

# District Review Report

Millbury Public Schools

Review conducted January 20-23, 2015

---



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

## Organization of this Report

Millbury Public Schools District Review Overview .....	1
Millbury Public Schools District Review Findings.....	6
Millbury Public Schools District Review Recommendations.....	25
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....	35
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....	37
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	49

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



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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner  
**Published May 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 regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 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](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



# Millbury 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 Millbury school district was conducted from January 20-23, 2015. The site visit included approximately 27 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 105 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, parents, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 2 focus groups with 5 elementary school teachers, and 14 junior high and high school teachers. The business manager could not attend interviews in the district because of illness. He was interviewed via telephone on January 22.

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 40 classrooms in 3 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

Millbury 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 unless otherwise noted.

The current superintendent has been in the position since August of 2015. The district leadership team includes: the superintendent; the business manager; the director of pupil personnel services; the director of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and the three principals. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past several years. The district has three principals leading three schools. Central office and principal turnover has been high. There are five other school administrators: four assistant principals and a technology director. The special education department director and the guidance director are members of the teachers' bargaining unit and do not have evaluation responsibilities. In the 2013-2014 school year, there were 126.9 teachers in the district.

In the 2014-2015 school year, 1,743 students were enrolled in the district's 3 schools:

**Table 1: Millbury Public Schools  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2014-2015**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Elmwood Street	ES	PK-3	605
Raymond E. Shaw Elementary	ES	4-6	424
Millbury Junior/Senior High	MS/HS	7-12	714
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3 schools</b>	<b>PK-12</b>	<b>1,743</b>
*As of October 1, 2014			

Between 2011 and 2015 overall student enrollment decreased by approximately 5.5 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were less than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: total in-district per-pupil expenditures were \$12,506 as compared with \$13,099. (See [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance

**Millbury is a Level 2 district because the Elmwood Street and Raymond E. Shaw elementary schools are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.**

- Elmwood Street is in Level 2 with a cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 56 for all students and 58 for high-needs students; the target is 75.
- Shaw Elementary is in the 66<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 77 for all students and 71 for high-needs students; the target is 75.
- Millbury Junior/Senior High is in the 54<sup>th</sup> percentile of middle-high schools and is in Level 1 with a cumulative PPI of 79 for all students and 78 for high-needs students; the target is 75.

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

- ELA CPI was 90.1 in 2014, below the district's target of 92.4.
- Math CPI was 84.1 in 2014, below the district's target of 86.7.
- Science CPI was 85.7 in 2014, above the district's target of 85.2.

**ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the district as a whole and in every tested grade except for the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. Between 2011 and 2014 there were notable increases in ELA proficiency rates in the 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades, and declines in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades.**

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 72 percent in 2011 to 74 percent in 2014, above the state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency rates were above the state by 12 percentage points in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, by 7 to 9 percentage points in the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and by 5 and 2 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 14 percentage points in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 9 percentage points in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.
- The 7<sup>th</sup> grade ELA proficiency rate decreased 10 percentage points between 2011 and 2014, from 73 percent in 2011 to 63 percent in 2014, and was 9 percentage points below the state rate of 72 percent.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 6 percentage points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and by 3 percentage points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

**Math proficiency rates were above the state rate in the district as a whole and in every tested grade except the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, which was equal to the state rate. Between 2011 and 2014 there were notable improvements in math proficiency rates in the 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and declines in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade.**

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district increased 4 percentage points from 62 percent in 2011 to 66 percent in 2014, above the state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were above the state rate in the 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades by 9 percentage points and above the state rate by 5 percentage points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades. Math proficiency was also above the state rate by 1 percentage point in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 15 percentage points in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, by 12 percentage points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 6 percentage points in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade.
- The 7<sup>th</sup> grade math proficiency rate was 50 percent, equal to the state rate for the 7<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> grade math proficiency rates decreased 12 percentage points from 78 percent in 2011 to 66 percent in 2014, above the state rate of 61 percent.

**Science proficiency rates improved throughout the district between 2011 and 2014.**

- 5<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates increased from 69 percent in 2011 to 72 percent in 2014, 19 percentage points above the state rate of 53 percent.
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates increased from 38 percent in 2011 to 47 percent in 2014, 5 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent.
- 10<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates increased from 61 percent in 2011 to 68 percent in 2014, 3 percentage points below the state rate of 71 percent.

**Students' growth on the MCAS assessments on average is slower than that of their academic peers statewide in ELA and similar in mathematics.**

- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 43.0, below the state median SGP of 50.0.
  - ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade (median SGP of 39.0) and in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade (30.0).
- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 50.0, equal to the state median SGP of 50.0.

**The district reached the 2014 four year cohort graduation target of 80.0 percent and the five year cohort graduation target of 85.0 percent.<sup>1</sup>**

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 90.0 percent in 2010 and 91.9 percent in 2014, above the state rate of 86.1 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.8 percentage points from 91.5 percent in 2009 to 91.4 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 87.7 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for Millbury has been below 2.0 percent since 2009 and was 1.6 percent in 2013, below the statewide rate of 2.2 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

# Millbury Public Schools District Review Findings

---

## Strengths

### *Curriculum and Instruction*

**1. In observed classrooms, teachers created an environment conducive to good teaching and learning.**

**A.** The team observed 40 classes throughout the district: 12 at the high school, 10 at the middle school, and 18 at the elementary schools. The team observed 17 ELA classes, 8 mathematics classes, and 11 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were three special education classes and one career/technical education class. 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.

1. In 100 per cent of the observed lessons at the elementary and high schools and in 90 percent of the observed lessons at the junior high school the team found clear and consistent evidence that the tone of interaction between teachers and students and among students was positive (#1).
  - a. Teachers at the elementary levels addressed students as friends and used positive reinforcement such as “I love how you people are transitioning.” They told students “to try,” reassuring them that the work did not have to be perfect.
  - b. Teachers at the high school demonstrated an easy rapport with their students. One teacher greeted a returning student asking her how she felt and a group of students joked with a teacher about his beard.

**B.** The team found clear and consistent evidence that behavioral standards were clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably (#2) in 83 percent of elementary classrooms observed, in 78 percent of junior high school classrooms observed, and in 100 percent of high school classrooms observed.

1. In one elementary class, to communicate behavior standards, the teacher reminded the students to “make a good choice.”
2. In a junior high school class, the teacher personally greeted students as they entered the room, and told students to begin the Do Now.

**C.** The team found clear and consistent evidence that the physical arrangement of the classroom ensured a positive environment and provided all students with access to learning activities (#3)

in 94 percent of elementary classrooms observed, in 80 percent of junior high school classrooms observed, and in 84 percent of the high school classrooms observed.

