

District Review Report

Douglas Public Schools

Review conducted April 27–30, 2015



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Douglas Public Schools District Review Overview	1
Douglas Public Schools District Review Findings	6
Douglas Public Schools District Review Recommendations	21
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit	29
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	31
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 2015

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 about 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.

© 2015 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



Douglas 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 2014–2015 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 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 Douglas was conducted from April 27–30, 2015. The site visit included 35 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 44 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, high school students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted one focus group with two elementary school teachers. No primary, middle, or high school teachers attended scheduled focus groups.

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 51 classrooms in 4 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

Douglas has a town meeting form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are five members of the school committee and they meet twice a month except in February and April when they meet once.

The current superintendent has been in the position since January 2015. The district leadership team includes: four principals; the school business and operations manager; the director of student support services; the director of business and operations; the director of curriculum, who also serves as the principal of the primary school and the Title I coordinator; and the director of technology. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past 5–10 years. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are two other school administrators, the middle school dean and the assistant high school principal; these other administrator positions are not members of a bargaining unit. In the 2014–2015 school year, there were 100.5 teachers in the district.

In the 2014–2015 school year, 1,544 students were enrolled in the district’s 4 schools:

**Table 1: Douglas Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2014–2015**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Douglas Primary School	ES	PK–1	236
Douglas Elementary School	ES	2–5	481
Douglas Middle School	MS	6–8	418
Douglas High School	HS	9–12	409
Totals	4 schools	PK–12	1,544
*As of October 1, 2014			

Between 2011 and 2015 overall student enrollment decreased by 10.8 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 to the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 K–12 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: \$10,093 as compared with a median of \$12,544 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been slightly above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Douglas is a Level 2 district because three of its four schools with reportable data are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.

- Douglas Primary School is the district's only Level 1 school with a cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 90 for all students and 93 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Douglas Elementary is in the 45th percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 63 for all students and 51 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Douglas Middle is in the 42nd percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 53 for all students and 47 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Douglas High is in the 51st percentile of middle-high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 60 for all students and 63 for high needs students; the target is 75.

The district did not reach its 2014 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets for ELA, math, and science.

- ELA CPI was 87.7 in 2014, below the district's target of 90.9.
- Math CPI was 78.6 in 2014, below the district's target of 84.0.
- Science CPI was 82.4 in 2014, below the district's target of 86.7.

ELA proficiency rates in the district as a whole did not progress between 2011 and 2014. ELA proficiency rates and performance varied by grade.

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 70 percent in 2011 and 2014, 1 percentage point above the 2014 state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate by 16 percentage points in the 3rd grade, and by 8 and 4 percentage points in the 5th and 8th grades, respectively.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 7 and 8 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, and by 1 and 2 percentage points in the 7th and 8th grades, respectively.
- ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate by 8 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 4 and 5 percentage points in the 6th and 7th grades, respectively, and by 1 percentage point in the 10th grade.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 11 percentage points in the 6th grade, by 6 percentage points in the 10th grade, and by 1 percentage point in the 5th grade.

Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in the district as a whole and in each tested grade except for the 3rd and 5th grades. There were notable declines in math proficiency rates in the 6th, 7th, and 10th grades and improvements in the 3rd and 4th grades.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district were 53 percent in 2011 and 54 percent in 2014, 6 percentage points below the state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were below the state rate by 13 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 9 and 10 percentage points in the 6th and 10th grades, respectively, by 7 percentage points in the 8th grade, and by 2 percentage points in the 7th grade.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates decreased by 11 percentage points in the 6th grade, and by 6 and 8 percentage points in the 7th and 10th grades, respectively.
- Math proficiency rates were above the state rate by 4 percentage points in the 3rd grade and equal to the state rate in the 5th grade.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 13 and 11 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, and by 3 percentage points in the 5th and 8th grades.

Science proficiency rates declined in the district as a whole and in the 5th and 10th grades between 2011 and 2014.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates decreased 8 percentage points from 70 percent in 2011 to 62 percent in 2014, 9 percentage points above the 2014 state rate of 53 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency rates increased 5 percentage points from 35 percent in 2011 to 40 percent in 2014, 2 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 42 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency rates declined 16 percentage points from 82 percent in 2011 to 66 percent in 2014, 5 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 71 percent.

Douglas students' growth on the MCAS assessments on average is comparable with that of their academic peers statewide in ELA and in mathematics.

- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 45.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.
 - ELA median SGP was above 60.0 in the 5th grade (69.0).
 - ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 4th grade (median SGP of 37.0), the 6th grade (35.0) and in the 8th grade (37.5), and at Douglas Middle (37.0).
- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 42.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.

- Math median SGP was above 60 in the 7th grade (61.0).
- Math median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 4th grade (33.0), the 6th grade (35.0), and the 8th grade (34.0), and at Douglas High (38.0).

Douglas reached the 2014 four year cohort graduation target of 80.0 and the five year cohort graduation target of 85.0 percent.¹

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 90.4 percent in 2011 and 92.1 percent in 2014, above the state rate of 86.1 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate declined from 90.2 percent in 2010 to 87.1 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 87.7 percent.
- The annual drop-out rate for Douglas was 1.7 percent in 2011 and 1.3 percent in 2014, below the statewide rate of 2.0 percent.

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

Douglas Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. The new superintendent, through his supportive, collaborative, and open leadership style, has fostered positive relations with internal and external stakeholders.

A. The superintendent has provided consistent and timely support to the administrative leadership team as it addresses district and school issues.

1. The administrative leadership team consists of the superintendent, the principals, the director of student support services, the director of business and operations, and the technology director. Meetings are scheduled twice each month for approximately two hours in the morning of the day that the school committee meets.

2. A review of administrative meeting agendas indicated that the meetings include: an opportunity for each principal to share activities in his/her school; district updates; the school committee agenda; budget preparation; and districtwide issues.

3. The superintendent and principals said that principals are actively involved in the budget process for their schools and participate in school committee budget meetings.

B. The superintendent promotes and practices an open-door policy and site-based management.

1. The superintendent said that he respects the right of principals to manage their schools.

2. Principals indicated that the superintendent promotes site-based management.

3. The superintendent said that principals are allowed to move funds between their line items.

4. The superintendent said that he has a trusting relationship and good rapport with the school business and operations manager.

C. District and school leaders described the superintendent as supportive, collaborative, and open.

1. The school business and operations manager said that she has very good working relations with and support from the superintendent and noted that administrators now have increased involvement in the budget process.

2. Principals said that the superintendent is open to healthy debate when opinions differ.

3. The superintendent and principals said in separate interviews that numerous individual meetings with all principals are held and frequent e-mail communications take place.

- D.** Teachers' association officials indicated a trend toward better working relations.
 - 1. Association officials stated that the superintendent is very communicative and has agreed to meet with them monthly.
 - 2. The superintendent said that there are no scheduled meetings with association representatives; however, he meets with the president and executive board regularly. He said that he has a professional relationship with association officials and intends to meet regularly with them.
 - 3. The superintendent and association leaders told the team that they agree that grievances are to be addressed with the appropriate school principal before they are taken to the superintendent.

