leadership team examines MCAS results at its meetings.
3. Literacy specialists assist teachers in the analysis of DRA results.
4. Department heads said that teachers who administer mid-year and final exams in common review the results together.

B. Some assessment analysis has resulted in specific shifts in instruction and assessment.

1. Secondary math teachers received training in teaching writing, and their common midyears and finals now include a question that requires a written answer. This provides them with information concerning how well their students can write about—and demonstrate their understanding of—mathematics.
2. Secondary English teachers have adopted a common student learning goal—improving topic development in student writing.
3. DRA results determine students' placements.
4. Elementary science specialists compare assessment results by classroom and provide assistance where it is needed.

C. The district does not sufficiently define and carry through on its expectations about planning and delivering instruction that addresses student needs identified through assessment.

1. School administrators reported various iterations of school data teams including RTI meetings.
    a. The district has disseminated to principals and department chairs a suggested step-by-step process for data teams to use in MCAS analysis and a worksheet for MCAS and other data analysis, as well as a more general set of steps for data analysis with a form to fill out.

b. However, the team did not see evidence of the use of these materials. Interviewees did not mention them, and the team was not shown examples of completed forms or worksheets.

2. The district does not require that analysis of assessment results conclude with written reports that would guide instructional responses to assessments.

3. As mentioned above, department heads said that secondary teachers who teach courses in common and give common assessments meet to examine the results. However, the review team did not find evidence of written instructional plans resulting from those meetings.

4. In addition, the team did not find evidence that principals, department heads, literacy specialists, and elementary math and science specialists assume responsibility for supervising the implementation of informally arrived-at instructional plans.

5. Finally, the team did not find evidence of district expectations for administrative oversight of the implementation of re-teach plans to address assessment results.

Impact: Without formal, consistently implemented expectations for analysis of assessment results, formulation of appropriate instructional shifts, and oversight of the accomplishment of these shifts, the district has an incomplete system for addressing its students' instructional needs. While informal analysis of assessments takes place, the district does not have the assurance that the important next step does—namely that its teachers are implementing and its students are receiving the modified instruction required to fill gaps in their learning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

13. There is inadequate time for professional development in the district: insufficient common planning and meeting time is embedded within the district calendar and individual teacher and school schedules.

A. The review team identified several elements within the district's professional development (PD) program worthy of note.

1. District PD agendas reflect a focus on helping educators advance student learning goals and supporting the educational needs of all students.

2. The district provides leadership opportunities for staff, including mentoring, Keys to Literacy coaching, serving as teacher trainers for the state's new educator evaluation system, and serving as presenters/facilitators for a variety of staff mini-workshops and targeted trainings.

3. The district makes efforts to differentiate PD programs to meet the diverse needs of staff in different schools, grade levels, content areas, and skill levels.

B. The amount of job-embedded and districtwide common planning and meeting time available for professional development is inadequate.

1. Interviewees concurred that the district's PD program has insufficient time and structures for regular and frequent faculty collaboration. Schedules do not provide teachers at any grade level with daily common planning time and allow only limited common meeting time opportunities. Administrators indicated that at present the time and formal opportunities allocated for staff members to work together regularly are inadequate to meet the demands imposed by state mandates as well as by the broad range of identified school and district initiatives and curriculum needs.

2. A review of school and district PD calendars showed an insufficient amount of scheduled common K-12 in-service released time. This is exacerbated because the district's elementary, middle, and high schools do not currently share the same PD released days. Further, differences in the master schedules of the district's elementary schools prevent grade level teacher meetings among those five schools. The inadequacy of embedded common planning and meeting time in teacher schedules, school master schedules, and the district calendar significantly limits opportunities for vertical and horizontal coordination and articulation K-12.

3. Teachers mentioned that until recently much PD time was used in connection with accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC).

C. Though one teacher described a "top-down list of PD days" and another said, "We're not involved in planning [PD]," teachers also said that teachers on a committee formed by the superintendent had been asked for input about PD, that at the high school department heads ask teachers what they need to work on, and that the assistant superintendent asked teachers what the district could offer.