1. Review team members noted that, in most cases, students were seated in an appropriate configuration for learning, such as small groups or centers.

**Impact:** A positive and respectful environment is the product of clearly articulated behavioral standards. When student behavior is managed correctly, the teacher and the students can focus on teaching and learning. When the teacher and the students act in positive ways toward each other and can focus on teaching and learning, students feel safe to be active participants in learning.

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

#### **2. The district provides resources to support a solid and well-organized mentoring program for teachers.**

##### **A. The Millbury Public Schools mentoring program includes support for teachers who follow a mentoring curriculum.**

1. The mentoring action plan includes a vision to support new teachers, descriptions of the mentoring leadership structure and levels of mentoring, a calendar of mentoring events, and a description of how the program will be sustained and measured.
  - a. The vision of the mentoring plan is to “successfully support new teachers by creating a mentoring program that will provide continuing professional development to mentors and mentees that focuses on support and good teaching practices.”
  - b. The mentoring support team includes the director of curriculum, instruction, and assessment who, among other things, oversees the process, advocates for financial resources, and provides professional development for mentors and mentees. Four lead mentors coordinate mentors and review program alignment, provide professional development to mentors and mentees, and annually report to the school committee.
    - i. Lead mentors and the director of curriculum, instruction, and assessment meet monthly to discuss mentoring issues.
    - ii. Interviewees said that the district has over 30 trained mentors. Mentors receive a stipend of between \$400 and \$600.
    - iii. Each elementary school has a lead mentor and the junior/senior high school has two lead mentors. Lead mentors receive a stipend of approximately \$2,100.
2. Interviews and a document review showed that mentors are assigned to teachers new to teaching or the district or new to a position or a school. A mentor may also be assigned to a

teacher who is rated unsatisfactory or needs improvement. Teachers' association representatives told the team that mentors are provided for long-term substitute teachers.

- a. Depending on the level of need, a mentor may be assigned to a mentee for more than one year. For example, typically, a teacher new to the district receives 40 hours of mentoring for one year. The district requires 20 hours of additional mentoring the second year. An experienced teacher new to the district and a teacher transitioning to a new position or school receive 20-30 hours of mentoring.
3. Mentees receive an orientation during the new teacher summer orientation program. During the school year, mentees attend four two-hour after-school training sessions on topics such as educator evaluation, RETELL, the Common Core, and differentiated instruction. Lead mentors facilitate meetings between mentors and mentees four times a year.
  - a. Mentors meet with mentees at least monthly and follow a curriculum. Mentors and mentees complete meeting logs, which include the topics discussed during meetings.
  - b. A review of TELL Massachusetts 2014 data showed that 90 percent of new teachers who responded indicated that the district provided a mentor and a new teacher orientation.
4. A review of the curriculum showed that it covers topics such as lesson planning and behavior management, including ideas and tips on how to handle classroom management and discipline issues.
5. Teachers' association representatives said that the mentoring program is firmly in place this year and mentors and mentees are provided a manual and meeting logs are required to be completed.
6. A formal mentoring program is not in place for administrators. The district has provided mentors for some administrators.

**Impact:** A well-organized and resourced mentoring program:

- builds a supportive environment for new teachers and other staff;
- improves teachers' leadership ability by offering them the opportunity to be mentors;
- invests in staff by providing orientation, coaching, mentoring, and support;
- develops a culture of continuous improvement; and
- sends a message to all staff of the importance of professional growth.

## ***Student Support***

### **3. The district provides supports and interventions at each school for students who are struggling.**

A. The district provides a range of support programs that help to ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program. Interviews and a review of documents showed that these programs are flexible to meet the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs of a wide variety of students. As one interviewee stated, Millbury has “strength in personalizing education.”

1. Support programs vary by school, yet there are similarities that point to a district system of supports that is flexible and responsive to students’ and families’ needs.
  - a. All students, whose performance on tests (such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and other reading assessment data) is low, have access to reading support or reading instruction from Title I reading teachers in the elementary schools, and from two reading intervention teachers at the junior/senior high school. An extra reading block at the junior/senior high school is provided for students who score ‘Warning’ or ‘Needs Improvement’ on the MCAS assessment.
  - b. The junior/senior high school provides academic support in ELA, mathematics, and science through two flexible academic support centers available to any student who self-identifies or who is referred by staff. Called the advocacy center in grades 7-8 and the student support center in grades 9-12, the centers are each staffed by one full-time teacher and one assistant. Mathematics and science teachers are also assigned to assist high school students during specific periods. The mission of the high school support program is to “provide flexible and individualized academic services.” In grades 7-8, the advocacy center once focused on students with behavioral issues; however, it now targets high-risk students<sup>2</sup> and connects them with supportive adults. Center staff monitor students closely, and may propose that a student attend a Saturday program if more academic support is needed.
  - c. The district has established a freshman academy for all grade 9 students. Described as a model “loosely based on a middle school team concept,” the academy supports students in the transition to the high school. All students are monitored for academic progress, attendance, and other factors deemed as early warning indicators that a student may be at risk of not meeting key K-12 benchmarks.

One administrator said that the freshman academy provides an alternative way to reach students who are challenged. District leaders reported that the intent of the academy is to work with all grade 9 students to make sure that they “have solid footing” as they enter high school. The freshman academy page of the school’s website states: “The

---

<sup>2</sup> High-risk students are students at high risk of not meeting key K-12 benchmarks culminating in high-school graduation.

Academy promotes a positive school culture and a sense of community within our school. We want all of our students to succeed in their first year of high school.”

- d. The two elementary schools provide additional reading support and mathematics support at the Raymond E. Shaw School based on students’ needs. Entitled “tier 3,” the program provides reading and mathematics support to any student who has low performance scores on mathematics and reading assessments or is referred by a teacher. In addition, the district provides a mathematics specialist at the Raymond E. Shaw School.
- e. After-school academic support is available for students at all levels.
  - i. At the junior/senior high school, students who have scored ‘Needs Improvement’ or ‘Warning’ on the MCAS assessment are invited to attend MCAS preparation sessions after school.
  - ii. At both elementary schools, after-school supplemental educational support programs provide support in ELA and math to groups of 5-6 students in grades 2-6, during three sessions each school year. Approximately 70 students are served at the Raymond E. Shaw School in this program. A teacher-director oversees the program.
- f. The high school offers credit recovery, virtual high school, tech prep, work-study, and internship programs. Post-graduate students (students aged 18-22 on IEPs) are supported and monitored by the special education department head at the junior/senior high school.
- g. Mental health and behavioral supports are available at each school, provided by four junior/senior high school and two elementary guidance counselors, one school adjustment counselor at the junior/senior high school and one at the elementary level, a social worker, three psychologists, and four certified applied behavioral specialists PK-12. The district also has two health teachers at the junior/senior high school and four nurses (one at each school and the fourth in the district’s medically fragile classroom).
- h. The district provides four programs to meet the needs of children who require special programs or supports. Elmwood Street has an inclusive preschool program staffed by dually certified teachers and a sub-separate program for students with mild to moderate cognitive and developmental delays. Raymond E. Shaw provides a program for medically fragile students. The Raymond E. Shaw and the junior/senior high school provide life skills programs for selected students.
- i. The district has partnerships with the College of the Holy Cross and Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester for students to access college credit courses.
- j. Teachers and administrators reported that there are backpack programs and food drives conducted for homeless families.