- E.** School committee members described the superintendent as communicative and collaborative.
 - 1. Members said that the superintendent is a people-oriented person and a good communicator. They said that they needed the superintendent to foster good relations and to help negotiate the teachers' collective bargaining agreement.
 - 2. Members said that they expect the superintendent to be visible at school events, noting that he has already begun to do so.

- F.** Town officials characterized the superintendent and the school department as being collaborative and transparent in providing information about district finances.
 - 1. Town officials reported good relations with the superintendent. They said that the superintendent is open, honest, and willing to work them.
 - 2. Town officials told the review team that they see relations with the school department as based on trust and both parties working together, even during a difficult year. They said that the district budget process is transparent and that the town has clear information about the budget.

Impact: A supportive district superintendent is responsive to the needs of principals and their schools. An open relationship between district and school leaders and town officials means collaboration to accomplish a clearly defined mission and set of goals and to meet the challenges of the future.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. In observed classes in the district the foundation of effective instruction was in place.

The team observed 51 classes throughout the district: 20 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, 6 at the primary school, and 14 at the elementary school. The team observed 21 ELA classes, 6

mathematics classes, and 22 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education 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. Characteristics of effective instruction that are associated with a positive learning environment were noted in virtually all the classrooms observed by the review team.

1. The tone of interactions between teachers and students and among students (# 1) was clearly and consistently found to be positive and respectful in 96 percent of classroom districtwide, and behavioral standards were clearly and consistently communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably (# 2) in 92 percent of classrooms overall.
 - a. The review team observed teachers politely greeting students as they entered the classroom; challenging and encouraging them; and redirecting them with gentle reminders when appropriate.
2. Clear and consistent evidence of the physical arrangement of the classroom ensuring a positive learning environment and providing all students with access to learning activities (#3) was present in 90 percent of the classrooms observed. While the review team noted increased class sizes in some rooms, the physical layout and classroom furnishings provided an environment conducive to whole-group instruction, student centers, discussion groups, and work groups.
3. Clear and consistent evidence of classroom rituals and routines that promoted transitions with minimal loss of instructional time (#4) was provided in 84 percent of classrooms observed by the review team.
 - a. Efficient practices observed by the team included: a middle school teacher who uses organizational vocabulary familiar to students to map movement in her busy classroom; a listing of "Do Now" assignments to focus students as they entered a classroom at the high school; and the use of time alerts by elementary teachers to prepare students for the lesson's transition.

B. Effective teaching practices associated with lesson design and classroom environment were observed in the majority of classes visited by the team.

1. Teachers used appropriate instructional strategies well matched teaching to Learning objective(s) and content (#9) in 74 percent of observed classes; paced lessons to match content and meet students' learning needs (#14) in 80 percent of observed classes; and promoted a classroom environment conducive to student inquiry (#13) in 76 percent of classes visited by the review team.

2. The review team also observed teachers using available technology to support instruction and enhance learning (#16) in 65 percent of classrooms districtwide, and students were observed using technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding (#22) in 80 percent of high school and in 73 percent of middle school classes observed by the team.
 - a. In some cases technology was used as a supplemental resource, but in many cases the team observed cutting edge learning environments in which the electronic tablet served as the basis for the great majority of students' interactions with instruction and content.

Impact: A positive learning environment is conducive to effective teaching and enhances learning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

3. The district adopted and implemented in 2012–2013 an educator evaluation system consistent with the educator evaluation regulations. Teacher evaluations consistently include quality feedback to promote professional growth, and most include suggestions on improving professional practice.

- A. The district developed and implemented its educator evaluation system in collaboration with the Douglas Teachers' Association (DTA). Interviews and a review of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the district and the DTA showed that the district and the DTA agreed to adopt and pilot an educator evaluation system consistent with the educator evaluation regulations in school year 2012–2013 and to fully implement it in school year 2013–2014.
 1. The DTA and the district agreed that during the pilot year, the educator evaluation system would “not have a negative effect on an Association member’s status in the district, with the exception of members without professional teacher status.”
- B. According to ESE’s Center for Educator Effectiveness, in June 2014 the district identified some District-Determined Measures (DDMs) and requested an extension for DDMs for administrators and SISP groups. The district is in the process of determining how to implement its DDMs.
- C. Evaluation documents for all educators are uploaded to TeachPoint, the district’s evaluation management tool. A review by the team showed that teacher files included self-assessments, goal setting documents, multiple observations, formative or summative assessments/evaluations written by evaluators, and formative evaluations of teachers’ progress by teachers.
 1. The DTA and the district agreed to assign all teachers with professional teacher status to two-year, self-directed growth plans. Since all teachers began the evaluation system at the same time, the frequency of the summative and formative assessments/evaluations varied

during the initial two-year implementation period.² Teachers without professional teacher status received summative evaluations annually.

- a. Interviews and a review of professional development agendas and information on the district's website indicated that the district provided teachers and administrators training in the educator evaluation system and SMART goal development.
2. The team reviewed evaluation files for the last 3 school years of 13 teachers on two-year, self-directed growth plans. The team also reviewed evaluation files of 10 central office administrators and principals.
- a. Most evaluations of teachers were high quality and instructive in that they included suggestions or recommendations on how to improve teaching practices. In line with the district's educator evaluation system, teachers had completed a self-assessment and developed SMART goals. Evaluators had observed teachers in the classroom multiple times.
 - b. The prior superintendent wrote the evaluations of administrators; the evaluations were well developed and included detailed information about job performance. While the evaluations were informative, they included limited suggestions on how to improve instruction.
 - i. Principals told the team that the prior superintendent provided recommendations to improve teaching during post-evaluation meetings.
 - c. Most formative and summative assessments/evaluations were timely and almost all evaluation documents were signed by both the evaluator and the educator.
- D.** A review of the District Improvement Plan (DIP) and the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) showed that they are aligned with the educator evaluation school and district level rubric for administrators and include district and school improvement goals. Principals told the team that teachers aligned their goals with SIP goals.
- E.** Administrators and association representatives said that the new evaluation system is a great tool. They said that being in the classroom more has opened communication and provided an "opportunity to identify teachers' strengths." They said, however, finding time to conduct observations and to write formative and summative assessments/evaluations has been "challenging."

Impact: Having in place an effective educator evaluation system aligned to school and district goals creates a powerful professional development tool that can enhance teacher and administrator competency and improve student achievement. If the superintendent and his leadership team remain fully committed to the collaborative implementation of the educator evaluation system and to providing

² Under the terminology of the model educator evaluation system, educators on plans of one year or less receive a mid-cycle check called a "formative assessment"; educators on two-year plans receive a mid-cycle check at the end of the first year called a "formative evaluation."

needed and ongoing support structures and targeted training for teachers and administrators, the likely result will be continuous and comprehensive improvements in learning opportunities and academic programs and outcomes for all students.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

Curriculum and Instruction

4. The district has not established consistent structures, support, and practices to ensure that a standards-based curriculum is effectively delivered to all students.