Impact: Although it includes a number of positive elements and benefits from the efforts of many, the district's PD program is unable to fulfill its mission effectively. It does not have sufficient embedded and regularly scheduled common planning and meeting opportunities for staff in all schools and grade levels Consequently, the district cannot consistently provide the type, quality, and range of programs and services necessary to properly support and sustain the professional growth of all its staff members and advance district goals and priorities effectively and systematically.

14. Before implementing its new educator evaluation system, the district had a less meaningful evaluation process.

A. The visiting team reviewed 36 teacher personnel files selected randomly from across the school district, as well as those of all 13 current district administrators and school principals. In general, evaluations of staff both with and without professional teacher status were completed when due. With very few exceptions, however, they were not instructive and seldom contained

specific comments or concrete recommendations that would contribute to improvements in classroom instruction, enhanced practice, or overall professional growth.

B. Although the annual evaluation of administrators is a legal requirement, a review of the personnel files of central office administrators and principals showed that no administrative evaluations had been written during the past four school years.

Impact: Although the district is making a concerted effort to implement the new educator evaluation system, its past history of producing ineffective teacher evaluations and no administrative evaluations means that implementation of the new system represents a cultural shift and will require clearly defined expectations as well as active monitoring.

Financial and Asset Management

15. Apart from budget development, some day to day district financial management and reporting practices are inefficient because of the outdated accounting software in use by the town and district.

A. Administrators and staff described difficulties and inefficiencies resulting from the town's accounting software.

1. Auditors have recommended updating the software.
2. Some processes still rely on completing multiple paper forms in school, administration, and town offices, especially when making purchases and paying invoices.
3. Many reports are not available on the town's software and must be created manually on special spreadsheets and reconciled to town reports.
    a. Such reports include information requested by the school committee, finance commission, and ESE, such as projected expenditures and payroll, special education expenses, and data for the ESE Financial End of Year Report.
    b. Tracking, analyzing, and reporting data necessary for human resources (licenses, pay scale placements, attendance, EPIMS data, payroll adjustments, and anticipated payments) and federal grants (whose fiscal year does not match the town's) is incompatible with the town's software. Here, too, special spreadsheets are required.
4. Reports and current account balances from the town accounting software are available only two days a week in the administrative office and not at all in schools.

B. There are opportunities for inaccuracies and errors in reports used for financial encumbrances, expenditures, and data because they were not created by the same software.

1. There were difficulties in reconciling accounts with the town and closing out the fiscal year in 2013. Internal school reports for the end of fiscal year 2013 showed a projected zero balance and projected expenditures of $35,668,212, while the figures subsequently reported on the town's budget reports showed expenditures of $36,032,561 (a discrepancy of $364,349, which had to be reconciled).

2. Because of the complications in using different reporting systems, journal entries have been necessary when balance discrepancies have arisen, such as charges to the incorrect fiscal year.

Impact: The outdated accounting software in use by the town has a negative impact on operations in the business office and on the accuracy of reports. It requires unnecessary additional time for multiple paper purchase orders, duplicate data entry, special spreadsheets and reports, and reconciliations. It is not cost effective; it increases opportunities for errors; it is an inefficient use of human resources and the cause of inefficient financial management practices in the district.

Norwood Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

1. **To effectively implement the district's newly adopted educator evaluation system the superintendent should make the completion of administrators' performance evaluations one of his highest priorities.**

   A. The superintendent should ensure that all district administrators' performance evaluations are appropriately completed in a timely manner.

   B. Resources that could be helpful to the district in arriving at compliance with 603 CMR 35.00 and implementing the newly adopted educator evaluation system include:

   - Direct link to state regulations on evaluation of educators: http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr35.html
   - **The Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation:** A collection of resources to support effective implementation of the new Educator Evaluation system, including district- and school-level planning and implementation guides, model rubrics, and model contract language. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/
   - **Educator Evaluation Resources:** Additional resources to support implementation of the new educator evaluation framework. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/
   - **Superintendents: Educator Evaluation and District Planning:** Part of the Educator Evaluation series of ESE's Planning for Success project. http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/

Benefits: By ensuring that all administrator performance evaluations are completed when required and by using the resources available to aid in making performance evaluations a tool for educational improvement, the superintendent will foster the growth and development of district personnel while sending the district the message that performance evaluation, because it fosters the growth and development of district personnel, is critical to the health of a school system.