- k. The district has a breakfast program for eligible students K-12.
  - l. The district partners with external providers such as Community Health Link for onsite counseling and mental health services for parents and staff.
2. Two ESL teachers provide support to 46 English language learners (ELLs). The superintendent told the team that the district is not satisfied that it is meeting the needs of ELLs and has requested additional ESL positions in the budget.
- B.** The district has processes in place for schools and teachers to make decisions about intervention assignments using assessment data. The director of pupil personnel services and the director of curriculum, instruction and assessment monitor data for sub-group performance, identify patterns, and report findings to school principals.
1. At each school level, teachers monitor the performance of high-risk students using a variety of tools and meeting structures.
    - a. Data teams are in place at each elementary school to review MAP data three times each year; teachers also report that weekly common planning time (CPT) is used to analyze data and discuss interventions. Additional meetings may take place at each level to analyze behavioral data. At the Raymond E. Shaw School there is a behavioral team and two assistant principals: one monitors students in grades 7-8 and the other, specific indicators for high-risk students in grades 9-12.
      - i. Data is used to make student selection for support services transparent. For example, at Raymond E. Shaw teacher recommendations are compared to MAP scores to help prioritize students in need. Data is also used to determine which students may be eligible for after-school supplementary education services.
    - b. While formal data teams are not in place at the junior/senior high school, teachers and principals report that weekly CPT meetings are used to discuss student performance data and to make recommendations for additional support.
    - c. Instructional Support Teams (ISTs) are active at each school although they address students' and teachers' needs in various ways. For example, the frequency of meetings is highest at the high school (weekly) and approximately every six weeks at the other schools; extensive forms with information about teacher interventions are required at one school, but not at the others.
    - d. To aid in collaboration efforts, teachers and specialists share data using Google docs at Raymond E. Shaw. The district is training staff to transition all staff to a commercial data management tool to provide universal access to student assessment data.

**Impact** Providing access to quality social/emotional support programs and resources that focus on the whole child provides an opportunity for all students to participate fully, and hopefully to thrive, in

academic programs. Providing access to academic support programs enables students to receive focused support that will likely contribute to improving student achievement. Creating organized teacher planning structures focused on using assessment data effectively enables teachers to focus instruction to meet the needs of individual students or groups of students.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

#### **4. District and town officials work collaboratively to develop a comprehensive and transparent budget. The district has a budget development process that includes input from all stakeholders, including town officials, teachers, principals, and central office administrators.**

- A. The district and town work together to develop a comprehensive and transparent budget.
  - 1. Town officials and district staff have a solid relationship that has led to efficient budget development operations and clean audits.
  - 2. The town and district have an agreement that revenue/expenses/and budget reductions are split 60 percent for the district and 40 percent for the town. If additional revenue needed to fund special education services exceeds 60 percent, interviewees said they “would make it work.”
  - 3. The town and the district have a written and signed indirect cost agreement. The agreement outlines how the town and district shares costs, such as health insurance, unemployment, workers’ compensation, and other administrative costs.
  - 4. The town manager attends all collective bargaining sessions and the superintendent attends town staff meetings.
  - 5. The improved relationship has helped to garner support and recognition from the school committee and town officials for initiatives. For example, a document review showed that the district is seeking funding in fiscal year 2016 for a school safety officer position and the town and district have agreed to share the funding of the position equally. In addition, town officials told the team that they recognize the need for a new or renovated Shaw elementary school.
- B. The development of the budget is collaborative. The superintendent and business manager distribute a budget memorandum to administrators in October of each year.
  - 1. Attached to the memorandum are budget development timelines, a budget request form template, and a budget summary sheet. Administrators are instructed to use budget request forms for each line item and summary sheets to document all account increases by line item. Extraordinary requests can be submitted on a capital projects list.
    - a. The memorandum indicated that administrators should request any materials needed to successfully implement the curriculum.

- b. The superintendent said that he wants the budget to be transparent, that it had to be an open book. As a result, detail line item rationales have been included and replace sections of the budget formerly labeled as “other.” The superintendent said that the budget is now “posted online along with a justification of why we need specific items.”
2. The district has a budget calendar that includes 12 timelines for actions related to the approval of the budget. The timeline begins in October with budget requests and ends at the annual town meeting in May. From October through December budget requests are submitted by administrators and prioritized by the superintendent and leadership team. The superintendent presents the budget to the school committee in January. Public budget meetings are held by the school committee and with town officials until the budget is voted on at the annual Town Meeting in May.
3. Administrators said that they submit a budget request to the superintendent and business manager detailing budget needs. Typically, a limit on the percentage an administrator can increase the budget for teaching supplies and textbooks is included in the budget memorandum. Administrators stated that they include feedback on budget requests from teachers.
  - a. Principals said that while they have some budgetary control over supplies and materials and have online access to their budgets, they do not have control over budgets related to professional development, buildings and grounds, transportation, or pupil services.

**Impact:** Having a resilient and responsible budget development process that includes input from teachers, administrators, and town officials helps to create a culture of commitment to developing a transparent and comprehensive budget.

## **Challenges and Areas for Growth**

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

### ***Leadership and Governance***

#### **5. In recent years there has been significant turnover in district leadership.**

- A.** According to information provided by the district, since 2009-2010 the school system has had nine different individuals who have served in one of the four central office administrative positions and eight individuals who have served in one of the three principal positions.
  1. Since 2009-2010, the district has had: two school superintendents; three directors of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and three directors of pupil personnel services.