- A. Interviews and a document review showed that curriculum documentation is incomplete.
- B. The district has aligned roughly 50 percent of its curriculum to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.
 - 1. Administrators told the team that high school ELA and mathematics documents are uniformly aligned to the 2011 Frameworks and that through the adoption of the Go-Math program much of the K–8 mathematics program is aligned.
 - 2. They also said that through the adoption of commercial programs, the K–8 ELA program is aligned, but curricula are not documented or mapped.
- C. Except for the practice of connecting educator goals to instruction, the district does not have a structure in place to monitor instructional planning to ensure that the district’s curriculum is taught in each classroom.
 - 1. School leaders told the review team that the district does not monitor lesson plans.
- D. The district has limited time and resources to devote to curriculum management and revision.
 - 1. Interviewees said that in recent years the district has purchased aligned commercial curriculum programs and has attempted to revise curriculum to reflect the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*. These efforts, however, have been hampered by a number of factors.
 - a. The district’s curriculum coordinator also serves as the primary school principal and the Title I director, leaving her with little time to manage the curriculum revision process.
 - b. The district has reduced the number of its vertical team coordinators from nine to four and each team meets only twice per year for a half day.
 - c. Except for the elementary school, which has bi-weekly, grade-level meetings, school schedules do not allow time for common planning and collaboration by faculty.

Impact: Without an aligned, consistently delivered, and continuously improving curriculum, the district cannot guarantee the effective delivery of grade-level curriculum to all students.

5. In observed classrooms, characteristics associated with academic challenge, rigor, and higher-order thinking did not consistently mark instruction across all grade levels.

The team observed 51 classes throughout the district: 20 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, 6 at the primary school, and 14 at the elementary school. The team observed 21 ELA classes, 6 mathematics classes, and 22 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education 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 observed classrooms, the review team found limited evidence of instruction marked by rigor and high expectations for student performance.

1. Students were engaged in challenging academic tasks (#17) in 45 percent of observed classes. Teachers were observed implementing lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations (#7) in 49 percent of observed classes.
2. Some lessons observed did not engage students actively in either content acquisition or inquiry. In such classrooms students completed homework and practice problems with little teacher attention, listened to lectures and demonstration without taking notes, or waited at their desks as lesson transitions unfolded.
3. Many teachers, however, did hold students to high standards in their classrooms. In the middle school, students were actively engaged in original research and writing; at the elementary school, a teacher effectively used reading content to structure a writing assignment being completed by very young students; and several Advanced Placement classes at the high school showed evidence of rigorous standards and expectations.

B. In observed classrooms, the review team found limited evidence of instruction that promotes higher-order thinking.

1. Clear and consistent evidence of teachers providing opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking (#11) was found in 45 percent of classes observed by the review team
2. However, some examples of teachers engaging students' higher-order thinking skills were observed in all schools.
 - a. At the primary school, a teacher was observed using a graphic organizer and thought provoking questions to evoke written responses from first grade students.
 - b. At the elementary school, students were asked to find the causes for scientific phenomena for which their teacher provided the effect; at the middle school, a

mathematics teacher encouraged students to explain their solutions to problems as other students provided alternative methods of solution;

- c. At the high school, an English teacher asked students a series of analytical questions that required close reading of the text under study.

Impact: Consistent implementation of a high-quality curriculum through effective instructional practice is central to the promotion of a high level of student achievement. When instruction does not consistently reflect rigor, high expectations, and the promotion of higher-order thinking, the district is not ensuring high-quality instruction that maximizes learning for all learners.

Assessment

6. The district has not established consistent, formal practices to collect, analyze, and disseminate formative and summative student assessment data. Data is not used systematically to guide instruction or to develop interventions for struggling students.

- A. The district has not developed and implemented formal processes to assess disaggregated data to determine students' strengths and challenges to improve instruction.
 1. A document review indicated that the district administers the following formative and summative assessments: K–5, Aimsweb in reading and mathematics, MCAS/PARCC, and unit and benchmark assessments; in grades 6–8, MCAS/PARCC and unit and benchmark assessments; and in grades 6–12, MCAS /PARCC, mid-term and final examinations, and unit and benchmark assessments.
 2. Interviewees said that principals provide data to teachers in a PowerPoint presentation.
 3. Schools do not have data teams.
- B. School leaders told the team that the district does not use assessment results systematically to develop interventions to enhance the performance of general education students.
 1. The review team was told that individual teachers use tools such as AssistMents and Edmodo to guide assessments and interventions in their classrooms and that grade-level teams at the elementary and middle schools have made limited efforts to establish intervention and test preparation structures. However, these practices are not systematic, widespread, or continuous.
 2. The district uses a number of assessments to screen students for special education and Title I services and to modify the services provided to these students. Interviewees said that student support and special education staff use data regularly, general education teachers less often.

3. The district does not use EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) or other Edwin Analytics reports to make decisions around prevention strategies for high-risk students.
- C.** Teachers use informal methods to collect and analyze student assessment data to inform teaching and learning throughout the district.
1. Teachers have developed Individualized Student Success Plans to address the assessment needs of students who have scored in the Needs Improvement or Warning categories on the MCAS. Benchmarks have been developed to assess student performance.
 2. The team observed some teachers use exit tickets, “thumbs up, thumbs down,” and student surveys to determine students’ understanding and to guide instruction. Elementary teachers use red cards and green cards to assess student learning.
 3. To adjust instruction teachers use quizzes, chapter tests, and unit tests for formative assessments and semester tests for summative assessments.
 4. The district has interactive notebooks, which administrators, teachers, students and parents can use to assess student learning immediately and on all levels.
 5. Some teachers use open-ended questions to improve their formative assessment of students who have scored in the Needs Improvement or Warning categories on MCAS tests.
- D.** There is limited common planning time for administrators and staff to meet to discuss the needs of struggling general education students.
1. The elementary school has 45 minutes scheduled every 8 days for planning.
 2. The middle school has no common planning time and common planning time at the high school takes place during department meetings.
- E.** Vertical teams meet periodically during the year to assess and prepare students for MCAS/PARCC testing. Vertical teams use Test Wiz data to establish priority focus areas.
- F.** A review of recent test item analysis showed low student performance in standard areas that are routinely tested by the grade 8 MCAS in mathematics.
1. For example, in 2013, grade 8 students scored 12 percentage points below state peers on questions in the geometry standard that measured understanding and ability to apply the Pythagorean Theorem. In 2014, students scored 11 percentage points below state peers. These differences contribute significantly to relatively low scores in mathematics by grade 8 students because this section of the assessment contains 16 of 54 possible points.

Impact: The absence of formal systems and structures to collect, analyze, and disseminate student assessment data systematically prevents staff from measuring progress, making needed adjustments to

programs, practices, and services, effectively guiding instruction, targeting interventions for all students, and making informed decisions about policy and planning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

7. Limited time and financial and human capital resources are allocated for professional development. The district does not have a professional development plan or program formally aligned to district priorities, the District Improvement Plan, or School Improvement Plans.