2. **The district should update and complete the Norwood Public Schools District Improvement Plan and make sure that it is used to guide staff's activities. The SIPs should be aligned with the DIP.**

   A. The district should complete its DIP in the light of its Strategic Goals 2012-2015 document and make sure that it is actively used; when the Strategic Goals document is updated or replaced, the DIP should be revisited. The superintendent and school committee should consider aligning some goals in the superintendent's Educator Plan with the goals in the DIP.

B. Once the district has a current DIP, school administrators should use it as guidance in developing and implementing School Improvement Plans.

C. Principals should use their school's SIP to inform their self-assessment and goal-setting process when creating their Educator Plans, and teachers should consider aligning their Educator Plan goals with the SIP goals. When setting team goals it may be appropriate to focus on addressing growth areas identified in the SIP.

D. The superintendent should report regularly to the school committee on progress toward accomplishing the goals in the DIP, and the principals should provide their school councils and school communities with regular reports on progress toward their SIP goals.

E. Resources that could be helpful to the district in developing its DIP and SIPs include the following ESE documents:

- **The Massachusetts Planning and Implementation Framework.** Part of the Educator Evaluation series of ESE's Planning for Success project. This document presents a common planning language, supporting the shared understanding critical to successful planning and execution.

  Overview and document link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/

- **District Self-Assessment:** A tool for districts to assess their systems and processes as part of an ongoing cycle of inquiry for continuous improvement.

  Overview: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/general/

  Direct link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/district-self-assessment.pdf

- **Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment:** A tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.

  Overview and document links: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/general/

  Direct link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSESelf-Assesment.pdf

- **Conditions for School Effectiveness Research Guide:** A thorough description of research that supports the Essential Conditions which can be used to consider the impact of decisions made to improve schools.

  Overview and document links: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/general/

  Direct link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/ConditionResearchGuide.pdf

Benefits: Up-to-date and aligned strategic, district improvement, and school improvement plans will provide consistent, clear direction throughout the district and make clear to all stakeholders involved in the accomplishment of the goals how, by whom, and when steps toward the goals are to be executed. Regular reporting on progress toward accomplishing the plans' goals will consolidate stakeholders' understanding of the direction of the district and its schools and highlight what remains to be done.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district should provide teachers with professional development on effective instructional strategies and then make sure that supervision of teachers focuses on effective implementation of the strategies in their classrooms.

A. Observations by review team members showed limited evidence of some effective instructional strategies in classrooms.

1. The district should provide teachers with professional development on research-based instruction based on the priorities in the plans and on information on teachers' needs, including summary information about teachers' evaluations. According to the observations of the review team, teachers' needs include the need for professional development on instruction that engages students and elicits higher-order thinking, as well as professional development on using technology to support instruction and enhance learning.

2. Also, the district should provide administrators with professional development on monitoring the implementation of prioritized instructional strategies and providing effective feedback to teachers.

B. Administrators should use the unannounced observations under the educator evaluation system to focus on the implementation of teachers' newly acquired instructional strategies.

C. Norwood's teachers whose practice exemplifies effective instruction should serve as models for their colleagues.[4]

D. Resources that could be helpful to the district in improving instruction include:

- **Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide:** A resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those

[4] In particular, as it proceeds with implementation of its new educator evaluation system, the district should be guided by the following regulation at 603 CMR 35.08(7): "Educators whose summative performance rating is exemplary and whose impact on student learning is rated moderate or high shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement."

who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

Overview: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/

Direct link to full text with appendices:
http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf

Direct link to Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice:* http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf

Benefits: Norwood students will have the opportunity for increased learning and greater understanding when teachers' instruction promotes their active engagement in challenging lessons.

Assessment

4. The district should establish expected procedures for the analysis of assessment results and for the implementation of instruction that addresses the indicated student needs.

A. The district should specify procedures for analysis of assessment results, for arriving at data-based instructional decisions based on those results, and for implementation of those decisions.

B. Assessment analysis should result in a written plan with strategies for addressing students' instructional needs.

C. Administrators and department heads should support and supervise the implementation of the instructional strategies decided on.

D. The district leadership team or another district data team should review results for such assessments as MCAS, DRA, and locally developed exams to provide overall guidance and oversight about needed instructional adjustments.

E. School data teams should provide similar guidance and oversight for school assessments.

F. Resources that could be helpful in fostering a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team include:

- **District Data Team Toolkit:** Resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.