2. The junior/senior high school has had four principals, and each elementary school has had two principals.
3. Interviewees reported that the frequent changes in administrators at the central office and the schools have had a significant effect on the district.
  - a. One central office administrator said that the impact of the high turnover resulted in a muddled vision and the absence of a collective understanding of the district's direction. Another added that the turnover eroded trust and school culture, inhibited progress in the district, and resulted in schools that operated as separate entities.
  - b. Principals said that administrator turnover resulted in initiatives being delayed or ended, a "hunkering down of teachers", and staff working in a survival mode. Principals also said School Improvement Plans (SIPs) have not been kept up to date.
  - c. Teachers said the district has been a "rudderless ship" without a clear-cut vision and that a standards-based curriculum had not been sufficiently developed. They also said that the schools operated by themselves and teachers did not meet frequently.
  - d. Teachers' association representatives said with the constant change in administrators everyone was not "on the same page," "cohesiveness was lacking," and initiatives would get started and then dropped. They said that there was a need to have better direction and to build a school system.
- B. Teachers mentioned frequent turnover in curriculum coordinator positions.
- C. Interviewees in multiple interviews spoke positively about the changes in the district under the new superintendent, who assumed leadership in August 2015.
  1. Administrators, teachers, and school committee members spoke of the superintendent's four goals and a literacy plan that is under development.
  2. Interviewees said that the superintendent has been supportive and has helped to develop a transparent budget process. In addition, they told the team that staff morale has improved and that the district now "has a direction and needs more."

**Impact:** The district is in a transitional period in terms of leadership. The vision of the new superintendent has meant new direction and improved morale; however, this work has just begun. Overall, schools and ultimately students will benefit from an established group of administrators in the district for multiple years.

**6. The district does not have a District Improvement Plan (DIP) to provide direction for improving the school district. None of the schools has a 2014-2015 School Improvement Plan (SIP).**

- A. Interviewees referred to various documents as the operational planning document in the district.

1. Some interviewees identified the Millbury Public Schools Review of District Goals and Initiatives 2013-2014 Moving Forward 2014-2015 as the DIP.
    - a. This document contains six goals related to technology, data-driven decisions, the Common Core, professional development, educator evaluation, and communication. Each goal included the next steps needed to meet the goal.
  2. Some interviewees identified the Superintendent's Goals 2014-2015 as a district planning document. In some instances, it was referenced along with the District Goals and Initiatives document.
    - a. The four Superintendent's Goals 2014-2015 are: effective entry and direction setting; safety; supervision and evaluation practices; and skills to be learned by attending the New Superintendents Induction Program. The format of the document consists of the goal, how it is measured, and key actions and benchmarks.
  3. A third plan cited by interviewees was the Millbury Public Schools District Literacy Plan 2014-2019.
    - a. The plan's overarching goal states that by 2019, 95 percent of students at every grade level will read at or above grade level as measured by standardized testing. In addition, the plan includes four component goals: leadership & structures, assessment, instruction, and intervention.
  4. Teachers and administrators said that the district does not have an improvement plan. An administrator stated that there is neither a DIP nor any uniformity as to what is driving the district.
  5. The superintendent said that a DIP will be developed.
- B.** The district does not have 2014-2015 SIPs.
1. The superintendent said that the SIPs were not an expectation in the past. However, he stated, "We will develop a district plan from which will come the SIPs." Another central office administrator and a principal said that none of the SIPs were updated because there was no emphasis on them. Some teachers stated that they have had the same goals at their schools for the past three years and that the previous administration "was not pushing the SIPs."

**Impact:** Without a single, detailed and complete planning document which identifies the direction the district is heading and the manner in which it plans to get there, there is an absence of clarity about the district's goals and priorities. In addition, the absence of SIPs leaves teachers uncertain about the goals and direction of the district and their schools and impedes the development of teachers' professional practice and student learning goals.

## ***Curriculum and Instruction***

### **7. The district does not have a fully developed, aligned, and documented curriculum. There is no formal structure in place to monitor the components of the curriculum that are in place.**

#### **A. Alignment of curriculum varies by subject area, grade, and school.**

1. According to the document provided by the district entitled *Status of the Curriculum Alignment to 2011 MA Curriculum Frameworks K-12*, only grade 4 has a complete aligned ELA curriculum. ELA alignment continues to be a work in progress in all other grades. The mathematics curriculum is aligned in grades 4-5 and is a work in progress in all other grades except grade 6 where the alignment process has not begun. Science alignment has not begun K-8, is in progress in grades 9-10, and has not begun in grades 11 and 12.
2. The superintendent told the team that the curriculum was not aligned in a formal way in every discipline.
3. Teachers told the team that the turnover in curriculum coordinators resulted in constantly changing initiatives, the absence of a clear vision, and documents getting shelved.
4. The curriculum is not articulated horizontally or vertically.
  - a. Interviewees told the team that meeting to discuss vertical alignment is challenging because of teachers' schedules.
  - b. Teachers told the team that horizontal alignment depended on the grade level.
5. Teachers told the team that it would be difficult for a new teacher to know what to teach.

#### **B. Curriculum mapping to document the curriculum is evolving, but the process is not organized.**

1. Schools have operated independently with little communication about curriculum. A member of the leadership team said that schools were "islands" for a long time and that the curriculum and instruction system was not consistent.
2. Although mapping the curriculum is in progress, interviewees told the team that they had not had training in mapping. Teachers told the team that they did not know whether the mapping they are doing is working.
3. Teachers told the team that during the summer they were developing maps in isolation. They were not focusing on the big picture of what skills the students were coming in with or leaving with.
4. District leaders told the team that they have scheduled three half days of training for curriculum work during the next school year.

5. A review of mapping documents showed that a common curriculum template is not being used. Components vary.
    - a. The map for US History 10 lists big ideas, student outcomes, Common Core standards and skills, key vocabulary, resources and assessments.
    - b. The grade 7 mathematics map documents a grade 7 course overview, critical areas, and Common Core Practice Standards.
    - c. The grade 4 mathematics map lists both the Common Core Standards and the Massachusetts Frameworks, topics, relevant everyday math lessons, games, and student reference book pages. It also contains assessments and other resources.
  6. Teachers told the team they have not received professional development for aligning the curriculum to the Common Core.
- C. There is no formal process for ensuring that the curriculum is consistently implemented and revised.
1. All teachers are required to have lesson plans, but interviewees said that principals check them sporadically.
    - a. There is no district lesson plan rubric. The format used depends on the principal. Some teachers use Aspen, others planning.com. At one elementary school, plan books are submitted every four weeks.
    - b. The Elmwood Street staff handbook includes guidelines for effective lesson plans based on Wiggins and McTighe's *Understanding by Design*, but these were not observed in use.
    - c. Feedback on curriculum information included in lesson plans is not ongoing, but takes place during learning walks and conversations with principals. District leaders said that walkthroughs are a method of monitoring curriculum.
    - d. Teachers told the team that curriculum implementation is limited and informal. Teachers teaching similar courses or subjects try to collaborate and make sure that they are exposing students to the same information.