- A.** The district does not have a professional development (PD) committee to engage school leaders and teachers in the development of an organized PD program.
 - 1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district’s curriculum director is responsible for PD. The curriculum director also serves as the primary school principal, the Title I director, and the educator evaluation program coordinator.
 - 2. The collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the teachers’ association and the school committee, which expired in August 2014 and has not been renewed, states that “professional improvement” consists primarily of taking courses or attending conferences and seminars. The CBA does not describe a structured PD committee.
- B.** The district schedules two full days of professional development during the school year. In 2014–2015, the district scheduled one day in October and one in March. In October, each school scheduled varied activities, some of which were held in collaboration with the Blackstone Valley Curriculum Consortium. In March, PD was focused on the Social Thinking program.
 - 1. Principals said that some PD may take place during faculty meetings and common planning time.
 - 2. PD is also provided to teachers as part of the district’s mentoring program.
- C.** According to the latest available ESE data, in 2012–2013 the district spent \$633 per teacher for PD. The state average was \$2,918.
- D.** The district does not have a strategic PD plan or program fully aligned to the Strategic Plan, the District Improvement Plan (DIP), and the School Improvement Plans (SIPs).
 - 1. Interviewees said that a PD plan is developed for each PD day. The menu of PD topics offered is not developed collaboratively; principals told the team that a range of topics is offered during the day.
- E.** Principals said that some surveys are in place to measure the quality of PD and to solicit topics that teachers would like offered.
 - 1. No formal learning walk process is in place to monitor PD effectiveness.

2. The district does not have academic coaches or other formal job-embedded PD.
- F. Staff concerns about the overall quality of in-service PD were shown in the 2014 TELL Mass survey. For example, 32 percent of district high school teachers who responded to the survey agreed that PD “deepened teachers’ content knowledge,” 42 percent agreed that PD enhanced their “ability to implement instructional strategies that meet diverse learning needs,” and 25 percent agreed that staff played a moderate role in “determining the content of in-service professional development.”
 - G. A review of the DIPS and SIPs showed that keys actions related to PD are general and focus on encouraging teachers to participate in PD activities or to continue to enroll in classes or workshops. The plans include some specific activities such as training in Go Math and Reading Wonders.
 - H. The DIP and the SIPs are aligned to the educator evaluation system and training was provided for administrators and teachers in 2012 and 2013 on the implementation of the system, SMART goals, and District-Determined Measures (DDMs).
 - I. Other PD related to district initiatives has been provided, such as iPad and Chromebook training.

Impact: Without a strategic PD plan that is formally aligned to the DIP and SIPs, the district cannot adequately expand and improve teachers’ professional ability to implement the district’s plan for attaining high levels of achievement for all students.

Student Support

8. **The district’s structure of student support services does not meet the needs of all students. While the district does provide appropriate supports to students who qualify for special education and Title I services, it has no formal, coordinated programs or identified classroom support practices for students who do not qualify for these services.**
 - A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has implemented a model where all formal intervention services are provided either by the special education staff or the Title I staff.
 1. While the special education and Title I programs use data to determine eligibility and to track and monitor student progress, there are no districtwide or school-based data teams or processes to identify and monitor students who are not eligible for, or enrolled in, these programs. One group of teachers told the team, “We are leaving some [students] behind and we cannot track students who may need more support.”
 - a. Student Assistance Teams (SATs), under the leadership of the director of student support services, are in place at all schools. However, some interviewees told the team

that the SATs serve as a pre-referral process for special education services. One teacher referring to supporting students noted, “We are not meeting the needs of all kids. . . There is no formal process except by pre-referrals for IEPs.”

- b. Some teachers told the team that the SAT process is not nimble enough to support students who need immediate attention.
 - c. Teachers identified guidance counselors and school adjustment counselors as key staff who monitor and provide some services to general education students.
 - i. At the elementary level, interviewees noted that in 2014 a .6 adjustment counselor also served as the guidance counselor for the 687 students K–5, making it difficult to schedule counselor interventions.
 - ii. At the high school, counselors said that they meet with students if they appear to need support, and may prepare a plan for support that could include arranging for extra tutoring. They told the team that there were no classes targeted to help struggling students. Interviewees said that counselors at the high school are responsible for approximately 45 students on 504 plans.
 - d. Counselors told the team that the district does not use EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) to identify students who may be at risk of not graduating.
 - e. The high school’s Student Intervention Team (SIT), composed of guidance staff, the school nurse, and the dean, meet to discuss students with academic, social, or emotional problems. A psychologist provides IEP services.
2. Stakeholders agreed that special education staff, when in the general education classrooms, provide varying degrees of support to general education students, as long as staff are able to meet the needs of the students with disabilities in the class. For example, interviewees said that in middle school inclusion classes, paraprofessionals “support the entire class,” not just students on IEPs. One special education teacher said that support is provided as needed.
- B.** The classroom instructional model is not a tiered system of instruction where all students who are not performing at grade level are identified and supported within the general education program.
1. When leaders, teachers, and students were asked how the needs of students were met within the district, they said that they followed a tiered intervention model where special educators, paraprofessionals, or Title I staff provide Tier 2 services.
 - a. One group of teachers described providing extra help during lunch periods or after school.

- b. Students also characterized support for general education as help with homework or projects before and after school or during lunchtime. One student noted, “Right now teachers are working to rule; they don’t have structured office hours.”
2. Administrators described teachers as having various levels of skill in differentiation. Review team members noted evidence of differentiation in 47 percent of observed classes.
 - a. Although interviewees told the team that they had had professional development (PD) in differentiation, the 2014 TELL MASS survey results for the group large enough to record responses indicated that to teach their students more effectively 39 percent of high school teachers who responded desired PD on differentiation, 43 percent on working with gifted and talented students, and 43 percent on methods of teaching.

Impact: Because the district’s model of support does not include in-class tiered instruction, students in classrooms without an inclusion teacher or paraprofessional must rely on the teacher’s availability before or after school. When a district’s model of intervention serves only a portion of its students who require support, it cannot ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program and achieve proficiency.

Financial and Asset Management

9. The district has had financial challenges for several years of budgets, in part because of declining enrollment.

- A. The district has spent between 1 and 3 percent more than required net school spending in the last several years (2.9 percent projected in 2015.)
 1. School district budgets have increased an average of 2.6 percent during the past three years. However, maintaining level services may require more than this level of funding increase, particularly if salaries and health insurance together increase at a higher rate.
 2. The town also supported school building projects, with debt and capital payments of \$11–14M from 2012 to 2014, supported with MSBA aid in those years of \$7.5– \$12.2M per year.
 3. The district’s expenditure per in-district pupil in 2014 was \$10,093, compared with a median of \$12,544 for districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students.) This was third lowest in the group, but still \$500 more than the lowest spending district of similar size, and almost \$1,000 more than the lowest spending district.
- B. One factor putting pressure on district budgets is declining enrollment. From 2010-2014, foundation enrollment decreased from 1,615 to 1,549. In-district enrollment, supported by choicing-in from surrounding districts, decreased from 1,771 to 1,596. Another factor is the fact the town already taxes at close to its levy limit, an override proposed in 2013 was soundly

defeated, and enrollment has been declining, making more than minor increases in Chapter 70 aid unlikely.