  Overview: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/lg.html

  Direct link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf

  Direct link, Module 4 (may be useful to identify root causes):
  http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/Knowledge.pdf

Benefits from implementing this recommendation will include the confidence that assessment analysis is followed by specific decisions about instructional adjustments and then implementation of those decisions, leading to improved student learning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

5. **The district should investigate ways to increase the amount of time available for professional development, while aligning professional development with district goals and priorities and making sure it is sufficiently informed by teacher needs and has sufficient resources allocated to it.**

   A. The district should create increased opportunities for embedded, regularly scheduled common planning and meeting time for faculty in all schools and at all grade levels, including common meeting time for staff across the elementary schools.

      1. This will allow for significantly more time for professional development (PD) during the school day.

   B. The district should investigate ways to increase and equalize the number of PD days for schools in the district and to make those days the same for every school, whether early release, delayed opening, or full day format. This would optimize opportunities for horizontal and vertical articulation and coordination of curriculum, programs, and related services.

   C. The PD program should directly support district priorities and goals as articulated in the district's planning documents. The district is encouraged to determine whether it is allocating sufficient resources to provide the PD called for by district priorities and goals and indicated by staff's needs.

   D. The district should consider whether there are enough avenues for input into PD from teachers, as the review team heard different views from teachers on this.

   E. ESE endorsed resources available to support these recommendations:

      - **Teachers' Domain: Digital Media for the Classroom and Professional Development:** Media resources, support materials, and tools for classroom lessons, individualized learning programs, and teacher professional learning communities.

        Direct link: http://www.teachersdomain.org/

      - **Professional Learning Communities:** A website maintained by the Center for Collaborative Education, devoted to supporting participating schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.

        http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/

- **Common Planning Time Self-Assessment Toolkit:** A guide to help districts raise student achievement by building districts' capacity to support effective teacher instructional teams.

  Direct link: http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CPTtoolkit.pdf

- **Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development:** Describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf

Benefits:

- Providing additional embedded opportunities for common planning and meeting time, as well as increased release time, will expand opportunities for faculty to work together in sustained and supported initiatives to improve their instructional practice, revise and coordinate curriculum, strengthen their assessment and data analysis skills, and enhance their content knowledge and overall professional competencies.

- By aligning professional development with district priorities and staff needs and making sure teachers' input is adequate and the resources allocated to professional development are sufficient, the district will be maximizing the benefit of its professional development program to its improvement initiatives.

Financial and Asset Management

6. The district business office and administrators should study jointly with town officials their financial management and reporting practices to make them more efficient; they should plan for the acquisition of new accounting software to be shared by district and town.

A. District officials should meet and work together with town officials to improve financial management and reporting practices. The selection of new software must be undertaken jointly to ensure that it satisfies municipal as well as district needs to manage human resource data, state requirements for district financial and personnel reporting, encumbered payroll and other expenditures, and appropriate reports for grants and other municipal and school revenues and expenditures.

1. Municipal accounting software products are available which would be more efficient and integrated in handling district human resource data and financial management needs as well as providing for more efficient and accurate reports.

2. Access to the software by schools as well as by the district office would allow initiating requisitions, thus making data entry more efficient. School access to financial reports

would make current financial information available to principals. The subsequent duplicate entries of requisition and purchase order data could be reduced or eliminated.

B. The option for the district to invest in its own accounting software could create some of these efficiencies, but would not be as effective as sharing appropriate software and record keeping functions with municipal offices. The reconciliation of reports and reentry of some financial data would still be necessary.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation would include more efficient operations in both district and municipal offices:

- Up-to-date accounting software could accomplish much to make financial information more readily available and to streamline financial practices, especially with respect to purchasing, human resource data, and reports.
- Communications with town offices would be improved, and financial information would be available immediately when needed at the district and school levels.
- Financial and personnel reports would be more accurate and would contain the information needed by school administrators and the school committee without the need for separate spreadsheets.
- The consolidation of financial management data entry and the reduction in necessary reconciliations of special reports would free up substantial administrative time that could be used for other purposes.