**Impact:** Without a documented, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum that articulates content standards, teachers have unclear expectations about what to teach and when to teach it. Without clear vertical and horizontal alignment it is difficult to assess area gaps or overlaps at each level. Without consistent monitoring and feedback of lessons it is difficult to judge whether the curriculum is being implemented effectively.

**8. In observed classrooms the review team saw inconsistent use of key instructional practices, including rigorous lessons that challenge students to use higher-order thinking skills.**

- A.** Teachers told the team that use of learning objectives is considered a best practice.
  - 1. Review team members saw clear and consistent evidence that teachers communicated clear learning objectives aligned to the 2011 *Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (#8)* in 28 percent of elementary and high school classrooms observed and in 20 percent of the junior high school classes.
- B.** Observers noted clear and consistent teacher use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content (#9) in 44 percent of elementary classrooms observed, in 40 percent and in 75 percent of junior high school and high school classrooms observed, respectively.
- C.** The team found clear and consistent evidence that the teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations (#7) in 44 percent of elementary classrooms, in 20 percent of junior high school classrooms, and in 58 percent of high school classrooms.
  - 1. In an upper-level English class, students were reviewing noun-verb agreement.
- D.** The team found clear and consistent evidence that teachers provided multiple opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking skills (#11) in 33 percent of elementary classrooms observed, in 30 percent of junior high classrooms, and in 58 percent of high school classrooms.
- E.** The review team found clear and consistent evidence that students articulated their thinking, verbally or in writing (#18) in 39 percent elementary classes, in 10 percent of junior high school classes, and in 42 percent of high school classes.
  - 1. In observed classes students elaborated clearly and consistently about content and ideas when responding to questions (#20) in 33 percent of elementary classrooms, in 20 percent of junior high classrooms, and in 8 percent high school classrooms. In several classes, students answered by repeating after the teacher rather than putting answers in their own words. Students often gave factual answers that did not require elaboration.
- F.** Observers noted clear and consistent evidence that students made connections to prior knowledge or real world experiences or could apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects (#21) in 28 percent of elementary classrooms, in 40 percent of junior high classes, and in 50 percent of high school classes.
  - 1. Students told the team that academic challenge depended on the course and the teacher.
  - 2. Parents told the team that there were various degrees of challenge in the district. They stated that teachers' ability to challenge varied and they expressed the view that that there was not much in the curriculum for higher-achieving students.

- G.** Although technology is a district priority, in observed classrooms use of technology as an instructional methodology was limited.
1. Teachers made use of available technology clearly and consistently to support instruction in 44 percent of elementary classrooms observed, and in 40 percent junior high classes, and in 50 percent of high school classes.
  2. Students clearly and consistently used technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding (#22) in 44 percent elementary classes, in 20 percent of junior high classes, and in 25 percent of high school classes.

**Impact:** The district has created a positive learning environment that allows students to feel safe. However, instruction is inconsistent in terms of best practice. Without a range of effective instructional methods, achievement for students is compromised. This is particularly evident in the areas of rigor and higher-order thinking skills. The low use of technology in the classroom removes an important resource for teaching and learning.

### ***Assessment***

- 9. The district does not have an organized system of using assessment data to inform and focus instruction.**
- A.** Methods for collecting, analyzing, and using student data vary among schools. These methods have not evolved into a systemic districtwide practice of using data horizontally and vertically to inform instruction.
1. At the Raymond E. Shaw and Elmwood Street elementary schools, teachers administer a series of assessments throughout the school year, which are labeled diagnostic and formative. The results are used to group students needing interventions into a tiered instructional model.
    - a. However, there is no strategic approach for incorporating assessment results into daily lesson plans to reflect instructional changes.
    - b. Elementary teachers reported that because there is no curriculum, there are no benchmark assessments aligned to the curriculum to monitor student progress data to predict results on MCAS or other summative tests.
  2. Administrators said that schools have operated independently with very little communication about curriculum, instruction, and assessment. They said that schools were “islands” for a long time. Most activity was building based.
  3. Review team members observed clear and consistent evidence of teachers conducting frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction (#15) in

67 percent of elementary classrooms, in 10 percent of junior high school classes, and in 50 percent of high school classrooms.

- B.** There is not an organized and consistent structure in place for collecting, analyzing, and using data to inform lesson planning and instruction.
  - 1. Interviewees reported that the junior/senior high school is in the beginning stages of formalizing data use. Interviewees said that data collection and analysis has not been a focused district practice.
  - 2. At the junior/senior high school, MAP tests in ELA and mathematics are administered three times per year in grades 7-10.
  - 3. Data from benchmark assessments are limited to science placement tests, MAP testing results, AP exams, and midterms; the district does not have a system for monitoring students' progress at all levels throughout the year.
- C.** Interviewees reported that instability and inconsistency in leadership have had an adverse impact on the amount of time and training scheduled for reviewing assessment data.
- D.** Interviewees said that there is now more talk about assessment data, setting the tone for schools to use assessments to inform decision making.
- E.** Interviewees reported that because training is voluntary, there is an uncoordinated approach to developing and implementing collaborative opportunities for teachers to engage in professional sharing, to increase learning, and to strengthen skills associated with effective assessment cultures.
  - 1. Data teams, initially designed for teachers to talk about and assess student performance data, have been established at both elementary schools, but one school reports lagging behind the other.
    - a. At Elmwood Street and Shaw, data meetings take place three times per year.
      - i. Common planning time (CPT) is extended to 1.5 hours at Elmwood Street to increase teacher planning time together, but the content of conversations varies at each meeting.
    - b. Data teams are not in place at the junior/senior high school. Teachers reported that central administration is responsible for data analysis.
    - c. At the junior/senior high school, CPT is scheduled once per week and teachers reported that the time is sometimes used to review data, but mostly to review IST referrals. Teachers said that because they are departmentalized at the secondary level, they "don't always see the whole picture."

**F. Teachers have not reached a level of proficiency in data literacy.**

1. Administrators reported that increasing teacher skill in data literacy is something the district is working on.
  - a. The District Literacy Plan states that the district will develop a process for transferring pertinent student information between grades and schools so that teachers can better use student data to drive instruction.
    - i. According to 2014-2015 district goals, the district will analyze student assessment data, as well as evaluate educator, school, and district performance data to improve the quality of instruction and student learning outcomes in every classroom.
2. Interviewees reported that all teachers at the Elmwood Street and Shaw schools have been trained in administering MAP and DIBELS. Teachers work with colleagues to learn how to administer assessments and analyze data as part of the induction program for new teachers and during CPT.
3. Some teachers have been piloting the use of new technology (e.g., clickers) and learning to assess student feedback to improve their skill at analyzing data.
4. Interviewees reported that data tools such as EWIS and Edwin Analytics reports are sporadically used. Some district and school staff members do not have access to user-friendly, districtwide and school-based reports and other relevant data.
  - a. Attendance, suspension, drop-out, and graduation rates are tracked in grades 9-12. At the elementary level, attendance is tracked and sometimes data is used if there is a need for interventions during the IST process.