1. An additional pressure on in-district spending was that out-of-district tuitions to private special education schools, and out-of-district transportation, increased from about \$200,000 in 2010 to about \$990,000 in 2014. Circuit-breaker aid increased from \$78,000 to \$391,000, covering a portion of the increase.
- C. The superintendent introduced a zero-based budgeting process for the fiscal year 2016 budget. All requests had to be specific and justified.
1. The school business and operations manager said that the value of zero-based budgeting to the principals has been that details are known, and budget reductions can be more intelligently made.
 2. The district participates in the French River Education Center, Inc. for collaborative bidding on fuel oil, which will reduce the price of oil for the district in fiscal year 2016.
 3. School and district support personnel expressed concern about whether and how they could re-allocate resources for data teams, common planning time and teacher leaders, a stated priority. Principals also said that a principal served as Title I and curriculum directors in addition to principal's duties and that this arrangement was not meeting curriculum, instruction, and professional development needs.
- D. Internal and external stakeholders agreed that the town generally supports the schools.
1. Town officials, school committee members, district leaders, parents and teachers' association representatives described the community as supportive of its schools, in spite of limited resources.
 2. Open and transparent discussions take place between the school district and town about anticipated annual increase in revenues. The superintendent characterized the school business and operations manager as having a good relationship with town officials that included trust and transparency.
 - a. Of the annual increase in revenues after increases in fixed costs are deducted, town officials have provided 70 percent to the school district and 30 percent to the municipal government.
 3. A strategic budget committee composed of town and school department officials and community residents has been established to look at revenues and expenditures in comparable towns.

Impact: In the face of real and continuing budget challenges, town and district leaders have a constructive relationship, including town support for new school buildings. The superintendent's

introduction of a new approach to budgeting is also a positive effort. The strategic budget committee is a promising initiative, particularly if it looks to similarly placed towns and districts and to innovative budget management ideas.

Douglas Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Curriculum and Instruction

- 1. The district should take decisive and collaborative action to assess curriculum and instruction structures, support, and practices, and develop a plan to manage and to continuously improve curriculum and instruction.**
 - A.** Under the leadership of the superintendent, a working group with wide representation should assess curriculum and instruction structures, support, and practices, particularly related to the strengths and challenges described in this report.
 - B.** The district should continue its work to complete K–12 ELA and math curricula.
 1. The district is encouraged to continue referencing ESE’s Model Curriculum Units to identify essential components of a comprehensive curriculum and to support teachers as they translate curricula into instructional practice.
 - C.** The district should review the structures, support, and practices in place for a multi-year process for the regular and timely review and revision of K–12 curricula.
 - D.** The district should build upon its positive learning environment by establishing districtwide expectations that emphasize rigor and high expectations and that address students’ diverse learning needs. The district should communicate these expectations to all staff and support teachers in their implementation.
 1. Using grade-level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time, or professional development (PD) days, the district is encouraged to discuss ideas and strategies of the instructional expectations.
 2. Equitable opportunities should be provided by level for teachers to share best practices reflective of the instructional expectations.
 3. Teachers should be provided appropriate guidance and feedback to support continuous improvement of instruction.
 - a. PD should focus on elements of instructional expectations.
 - b. The district should review the curricular and instructional support and leadership provided at each level to ensure sufficient embedded PD.
 - c. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district’s expectations for instruction.
 - d. Teachers should receive frequent, helpful feedback that helps them to continually improve their instruction.

- e. The district should review and if possible modify teaching schedules to that teachers at all levels have regular, frequent department or grade-level common planning and meeting time that can be used to collaboratively reflect on and improve curriculum and instruction.
4. The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs/small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Conditions for School Effectiveness* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSE.pdf>) identify the research-based practices that all schools, especially the state's most struggling schools, require to effectively meet the learning needs of all students. This tool also defines what each condition looks like when implemented purposefully and with fidelity.
- The *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSESelf-Assesment.pdf>) is a tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.
- ESE's *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/download_form.aspx) provide exemplars that can be useful as the district (develops its systematic approach to curriculum/continues to develop curriculum). Supplemental presentations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/resources/>) provide more information about the units.
- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvX_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- The *Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
- Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is 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 who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- *Characteristics of an Effective Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf>) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

Benefits: Thoughtful and strategic management of curriculum and instruction will benefit the district in a number of ways. A complete, aligned curriculum will provide students with rich content and equitable instruction. The establishment of shared instructional expectations will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

Assessment

- 2. The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources.**
 - A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.
 1. Building on the practices in place at some grade levels, the district should establish systematic, consistent processes for the analysis and use of assessment data.
 2. The district should ensure that educators at all levels use data strategically to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.
 - a. The district should continue its work identifying and using District-Determined Measures (DDMs), and develop the process by which teachers will be trained and supported in their use as a tool to improve teaching and learning.
 3. The district should consider the development of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to provide opportunities for more frequent data analysis to improve response time to student performance data.
 - B.** Ongoing, targeted training should be provided for staff in each school, grade level, and subject area in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data.
 - C.** Training should include, for appropriate staff, the development of skills to use EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) and other Edwin Analytics reports to manage assessment data and build data literacy across the district.
 - D.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision-making, including budget development and School Improvement Plans, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, the district can determine potential next steps.
- The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.

- ESE's *Early Warning Indicator System* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html>) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to address systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.
- The *Early Warning Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/2014ImplementationGuide.pdf>) provides information on how to use early warning data, including the Massachusetts Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), to identify, diagnose, support and monitor students in grades 1-12. It offers educators an overview of EWIS and how to effectively use these data in conjunction with local data by following a six-step implementation cycle.
- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/lg.html>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
- *District-Determined Measures* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquEalxpfzD6gG9zxvPWlOc>) is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).

Benefits: Having a balanced and coherent system of assessment analysis will mean clarity and consistency in the district's use of data for decision-making. It will help district leaders and teachers to understand, and provide professional development for, the analysis and use of data to improve instructional skills and to increase student achievement. It will also help all stakeholders to evaluate programs, texts, and services. The system will enable the district to provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

Human Resources and Professional Development

3. The district should develop a professional development plan that is aligned with district improvement initiatives.

- A. District leaders are encouraged to create a professional development (PD) committee to plan and oversee PD for the district. The committee should develop a PD plan that is aligned with the District Improvement Plan and the district's instructional model.
 1. As part of this effort, the committee should outline and document a set of learning experiences that is systematic, sustained, and aligned with district goals.

2. The plan should identify specific PD needs, determine how they might be met, and recommend adjustments in PD practices and resources to meet them.
3. The plan should address needs indicated by student performance data and trends from classroom observations. It should include goals focused on improving teacher practice and student outcomes.
 - a. The plan should include strategies for collecting and analyzing participant’s feedback about the quality and impact of PD.
4. PD requires a long-term commitment by administrators and embedded support structures, such as facilitated team meetings, to convey and promote a common understanding of instructional practices expected from all educators.
 - a. Sufficient common planning time is necessary for educators at all levels to reflect on professional development and plan implementation of new strategies.