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 21-24, 2014, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. William Contreras, leadership and governance
2. Dr. Peter McGinn, curriculum and instruction
3. Patricia Williams, assessment, review team coordinator
4. Dr. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development
5. Dr. Evangeline Harris Stefanakis, student support
6. Dr. George Gearhart, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the onsite:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the business manager, the grants manager, a finance committee member, two selectmen, and the chair of the board of selectmen.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: the chair, the vice-chair, and a member.

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

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

The team visited the following schools: Norwood High School (grades 9-12), Coakley Middle School (grades 6-8), Balch Elementary (grades 1-5), Oldham Elementary (grades 1-5), and Cleveland Elementary(grades 1-5).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with eight principals and three focus groups with six elementary school teachers, one middle school teacher, and two high school teachers. On day three, the district had a late opening because of snow. As a result, the team rescheduled the classroom observations and the interview that were to have taken place.

The team observed 64 classes in the district: 25 at the high school, 23 at the middle school, and 16 at the 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

Tuesday 01/21/2014	**Wednesday** 01/22/2014	**Thursday** 01/23/2014	**Friday** 01/24/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files, document reviews; interview with teachers' association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; visits to Norwood High School for classroom observations; interview with town officials.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Balch Elementary, Oldham Elementary, and Norwood High School, for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Coakley Middle School and Cleveland Elementary School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

Table B1a: Norwood
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Afr. Amer./Black	341	9.8%	82990	8.7%
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.	3	0.1%	2209	0.2%
Asian	238	6.9%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic/Latino	279	8.0%	162647	17.0%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.	46	1.3%	27803	2.9%
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.	6	0.2%	1007	0.1%
White	2558	73.7%	620628	64.9%
All Students	3471	100.0%	955739	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2013

Table B1b: Norwood 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	598	40.0%	17.0%	164336	34.8%	17.0%
Low Income	997	66.7%	28.7%	365885	77.5%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	245	16.4%	7.1%	75947	16.1%	7.9%
All high needs students	1495	100.0%	42.4%	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 3,522; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,360.

Table B2a: Norwood 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	258	89.3	87.9	88.3	91.5	83.3	2.2	3.2
	P+	258	67.0%	65.0%	65.0%	72.0%	57.0%	5.0%	7.0%
4	CPI	253	85	85.5	84.6	84	78.9	-1	-0.6
	P+	253	58.0%	64.0%	62.0%	58.0%	53.0%	0.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	235	58	60	53	47	49	-11	-6
5	CPI	253	87.3	90.3	87.1	87.4	84.7	0.1	0.3
	P+	253	64.0%	74.0%	68.0%	66.0%	66.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	238	46	53.5	44	43.5	52	-2.5	-0.5
6	CPI	231	89.4	89.7	90.6	90	85.1	0.6	-0.6
	P+	231	77.0%	75.0%	75.0%	77.0%	67.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	SGP	214	67	63	62	57	52	-10	-5
7	CPI	240	88.6	91.3	89.6	92.9	88.4	4.3	3.3
	P+	240	71.0%	79.0%	73.0%	83.0%	72.0%	12.0%	10.0%
	SGP	229	45	51	41	46	48	1	5
8	CPI	249	92.4	91.6	94	89.7	90.1	-2.7	-4.3
	P+	249	81.0%	81.0%	86.0%	77.0%	78.0%	-4.0%	-9.0%
	SGP	227	50	66	62	55	50	5	-7
10	CPI	274	94.8	97.1	95.9	97	96.9	2.2	1.1
	P+	274	81.0%	91.0%	90.0%	92.0%	91.0%	11.0%	2.0%
	SGP	227	41	59.5	46	57	57	16	11
All	CPI	1758	89.5	90.7	90.1	90.4	86.8	0.9	0.3
	P+	1758	71.0%	76.0%	74.0%	75.0%	69.0%	4.0%	1.0%
	SGP	1370	51	59	51	51	51	0	0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP 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: Norwood 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	256	89.4	86.9	86.9	90.7	84.3	1.3	3.8
	P+	256	75.0%	70.0%	67.0%	76.0%	66.0%	1.0%	9.0%
4	CPI	253	82	81.5	81.4	83.8	80.2	1.8	2.4
	P+	253	52.0%	51.0%	54.0%	55.0%	52.0%	3.0%	1.0%
	SGP	233	56	50	51	53	54	-3	2
5	CPI	254	83.6	85.2	84.2	83.5	80.6	-0.1	-0.7
	P+	254	60.0%	66.0%	64.0%	63.0%	61.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	238	57	53	54	55	54	-2	1
6	CPI	233	80.4	81.6	85.8	81	80.3	0.6	-4.8
	P+	233	61.0%	60.0%	68.0%	60.0%	61.0%	-1.0%	-8.0%
	SGP	217	57	46.5	58	36	50	-21	-22
7	CPI	240	71.9	75.4	76.3	75.7	74.4	3.8	-0.6
	P+	240	46.0%	52.0%	50.0%	50.0%	52.0%	4.0%	0.0%
	SGP	230	56.5	57	52.5	32	46	-24.5	-20.5
8	CPI	247	72.6	70	76.2	73.8	76	1.2	-2.4
	P+	247	45.0%	44.0%	54.0%	47.0%	55.0%	2.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	225	44	56	52	37	50	-7	-15
10	CPI	276	91	91.3	89.5	92	90.2	1	2.5
	P+	276	76.0%	80.0%	77.0%	83.0%	80.0%	7.0%	6.0%
	SGP	229	33	52	56	60	51	27	4
All	CPI	1759	80.9	81.7	82.9	83.2	80.8	2.3	0.3
	P+	1759	58.0%	61.0%	62.0%	62.0%	61.0%	4.0%	0.0%
	SGP	1372	52	53	54	46	51	-6	-8