**Impact:**

- In the absence of a well-developed structure for collecting, analyzing, and using assessment data, teachers do not have sufficient support and data to make the changes needed to continuously improve instruction.
- The uncoordinated and inconsistent use of data teams and other teacher meeting structures likely inhibits vertical conversations about data and misses opportunities to strengthen instruction and improve learning.

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

#### **10. Evaluations do not consistently include feedback that is instructive or promotes professional growth.**

- A.** The district’s educator evaluation system philosophy, which appears on its website, states “The district's primary goal, in the adoption of the Model System, is to strengthen professional practice, while enabling educators to assume responsibility for their professional and personal growth.”
- B.** The team reviewed evaluations of 9 administrators and 20 teachers in personnel files or on TeachPoint, the district’s evaluation management system.
  - 1. Most files contained self-assessments, goal setting documents, multiple observations, and formative or summative evaluations. The frequency of observations and formative and summative evaluations depended on the assigned educator plan.
  - 2. Most evaluations were informative and included observations related to progress toward meeting goals. Approximately 50 percent of observations and formative and summative evaluations did not include recommendations or suggestions on how to improve professional growth. A number of evaluations included suggestions that the educator continue current practice.
- C.** The superintendent said that expectations for evaluations are not consistently aligned throughout the district. Members of the Educator Evaluation Committee said that calibration of expectations was an ongoing process and meaningful conversations were taking place, but agreed that calibration was not being done consistently school to school.
  - 1. The process of evidence collection has also evolved. Interviewees said that the teacher determines what evidence to submit. This gives them the opportunity to provide evidence to support any progress made toward meeting goals; however, some teachers submit more than others. Teachers have been trained in uploading evidence to TeachPoint.
  - 2. A document review showed that complete calibration of expectations for evaluations is included as an action step (“to complete calibration of administration in and across buildings”) in the district goal to implement year 2 of the educator evaluation system.
- D.** The district is participating in ESE’s Model Student and Staff Feedback Administration Project this year.
- E.** Teachers and administrators said the district implemented the educator evaluation system for half of the educators in school year 2012-2013. The district fully implemented the system in 2013-2014. The district included all non-professional staff teachers in the initial stage of implementation.

1. Members of the district's Educator Evaluation Committee told the team that the district adopted the ESE model system.
  - a. Interviewees said that a joint labor-management committee negotiated the educator evaluation memorandum of understanding. They also said that the teachers' association and the district were united in the effort to make the implementation work.
  - b. The district held 17 educator evaluation training sessions from January 2012 to January 2014. Topics included self-assessment, goal setting, and gathering evidence.
  - c. The superintendent estimated that seven individuals conduct evaluations, including all principals and assistant principals. Interviewees told the team that evaluators received training in observational methods.
- F. The district submitted a DDM implementation plan to ESE's Center for Educator Effectiveness in June 2014; however, an interviewee told the team that while the district has an awareness and understanding that educators need to be working toward developing DDMs, there has not been any progress on developing DDMs.
  1. Some assessments are in use across the district; they were submitted in the implementation plan and are likely to become DDMs.
  2. No training has taken place in the development of DDMs.

**Impact:** Without consistent actionable feedback on how an educator can move to the next level, teachers' skills will not sufficiently improve. Without evaluation practices that are informative, instructive, and used to promote individual growth, the district is challenged to foster a culture of continuous improvement that will likely lead to improved student achievement.

**11. The district does not have a professional development plan strategically aligned to district goals or initiatives.**

- A. Interviewees and a review of the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP) indicated that the district had a professional development committee, but it became inactive; however, the district resurrected it last year. For the previous several years, aside from required ESE initiatives, principals determined what professional development (PD) was needed.
  1. Interviewees said that the professional development committee has 12 members and meets approximately four times per year. Membership consists of administrators, teachers (including special education and ESL), and instructional assistants. All schools have representatives on the committee.
  2. Interviewees indicated that the professional development committee has given PD a new direction in the district, but more is needed. More collaborative conversations about PD needs are taking place at schools.
- B. The district does not have a strategic professional development plan aligned to a DIP or to SIPs.

1. The menu of PD sessions offered is developed collaboratively through surveys and discussions with school and district administrators. District goals and initiatives, as well as teachers' goals and goals in the literacy plan, are considered during the development of PD offerings.
  2. One district goal is to provide high-quality PD to all staff. Next steps to meet the goal include soliciting staff for input and providing more after-school and summer PD opportunities. The district's literacy plan includes providing PD related to the development of a tiered instructional model and curriculum guides.
  3. A review of the school calendar shows the district has four PD days scheduled during school year 2014-2015. The district provided numerous professional development offerings on professional development days.
    - a. The district is building an additional three half-days of PD into the school calendar next year specifically for curriculum development.
    - b. Surveys are the primary method used by the district to measure satisfaction with and effectiveness of PD. A formal learning walk process is not in place to monitor the effectiveness of PD.
    - c. A review of 2014 TELL Mass survey data showed that 35 percent of teachers who responded agreed or strongly agreed that sufficient resources for PD were available in their school and 31 percent who responded agreed or strongly agreed that PD was differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers.
- C. While the district's mentoring program offers PD to new, transitional, or struggling teachers, common planning time structures are not consistent at all schools limiting the program's effectiveness as a venue for PD.
1. The district does not have coaches to provide job-embedded professional development or to facilitate team meetings or common planning time meetings.

**Impact:**

- The absence of a professional development plan that includes a theory of action and is aligned to district goals and initiatives results in an absence of clarity and direction for staff. Without an organized process to monitor the effectiveness of professional development, it is unclear what impact PD is having on student achievement and educator learning.
- The absence of consistent, organized, and facilitated structures for common planning time for teachers to collaborate slows improvements in curriculum and instructional practice.

# Millbury Public Schools District Review Recommendations

---

## ***Leadership and Governance***

**1. To attract and retain quality leaders, the superintendent and school committee should determine the reasons for the high turnover of administrators and principals since 2009-2010, and provide additional guidance and support to leaders across the district.**

**A.** The superintendent and the school committee should collect information for the reasons administrators have left the district and analyze this data to identify potential ways to address the high turnover rate.