Recommended resources:

- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- *ESE’s Professional Development Self- Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/dsac/pd/PDProviderGuide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings’ alignment with the Massachusetts High-Quality Professional Development Standards, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.
- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
- *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncg&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqtEmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.

Benefits:

- A PD program aligned with district, school, and educator goals will support teachers as lifelong learners and help to implement best practices throughout the district.
- A high- quality PD program coupled with the time and resources already available in the district will likely lead to educator growth and improved student achievement.

Student Support

- 4. District leaders, teachers, and staff should work collaboratively to improve and coordinate practices and programs so that they are more effective in supporting and improving learning for all students.**
 - A.** The district should put practices in place to ensure that all students are provided with instruction and supports that meet their needs.
 1. It should use student performance data to determine additional interventions that are necessary in order to more directly address students' needs.
 2. The district should identify the staff and resources available to deliver additional interventions. In cases where insufficient resources exist, the district should consider reallocating resources in future budget planning to fill these gaps.
 3. The district's professional development plan (see previous recommendation) should include an emphasis on differentiated instruction, to ensure that core instruction addresses the learning styles and readiness levels of all students.
 - B.** The district should review and extend its approach to providing additional supports to students, with the goal of establishing a coordinated, districtwide system of tiered interventions.
 1. The district should review the make-up, purpose, and goals of the Student Assistance Teams (SATs) with the goal of making them a broader resource for classroom teachers in working to improve student achievement.
 - C.** Tiered interventions should be incorporated into the daily schedule, should be monitored for effectiveness, and should provide flexibility for student movement.
 1. The district might consider a model of shared responsibility by teams of teachers for interventions in the general education setting and explore other promising practices.

Recommended resource:

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

MTSS Self-Assessment Overview (includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*).

Benefits: When a district's model of intervention supports all students who require help to achieve proficiency it will ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program and improve their levels of achievement. When the district provides formal academic support services to all

students, including those who do not qualify for special education or Title I services, it can begin to monitor the overall effectiveness of general education practices and interventions.

Financial and Asset Management

- 5. The school district should focus on the most effective use of every dollar for staff (the largest expenditure) by researching and analyzing schedules and services to deploy limited staff resources most effectively.**
 - A.** The strategic budget committee should explore innovative ways to address resource allocation.
 1. The committee should focus on comparable towns based on both size and wealth/tax revenues, and compare performance and spending levels as a start.
 2. The steering committee should contact their state representative and/or state senator.
 - B.** The school committee should consider actions that will reduce costs without having an impact on direct student services.
 1. Cost reduction measures to be considered by the school committee should include; a review of the school grade structure for possible building closure, creation of a regional school district and/or consolidation of school department and town support services such as finances and maintenance.
 - C.** Budget planning must take into account that the town already taxes at close to its levy limit, an override proposed in 2013 was soundly defeated, and enrollment has been declining, making more than minor increases in Chapter 70 aid unlikely.

Recommended resources:

- *Smart School Budgeting* (<http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is the Rennie Center's summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.
- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step links to a Best Practice guide.

Benefits: Town officials and school committee members working collaboratively should reach a consensus on action to be taken to support the district as it addresses the pressures of declining enrollment and limited tax revenues.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 27–30, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Wilfrid Savoie, leadership and governance and financial and asset management
2. Thomas Pandiscio, curriculum and instruction
3. Kharis McLaughlin, assessment
4. James L. Hearn, *review team coordinator*, human resources and professional development
5. Christine Brandt, student support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: school business and operations manager and accounts payable staff, town administrator, chair of town finance committee.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the School Committee: vice-chair and two members.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the director of curriculum/Title I, the director of student support services, the school business and operations manager, and the special education coordinator.

The team visited the following schools: Douglas Primary School (PK–1), Douglas Elementary School (grades 2–5), Douglas Middle School (grades 6–8), and Douglas High School (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and a focus group with two elementary school teachers; no teachers from the primary, middle, or high schools attended scheduled focus groups.

The team observed 51 classes in the district: 20 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, 14 at the elementary school, and 6 at the primary school.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
04/27/2015	04/28/2015	04/29/2015	04/30/2015
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Douglas High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to the Douglas Primary School, Douglas Elementary School, Douglas Middle School, and Douglas High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to the Douglas Elementary School, Douglas Middle School, and Douglas High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to the Douglas Elementary School, Douglas Middle School, and Douglas High School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Douglas Public Schools
2014–2015 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	6	0.4%	83,556	8.7%
Asian	21	1.4%	60,050	6.3%
Hispanic	31	2.0%	171,036	17.9%
Native American	1	0.1%	2,238	0.2%
White	1,457	94.4%	608,453	63.7%
Native Hawaiian	3	0.2%	930	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	25	1.6%	29,581	3.1%
All Students	1,544	100.0%	955,844	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2014

**Table B1b: Douglas Public Schools
2014–2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations³**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	271	--	17.4%	165,060	--	17.1%
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs and Former ELLs	1	--	0.1%	81,146	--	8.5%
All high needs students	--	--	--	--	--	--

Notes: As of October 1, 2014. 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 1,555; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391.

³ Because of changes in free-lunch policies in some districts the population of students from economically disadvantaged families and high-needs students has not yet been calculated for the 2014-2015 school year.

**Table B2a: Douglas Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2011–2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	102	87.1	86.5	83.8	90.4	82.6	3.3	6.6
	P+	102	66.0%	61.0%	56.0%	73.0%	57.0%	7.0%	17.0%
4	CPI	128	73.1	80.3	80.5	76.6	79.1	3.5	-3.9
	P+	128	38.0%	54.0%	54.0%	46.0%	54.0%	8.0%	-8.0%
	SGP	122	37	35	41	37	49	0	-4
5	CPI	133	90.6	81.2	87.8	90.6	84.5	0	2.8
	P+	133	73.0%	56.0%	70.0%	72.0%	64.0%	-1.0%	2.0%
	SGP	125	56	56	54	69	50	13	15
6	CPI	148	90.9	88.1	85	83.4	85.8	-7.5	-1.6
	P+	148	75.0%	69.0%	66.0%	64.0%	68.0%	-11.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	131	44	51.5	58	35	50	-9	-23
7	CPI	128	86.7	94.3	93	85.9	88.3	-0.8	-7.1
	P+	128	66.0%	83.0%	78.0%	67.0%	72.0%	1.0%	-11.0%
	SGP	123	25.5	61	53.5	41	50	15.5	-12.5
8	CPI	120	91	89.9	94.9	93.5	90.2	2.5	-1.4
	P+	120	81.0%	73.0%	86.0%	83.0%	79.0%	2.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	110	46	47	36	37.5	50	-8.5	1.5
10	CPI	104	98.2	98.4	97.5	96.9	96	-1.3	-0.6
	P+	104	95.0%	94.0%	92.0%	89.0%	90.0%	-6.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	96	63	66.5	68	55	50	-8	-13
All	CPI	863	87.8	88.3	88.8	87.7	86.7	-0.1	-1.1
	P+	863	70.0%	70.0%	71.0%	70.0%	69.0%	0.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	707	45	52	51	45	50	0	-6