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: Norwood 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	254	86.7	81.4	81.2	82.3	78.5	-4.4	1.1
	P+	254	64.0%	54.0%	55.0%	55.0%	51.0%	-9.0%	0.0%
8	CPI	247	73.4	65	77.9	69.3	71	-4.1	-8.6
	P+	247	41.0%	29.0%	52.0%	32.0%	39.0%	-9.0%	-20.0%
10	CPI	261	86	86.6	87	86	88	0	-1
	P+	261	64.0%	65.0%	67.0%	64.0%	71.0%	0.0%	-3.0%
All	CPI	762	81.2	77.3	81.9	79.4	79	-1.8	-2.5
	P+	762	54.0%	49.0%	58.0%	51.0%	53.0%	-3.0%	-7.0%

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: Norwood 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	730	80.1	81.3	81.2	82.2	2.1	1
		P+	730	49.0%	54.0%	55.0%	56.0%	7.0%	1.0%
		SGP	531	48	50	49	48	0	-1
	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	502	82.7	83.1	83.6	84.4	1.7	0.8
		P+	502	56.0%	60.0%	61.0%	61.0%	5.0%	0.0%
		SGP	377	48	50	52	49	1	-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	293	69.2	72.7	72.9	70.8	1.6	-2.1
		P+	293	24.0%	34.0%	37.0%	32.0%	8.0%	-5.0%
		SGP	210	40	41	43	38.5	-1.5	-4.5
	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	155	80.1	73.8	73.6	81.1	1	7.5
		P+	155	53.0%	44.0%	41.0%	51.0%	-2.0%	10.0%
		SGP	97	64	67	58	56	-8	-2
	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	1758	89.5	90.7	90.1	90.4	0.9	0.3
		P+	1758	71.0%	76.0%	74.0%	75.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	1370	51	59	51	51	0	0
	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: Norwood 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	732	67.8	68	70.5	71.9	4.1	1.4
		P+	732	36.0%	38.0%	40.0%	44.0%	8.0%	4.0%
		SGP	533	50	50	53	42	-8	-11
	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	503	69.2	69.3	71.6	72.9	3.7	1.3
		P+	503	39.0%	41.0%	42.0%	46.0%	7.0%	4.0%
		SGP	381	50	51	55	42	-8	-13
	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	293	57.8	56.4	60.3	59.6	1.8	-0.7
		P+	293	21.0%	20.0%	22.0%	24.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	211	46	43	46	35	-11	-11
	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	156	71.1	67.3	69.4	74.4	3.3	5
		P+	156	43.0%	39.0%	38.0%	48.0%	5.0%	10.0%
		SGP	97	62	57	68.5	47	-15	-21.5
	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	1759	80.9	81.7	82.9	83.2	2.3	0.3
		P+	1759	58.0%	61.0%	62.0%	62.0%	4.0%	0.0%
		SGP	1372	52	53	54	46	-6	-8
	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: Norwood 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	320	69	63.7	69.2	69.6	0.6	0.4
		P+	320	32.0%	27.0%	35.0%	34.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
	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	224	69.7	65.9	69.9	70.5	0.8	0.6
		P+	224	36.0%	30.0%	37.0%	37.0%	1.0%	0.0%
	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	134	62.7	53.5	60.9	59.5	-3.2	-1.4
		P+	134	17.0%	13.0%	21.0%	19.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	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	55	72.6	52.8	63.2	70	-2.6	6.8
		P+	55	43.0%	15.0%	28.0%	35.0%	-8.0%	7.0%
	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	762	81.2	77.3	81.9	79.4	-1.8	-2.5
		P+	762	54.0%	49.0%	58.0%	51.0%	-3.0%	-7.0%
	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: Norwood 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	1.6	0.9	1.3	1.8	0.2	12.5%	0.5	38.5%	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: Norwood 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	105	79.1%	78.2%	78.3%	81.9%	2.8	3.5%	3.6	4.6%	74.7%