**B.** The superintendent and school committee should review the roles and responsibilities of each administrator position and ensure that adequate support is provided and that contract provisions are competitive.

1. The district should provide a mentor for all administrators new to the position.

**C.** The district should consider providing *National Institute for School Leadership Training (NISL)* training for administrators.

**D.** The district should consider developing teacher leadership teams to provide growth opportunities for teachers and to provide support for school principals.

### **Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *National Institute for School Leadership (NISL)* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edleadership/nisl/>) provides information about the program, which is a researched based executive leadership program designed to assist school districts across the state with leadership development efforts.
- *The Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents, the Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials, the Massachusetts Secondary School Principals Association, and the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association* are statewide organizations that survey and collect information from their members and provide professional development opportunities for leadership personnel.

**Benefits:** Maintaining a stable group of administrators in a district for multiple years helps to ensure that the district and each school has an established and effective administrative team guided by the same set of expectations for all leaders and principals. By implementing this recommendation:

- The vision and mission of the district and schools will remain relatively constant as opposed to shifting without consistent direction.

- Initiatives will be implemented and sustained rather than started and stopped with changes in administrators.
- Curriculum, instruction, and assessment will be consistent PreK-12.

**2. The district should carry out its plan to develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) and align other planning documents with it.**

- A.** Under the leadership of the superintendent, a working group with wide representation should analyze student performance and other data and develop a DIP.
1. It is critical that this stakeholder group recognize and be committed to the role of the DIP in creating a blueprint for student success, achieving greater teacher effectiveness, and strongly influencing each School Improvement Plan.
- B.** The DIP should include the district’s mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.
1. DIP goals should be SMART (specific and strategic; measurable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked).
  2. The DIP should draw from the superintendent’s goals and the district’s literacy plan, as well as other relevant documents.
- C.** The DIP’s performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district’s educational programs.
1. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) should be created in alignment with the DIP and based on an analysis of student achievement data.
    - a. Principals should provide the superintendent, school committee, and staff with regular updates on progress toward SIP goals.
    - b. Each principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.
  2. Professional development should be designed to support DIP initiatives and goals.
- D.** The DIP should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
1. The superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and community on progress toward DIP goals.
  2. The district should establish procedures to review the DIP periodically. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted at least annually, and when necessary to meet current conditions.

3. The superintendent and the school committee should consider aligning some goals in the superintendent's Educator Plan (as part of the district's educator evaluation system) with DIP goals.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *Planning for Success* model (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) highlights the practices, characteristics and behaviors that contribute to effective improvement planning and implementation.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- The *Massachusetts Definition of College and Career Readiness* (<http://www.mass.edu/library/documents/2013College&CareerReadinessDefinition.pdf>) is a set of learning competencies, intellectual capacities and experiences essential for all students to become lifelong learners; positive contributors to their families, workplaces and communities; and successfully engaged citizens of a global 21st century. This could be a helpful resource as the district articulates its vision and goals.
- *Massachusetts Transfer Goals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MATransferGoals.pdf>) are long-range goals that students should work toward over the course of their PreK-12 academic experience. These goals provide a precise connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts' definition of college and career readiness. This resource could be beneficial for districts as they embark on long-term planning.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a resource that describes SMART goals and includes examples.

**Benefits:** The primary benefit of the development and implementation of a DIP and SIPs is that they will provide the district and schools with direction toward greater teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement. The plans will give the administrators, teachers, support personnel, parents, and the citizens of Millbury a roadmap of where the district is heading. The DIP and the SIPs will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district's short- and long-term goals.

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

- 3. The district should complete as soon as possible curricula aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*, and document and share a multi-year process for the regular and timely review and revision of K-12 curricula. The district should also identify and articulate a district instructional model.**
  - A.** Under the leadership of the director of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, the district should convene a districtwide curriculum task force to develop a plan for curriculum development.
    1. The district should communicate to teachers the plan for completing the curriculum.
    2. The district is encouraged to reference ESE’s Model Curriculum Units (MCUs) to identify essential components of a comprehensive curriculum and to support teachers as they translate curriculum into instructional practice.
      - a. All MCUs use the Understanding by Design process developed by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe.
    3. WIDA standards should be integrated into the curriculum for classes in which English language learners participate.
  - B.** District leadership, in collaboration with the curriculum task force, should develop a process for the timely and regular review and revision of K-12 curriculum. This process should be collaborative and include the necessary resources to support the work including dedicated time and updated instructional resources.
    1. The district’s plan should provide a timeline for when K-12 curricula in each discipline will be regularly reviewed and updated, identify participants, and dedicated time (within and among schools) for this ongoing work.
      - a. The plan should provide regular meetings to align the curriculum horizontally (across schools) and vertically (between grade levels).
    2. Practices should be established in this plan to ensure that curriculum materials are regularly reviewed and monitored for effectiveness and currency.
      - a. Practices might include conducting systematic review of lesson plans and regular collaborative discussion by level and discipline of what materials work well and which materials need revision or replacement, including textbooks.
  - C.** District leaders, in collaboration with the curriculum task force, should define the characteristics of high-quality instruction.
    1. Key instructional practices should be prioritized as the district’s non-negotiables.

2. Once a model of instructional practice is identified and defined, district leaders should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.
  - a. Using grade level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time, and/or professional development days, the district is encouraged to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model.
3. 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:**

- *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.
- *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.
- ESE's *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
- *Model Curriculum Units* ([http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx\\_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu](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.

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu\\_guide.pdf](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.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *Mathematics Framework Exploration Activities* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/mathexplore/default.html>) are a growing set of activities designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education mathematics staff and educators. The activities can be accessed and used to promote discussion and collaborative inquiry.
- *Science and Technology/Engineering Concept and Skill Progressions* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/ste/default.html>) articulate of possible ways for students to progress through levels of understanding of concepts.
- ESE's *Writing Standards in Action* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/wsa/>) provide examples of high-quality student writing with annotations that highlight how each piece demonstrates competence in learning standards at each grade level.
- The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards Implementation Guide (Part I)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/Guidance-p1.pdf>) provides general information about the WIDA ELD standards framework, expectations for district implementation, and available support.

**Benefits** of implementing this recommendation:

- Comprehensive and coherent curriculum ensures horizontal and vertical alignment and optimizes instructional time.
- A clearly articulated and comprehensive curriculum review process guarantees currency of curriculum, dedicated time to complete work in a timely way, and a system for reviewing and updating instructional materials.
- Clear and articulated expectations for administrators and teachers of what constitutes high-quality teaching provides a common language that facilitates more focused feedback and professional development.
- A consistent instructional model that focuses on rigor and on challenging students will likely lead to professional growth and improved student achievement.