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: Douglas Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2011–2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	102	81.5	76.7	85	88	85.1	6.5	3
	P+	102	59.0%	51.0%	68.0%	72.0%	68.0%	13.0%	4.0%
4	CPI	128	73.5	77.6	82.6	74.6	79.6	1.1	-8
	P+	128	28.0%	40.0%	55.0%	39.0%	52.0%	11.0%	-16.0%
	SGP	122	36	54	65	33	50	-3	-32
5	CPI	134	80.5	76	84.7	82.8	80.4	2.3	-1.9
	P+	134	58.0%	52.0%	63.0%	61.0%	61.0%	3.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	126	51	53	66.5	54	50	3	-12.5
6	CPI	149	82.5	85.6	79.3	76.2	80.2	-6.3	-3.1
	P+	149	62.0%	70.0%	54.0%	51.0%	60.0%	-11.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	131	45	70.5	49	35	50	-10	-14
7	CPI	126	77.9	79.9	78.8	72.4	72.5	-5.5	-6.4
	P+	126	54.0%	56.0%	56.0%	48.0%	50.0%	-6.0%	-8.0%
	SGP	122	62	58	54	61	50	-1	7
8	CPI	121	67.4	65.9	75.7	71.1	74.7	3.7	-4.6
	P+	121	42.0%	35.0%	52.0%	45.0%	52.0%	3.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	111	41	25	36	34	50	-7	-2
10	CPI	105	92.4	86.5	92.2	88.3	90	-4.1	-3.9
	P+	105	77.0%	73.0%	79.0%	69.0%	79.0%	-8.0%	-10.0%
	SGP	96	49	55	67	44	50	-5	-23
All	CPI	865	78.7	78	82.4	78.6	80.3	-0.1	-3.8
	P+	865	53.0%	53.0%	61.0%	54.0%	60.0%	1.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	708	48	51	57.5	42	50	-6	-15.5

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: Douglas Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2011–2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	134	88.5	84.3	86.8	86.9	79	-1.6	0.1
	P+	134	70.0%	65.0%	64.0%	62.0%	53.0%	-8.0%	-2.0%
8	CPI	121	70.6	71.9	73.8	72.5	72.4	1.9	-1.3
	P+	121	35.0%	39.0%	42.0%	40.0%	42.0%	5.0%	-2.0%
10	CPI	100	94.3	93.6	92.9	88.3	87.9	-6	-4.6
	P+	100	82.0%	82.0%	76.0%	66.0%	71.0%	-16.0%	-10.0%
All	CPI	355	82.2	82.5	83.7	82.4	79.6	0.2	-1.3
	P+	355	58.0%	61.0%	59.0%	55.0%	55.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%

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: Douglas Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	249	75.4	76.5	77	74.8	-0.6	-2.2
		P+	249	43.0%	43.0%	48.0%	46.0%	3.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	191	34	47	45	40	6	-5
	State	CPI	241,069	77	76.5	76.8	77.1	0.1	0.3
		P+	241,069	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	183,766	46	46	47	47	1	0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	130	80.5	78.9	80.3	78.8	-1.7	-1.5
		P+	130	53.0%	50.0%	56.0%	51.0%	-2.0%	-5.0%
		SGP	102	34	47	51.5	39	5	-12.5
	State	CPI	189,662	77.1	76.7	77.2	77.5	0.4	0.3
		P+	189,662	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	51.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	145,621	46	45	47	47	1	0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	163	69.3	71.5	69.6	68.7	-0.6	-0.9
		P+	163	30.0%	31.0%	34.0%	36.0%	6.0%	2.0%
		SGP	124	36	43	38	41	5	3
	State	CPI	90,777	68.3	67.3	66.8	66.6	-1.7	-0.2
		P+	90,777	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	66,688	42	43	43	43	1	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	47,477	66.2	66.2	67.4	67.8	1.6	0.4
		P+	47,477	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,239	50	51	53	54	4	1
All students	District	CPI	863	87.8	88.3	88.8	87.7	-0.1	-1.1
		P+	863	70.0%	70.0%	71.0%	70.0%	0.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	707	45	52	51	45	0	-6
	State	CPI	488,744	87.2	86.7	86.8	86.7	-0.5	-0.1
		P+	488,744	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	390,904	50	50	51	50	0	-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: Douglas Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	251	61.8	61.6	66	64.4	2.6	-1.6
		P+	251	28.0%	28.0%	34.0%	31.0%	3.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	191	37	43	45	40	3	-5
	State	CPI	241,896	67.1	67	68.6	68.4	1.3	-0.2
		P+	241,896	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	184,937	46	46	46	47	1	1
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	131	65	63.2	71.6	66.6	1.6	-5
		P+	131	33.0%	35.0%	43.0%	34.0%	1.0%	-9.0%
		SGP	103	37.5	43	48	38	0.5	-10
	State	CPI	190,183	67.3	67.3	69	68.8	1.5	-0.2
		P+	190,183	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	41.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	146,536	46	45	46	47	1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	165	57.1	55.2	56.8	58.6	1.5	1.8
		P+	165	19.0%	17.0%	20.0%	23.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	124	37	39	43	41.5	4.5	-1.5
	State	CPI	91,181	57.7	56.9	57.4	57.1	-0.6	-0.3
		P+	91,181	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	67,155	43	43	42	43	0	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	47,847	62	61.6	63.9	63.8	1.8	-0.1
		P+	47,847	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,607	52	52	53	52	0	-1
All students	District	CPI	865	78.7	78	82.4	78.6	-0.1	-3.8
		P+	865	53.0%	53.0%	61.0%	54.0%	1.0%	-7.0%
		SGP	708	48	51	57.5	42	-6	-15.5
	State	CPI	490,288	79.9	79.9	80.8	80.3	0.4	-0.5
		P+	490,288	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	392,953	50	50	51	50	0	-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: Douglas Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	111	69.4	60.2	69.7	70.3	0.9	0.6
		P+	111	35.0%	23.0%	32.0%	32.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	100,582	63.8	65	66.4	67.3	3.5	0.9
		P+	100,582	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	57	69	61.3	76.5	72.8	3.8	-3.7
		P+	57	40.0%	25.0%	44.0%	33.0%	-7.0%	-11.0%
	State	CPI	79,199	62.8	64.5	66.1	66.8	4	0.7
		P+	79,199	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	33.0%	5.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	77	64.5	54.6	58.9	64.9	0.4	6
		P+	77	26.0%	15.0%	13.0%	23.0%	-3.0%	10.0%
	State	CPI	38,628	59.2	58.7	59.8	60.1	0.9	0.3
		P+	38,628	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	2.0%	2.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	16,871	50.3	51.4	54	54	3.7	0
		P+	16,871	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
All students	District	CPI	355	82.2	82.5	83.7	82.4	0.2	-1.3
		P+	355	58.0%	61.0%	59.0%	55.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%
	State	CPI	211,440	77.6	78.6	79	79.6	2	0.6
		P+	211,440	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	3.0%	2.0%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2011–2014**