Low income	73	80.5%	83.3%	77.4%	89.0%	8.5	10.6%	11.6	15.0%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	50	74.5%	70.3%	71.4%	72.0%	-2.5	-3.4%	0.6	0.8%	67.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	88.9%	87.5%	90.9%	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	297	89.0%	88.7%	88.7%	92.3%	3.3	3.7%	3.6	4.1%	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: Norwood 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	115	74.0%	83.5%	87.9%	83.5%	9.5	12.8%	-4.4	-5.0	78.9%
Low income	84	73.2%	84.1%	93.6%	83.3%	10.1	13.8%	-10.3	-11.0	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	56	75.5%	81.8%	79.7%	73.2%	-2.3	-3.0%	-6.5	-8.2	73.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	11	50.0%	88.9%	100%	100%	50.0	100.0%	0.0	0.0	68.5%
All students	238	87.5%	91.0%	93.1%	91.6%	4.1	4.7%	-1.5	-1.6	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: Norwood 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	95.0%	95.3%	95.5%	95.4%	0.4	0.4%	-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: Norwood 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	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	--	0.0	--	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	3.1%	3.6%	3.4%	2.8%	-0.3	-9.7%	-0.6	-17.6%	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: Norwood 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	$34,194,137	$34,141,202	$34,345,233	$34,048,865	$35,496,213	$36,265,922
By municipality	$11,506,050	$25,232,556	$26,501,838	$17,274,378	$11,625,070	$14,251,163
Total from local appropriations	$45,700,187	$59,373,758	$60,847,071	$51,323,243	$47,121,283	$50,517,085
From revolving funds and grants	--	$5,382,761	--	$5,204,025	--	$5,333,667
Total expenditures	--	$64,756,520	--	$56,527,268	--	$55,850,752
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$4,783,122	--	$4,808,800	--	$5,111,751
Required local contribution	--	$28,648,256	--	$29,934,115	--	$30,967,635
Required net school spending**	--	$33,431,378	--	$34,742,915	--	$36,079,386
Actual net school spending	--	$41,058,649	--	$40,736,080	--	$43,145,291
Over/under required ($)	--	$7,627,271	--	$5,993,165	--	$7,065,905
Over/under required (%)	--	22.8%	--	17.3%	--	19.6%

*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, FY13 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved June 23, 2014

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

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012	2013
Administration	$612	$693	$638	$663
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$677	$685	$660	$696
Teachers	$4,618	$5,060	$5,094	$5,206
Other teaching services	$1,030	$944	$874	$938
Professional development	$179	$175	$164	$157
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$304	$324	$327	$323
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$294	$302	$290	$310
Pupil services	$1,157	$1,210	$1,264	$1,283
Operations and maintenance	$1,292	$1,297	$1,204	$1,368
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$1,907	$2,280	$2,254	$2,229
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$12,069	$12,970	$12,770	$13,174