	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	1.7%	2.8%	2.2%	1.3%	-0.4	-23.5%	-0.9	-40.9%	2.0%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2011-2014**

Group	Number Included (2014)	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	34	71.0%	62.2%	68.8%	82.4%	11.4	16.1%	13.6	19.8%	76.5%
Econ. Disad.	24	65.2%	48.1%	68.4%	79.2%	14.0	21.5%	10.8	15.8%	75.5%
Students w/ disabilities	19	63.6%	70.4%	65.0%	78.9%	15.3	24.1%	13.9	21.4%	69.1%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.9%
All students	127	90.4%	84.5%	85.1%	92.1%	1.7	1.9%	7.0	8.2%	86.1%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Five-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	32	69.6%	71.0%	66.7%	71.9%	2.3	3.3	5.2	7.8%	79.2%
Econ. Disad.	19	60.0%	65.2%	51.9%	68.4%	8.4	14.0	16.5	31.8%	78.3%
Students w/ disabilities	20	64.7%	63.6%	74.1%	70.0%	5.3	8.2	-4.1	-5.5%	72.9%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	70.9%
All students	101	90.2%	90.4%	86.8%	87.1%	-3.1	-3.4	0.3	0.3%	87.7%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2011–2014**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.2%	95.0%	95.4%	95.4%	0.2	0.2%	0.0	0.0%	94.9%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2011–2014**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	1.4%	2.1%	0.8%	0.5%	-0.9	-64.3%	-0.3	-37.5%	2.1%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	2.8%	2.7%	1.8%	1.0%	-1.8	-64.3%	-0.8	-44.4%	3.9%

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: Douglas Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$11,859,223	\$11,859,223	\$12,357,556	\$12,368,768	\$12,708,753	\$12,618,587
By municipality	\$5,113,673	\$16,127,023	\$6,231,128	\$18,339,807	\$27,414,907	\$14,376,364
Total from local appropriations	\$16,972,896	\$27,986,245	\$18,588,684	\$30,708,575	\$40,123,660	\$26,994,951
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$2,160,906	--	\$1,816,303	--	\$2,022,392
Total expenditures	--	\$30,147,151	--	\$32,524,877	--	\$29,017,344
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$8,368,517	--	\$8,454,415	--	\$8,493,140
Required local contribution	--	\$5,567,549	--	\$5,766,202	--	\$5,973,388
Required net school spending**	--	\$13,936,066	--	\$14,220,617	--	\$14,466,528
Actual net school spending	--	\$14,318,355	--	\$14,699,418	--	\$14,650,422
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$382,289	--	\$478,801	--	\$183,894
Over/under required (%)	--	2.7	--	3.4	--	1.3

*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: FY12, FY13, FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved April 22, 2015

**Table B9: Douglas Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

Expenditure Category	2011	2012	2013
Administration	\$459	\$424	\$444
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$528	\$602	\$633
Teachers	\$3,985	\$4,199	\$4,170
Other teaching services	\$841	\$883	\$877
Professional development	\$28	\$38	\$40
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$254	\$124	\$93
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$240	\$245	\$278
Pupil services	\$903	\$945	\$973
Operations and maintenance	\$779	\$797	\$836
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,541	\$1,652	\$1,665
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$9,558	\$9,910	\$10,009

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment & Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	0%	18%	82%
	HS	0%	0%	100%
	Total #	0	2	49
	Total %	0%	4%	96%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	0%	9%	91%
	HS	0%	15%	85%
	Total #	0	4	47
	Total %	0%	8%	92%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	0%	18%	82%
	HS	5%	10%	85%
	Total #	1	4	46
	Total %	2%	8%	90%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	9%	27%	64%
	HS	16%	5%	79%
	Total #	4	4	42
	Total %	8%	8%	84%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	0%	25%	75%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	25%	5%	70%
	Total #	6	8	37
	Total %	12%	16%	72%
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0%	5%	95%
	MS	0%	18%	82%
	HS	0%	5%	95%
	Total #	0	4	47
	Total %	0%	8%	92%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	0%	60%	40%
	MS	9%	27%	64%
	HS	15%	35%	50%
	Total #	4	22	25
	Total %	8%	43%	49%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to the <i>2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</i> .	ES	60%	0%	40%
	MS	18%	36%	45%
	HS	45%	5%	50%
	Total #	23	5	23
	Total %	45%	10%	45%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	ES	5%	20%	75%
	MS	9%	27%	64%
	HS	10%	10%	80%
	Total #	4	9	38
	Total %	8%	18%	74%
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	40%	10%	50%
	MS	64%	0%	36%
	HS	45%	5%	50%
	Total #	24	3	24
	Total %	47%	6%	47%
11. The teacher provides 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	25%	35%	40%
	MS	18%	18%	64%
	HS	20%	40%	40%
	Total #	11	17	23
	Total %	22%	33%	45%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	5%	35%	60%
	MS	36%	18%	45%
	HS	15%	30%	55%
	Total #	8	15	28
	Total %	16%	29%	55%
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas.	ES	0%	15%	85%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	10%	20%	70%
	Total #	3	9	39
	Total %	6%	18%	76%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	0%	15%	85%
	MS	9%	27%	64%
	HS	5%	10%	85%
	Total #	2	8	41
	Total %	4%	16%	80%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	5%	45%	50%
	MS	27%	27%	45%
	HS	25%	15%	60%
	Total #	9	15	27
	Total %	18%	29%	53%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	40%	10%	50%
	MS	27%	0%	73%
	HS	25%	0%	75%
	Total #	16	2	33
	Total %	31%	4%	65%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	0%	65%	35%
	MS	18%	18%	64%
	HS	15%	40%	45%
	Total #	5	23	23
	Total %	10%	45%	45%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	ES	20%	35%	45%
	MS	18%	27%	55%
	HS	20%	30%	50%
	Total #	10	16	25
	Total %	20%	31%	49%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	35%	20%	45%
	MS	27%	27%	45%
	HS	20%	30%	50%
	Total #	14	13	24
	Total %	27%	26%	47%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	40%	25%	35%
	MS	36%	27%	36%
	HS	40%	25%	35%
	Total #	20	13	18
	Total %	39%	26%	35%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	70%	0%	30%
	MS	36%	18%	45%
	HS	20%	30%	50%
	Total #	22	8	21
	Total %	43%	16%	41%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	70%	0%	30%
	MS	27%	0%	73%
	HS	20%	0%	80%
	Total #	21	0	30
	Total %	41%	0%	59%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	10%	35%	55%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	10%	25%	65%
	Total #	5	14	32
	Total %	10%	27%	63%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	40%	35%	25%
	MS	18%	45%	36%
	HS	55%	25%	20%
	Total #	21	17	13
	Total %	41%	33%	26%