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%	13%	88%	**#**	0	5	59
	MS	0%	9%	91%	**%**	0%	8%	92%
	HS	0%	4%	96%	**---**	---	---	---
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	**ES**	0%	25%	75%	**#**	0	8	56
	MS	0%	13%	87%	**%**	0%	13%	88%
	HS	0%	4%	96%	**---**	---	---	---
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	**ES**	0%	38%	63%	**#**	4	16	44
	MS	13%	26%	61%	**%**	6%	25%	69%
	HS	4%	16%	80%	**---**	---	---	---
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	**ES**	6%	31%	63%	**#**	11	12	41
	MS	22%	9%	70%	**%**	17%	19%	64%
	HS	20%	20%	60%	**---**	---	---	---
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	**ES**	0%	44%	56%	**#**	11	28	20
	MS	0%	72%	28%	**%**	19%	47%	34%
	HS	44%	32%	24%	**---**	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None (0)	Partial (1)	Clear & Consistent (2)		None (0)	Partial (1)	Clear & Consistent (2)
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	**ES**	6%	31%	63%	**#**	2	12	50
	MS	4%	13%	83%	**%**	3%	19%	78%
	HS	0%	16%	84%	**---**			
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	**ES**	13%	50%	38%	**#**	16	24	24
	MS	35%	35%	30%	**%**	25%	38%	38%
	HS	24%	32%	44%	**---**	---	---	---
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	**ES**	56%	6%	38%	**#**	21	8	35
	MS	22%	9%	70%	**%**	33%	13%	55%
	HS	28%	20%	52%	**---**	---	---	---
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	**ES**	6%	50%	44%	**#**	6	29	29
	MS	13%	43%	43%	**%**	9%	45%	45%
	HS	8%	44%	48%	**---**	---	---	---
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**	56%	25%	19%	**#**	47	11	6
	MS	70%	17%	13%	**%**	73%	17%	9%
	HS	88%	12%	0%	**---**	---	---	---
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**	19%	56%	25%	**#**	29	23	12
	MS	61%	22%	17%	**%**	45%	36%	19%
	HS	48%	36%	16%	**---**	---	---	---

(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**	13%	38%	50%	**#**	13	20	31
	MS	26%	26%	48%	**%**	20%	31%	48%
	HS	20%	32%	48%	**---**			
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**	38%	19%	44%	**#**	29	12	23
	MS	65%	4%	30%	**%**	45%	19%	36%
	HS	32%	32%	36%	**---**	---	---	---
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	**ES**	13%	38%	50%	**#**	5	27	32
	MS	9%	43%	48%	**%**	8%	42%	50%
	HS	4%	44%	52%	**---**	---	---	---
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	**ES**	31%	31%	38%	**#**	20	26	18
	MS	39%	39%	22%	**%**	31%	41%	28%
	HS	24%	48%	28%	**---**	---	---	---
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	**ES**	44%	31%	25%	**#**	33	13	18
	MS	48%	30%	22%	**%**	52%	20%	28%
	HS	60%	4%	36%	**---**	---	---	---

(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**	13%	44%	44%	**#**	20	25	19
	MS	48%	35%	17%	**%**	31%	39%	30%
	HS	28%	40%	32%	**---**	---	---	---
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	**ES**	0%	63%	38%	**#**	13	25	26
	MS	43%	26%	30%	**%**	20%	39%	41%
	HS	12%	36%	52%	**---**			
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	**ES**	25%	44%	31%	**#**	33	16	15
	MS	65%	9%	26%	**%**	52%	25%	23%
	HS	56%	28%	16%	**---**	---	---	---
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	**ES**	31%	38%	31%	**#**	32	18	14
	MS	57%	22%	22%	**%**	50%	28%	22%
	HS	56%	28%	16%	**---**	---	---	---
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	**ES**	25%	50%	25%	**#**	19	22	23
	MS	35%	43%	22%	**%**	30%	34%	36%
	HS	28%	16%	56%	**---**	---	---	---
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	**ES**	69%	25%	6%	**#**	48	11	5
	MS	74%	22%	4%	**%**	75%	17%	8%
	HS	80%	8%	12%	**---**	**---**	**---**	**---**
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	**ES**	6%	44%	50%	**#**	13	23	28
	MS	39%	17%	43%	**%**	20%	36%	44%
	HS	12%	48%	40%	**---**	---	---	---
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	**ES**	31%	50%	19%	**#**	32	25	7
	MS	52%	39%	9%	**%**	50%	39%	11%
	HS	60%	32%	8%	**---**	---	---	---