## **Assessment**

- 4. To build a data-driven culture, the district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data.**
  - A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers and the director of curriculum, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.
    1. The district should establish a data team at the junior/senior high school.
      - a. The data teams should have a collaborative leadership structure in which faculty and administrators work together formally and communicate regularly and systematically. Data teams should have clearly defined authority and responsibilities, closely aligned goals and objectives, and be provided with the resources and supports needed to sustain their efforts.
  - B.** The district should provide focused and sustained professional development for all staff in the identification and development of valid and reliable student assessments, including district-determined measures (DDMs). Ongoing training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided for staff in every school, grade level, and content area.
  - C.** The data system should provide educators with convenient, real-time access to student performance data as well as to other relevant academic and demographic data, as appropriate.
  - 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, district and school improvement plans, and the evaluation of education programs.

### **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, districts 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.
- *District-Determined Measures* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquEalxpfpzD6qG9zxvPWl0c>) is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.

**Benefits:** Having a unified system of assessments that measures student progress toward learning standards and includes an organized process of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data will mean improved and more targeted instruction and student support services, enhanced curriculum, and better informed educational policy and decision making. Ultimately, the district will provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

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

#### **5. The district should develop policies and practices to effectively promote the culture of growth-oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation that is the goal of the educator evaluation system.**

- A.** The Educator Evaluation Committee should review current supervisor policies, practices, and expectations to ensure that the quantity and quality of evaluative feedback, both written and verbal, is enhanced.
  1. Evaluators should serve as instructional coaches/mentors to educators, to engage them in an ongoing, performance-based, collaborative dialogue, thereby providing them with informal and formal feedback, guidance and support that is continuous, frequent, and focused on specific professional practice and skills.
  2. The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of principals and supervisors to ensure that they are regularly providing staff with high-quality instructional feedback that is timely, informative, instructive, and designed to promote individual growth and overall effectiveness. Administrators should receive ongoing training to enhance their ability to observe and to analyze instruction and to provide feedback focused directly on professional practice, growth, and student achievement.
- B.** The superintendent should continue to implement the next steps related to the district's 2014-2015 educator evaluation goal "to complete calibration of administration in and across buildings."
- C.** In order to meet the current requirements of the state educator evaluation regulations, the district should develop and use multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement in order to create valid and reliable Student Impact Ratings.
  1. The district should accelerate, prioritize, and properly resource the development of District Determined Measures (DDMs). In order to meet state requirements and adhere to the district's DDMs Implementation Plan, DDMs that are integral to curriculum and instruction and can provide meaningful data to educators should be implemented in the district this

year in all areas, with the exception of the specific areas for which Millbury was granted an extension.

- D. The district should consider reaching out to ESE's Center for Educator Effectiveness to identify districts that have successfully streamlined the evaluation process.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *District-Determined Measures* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/>) provides a wealth of information, implementation resources, and other materials to support the development and use of DDMs.
- *Rating Educator Performance* ([www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/RatingEdPerformance.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/RatingEdPerformance.pdf)) is a guide to assist educators and evaluators in the determination of Summative Performance Ratings.
- *Rating Educator Impact: The Student Impact Rating* ([www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/EducatorImpact.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/EducatorImpact.pdf)) is a guide to assist educators and evaluators in the determination of Student Impact Ratings.
- *Quick Reference Guide: Student and Staff Feedback* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf>) includes an overview, resource links, and FAQ related to student and staff feedback.
- *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.

**Benefits:** When educators and evaluators are provided timely, relevant, and continuous feedback for improved practice and ongoing, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, improved professional practice and student achievement will likely result.

**6. The district should develop a professional development plan aligned with district improvement initiatives.**

- A. The district should outline and document a set of learning experiences for its educators that is systematic, sustained, and aligned.
1. Working with the professional development committee, district leaders should develop a professional development plan for the district that is aligned with DIP and SIP goals (see Leadership and Governance recommendation above).
  2. As part of the plan, the professional development committee should specify professional development needs, determine how they might be met, and recommend adjustments in professional development practices 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.

B. Professional development 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.

**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.
- *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=PLTuqmiQ9ssqt9EmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.
- The *PLC Expansion Project* website (<http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/>) is designed to support schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.
- *PBS LearningMedia* (<http://www.pbslearningmedia.org/>) is a free digital media content library that provides relevant educational resources for PreK-12 teachers. The flexible platform includes high-quality content tied to national curriculum standards, as well as professional development courses.
- *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.

**Benefits:** By developing a districtwide professional development plan that is driven by district improvement initiatives and includes expected learning experiences for educators and student achievement outcomes, the district will provide more focused and effective professional development.

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

---

### Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 20-23, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. John Kulevich, Ph.D., leadership and governance
2. Melanie Gallo, curriculum and instruction
3. Willette Johnson, assessment
4. James Hearn, *review team coordinator*, human resources and professional development
5. Christine Brandt, student support
6. John Kulevich, Ph.D./James Hearn, financial and asset management

### District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager and two business office support staff.

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

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent; the director of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the director of pupil personnel services, and the business manager.

The team visited the following schools: Elmwood Street (PK-3), Raymond E. Shaw Elementary (grades 4-6), and Millbury Junior/Senior High School (grades 7-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 3 principals and focus groups with 5 elementary school teachers, and 14 junior and senior high school teachers.

The team observed 40 classes in the district: 12 at the high school, 10 at the junior high school, and 18 at the elementary schools.

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

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

**Site Visit Schedule**

<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
01/20/2015	01/21/2015	01/22/2015	01/23/2015
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to the Millbury Junior/Senior High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; interviews with school committee members; parent focus group; and visits to the Millbury Junior/Senior High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; visits to the Millbury Junior/Senior High School, and the Elmwood Street and Raymond C. Shaw elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to the Millbury Junior/Senior high school, and the Elmwood Street and Raymond C. Shaw elementary schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Millbury Public Schools  
2014-2015 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	24	1.4%	83,556	8.7%
Asian	31	1.8%	60,050	6.3%
Hispanic	122	7.0%	171,036	17.9%
Native American	2	0.1%	2,238	0.2%
White	1,504	86.3%	608,453	63.7%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	930	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	60	3.4%	29,581	3.1%
<b>All Students</b>	<b>1,743</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>955,844</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2014

**Table B1b: Millbury Public Schools  
2014-2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations<sup>3</sup>**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	314	--	18.0%	165,060	--	17.3%
Low Income	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs and Former ELLs	31	--	1.8%	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 1,767; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391.

<sup>3</sup> Because of changes in free-lunch policies in some districts the population of students from low-income families and high-needs students has not yet been calculated for the 2014-2015 school year.

**Table B2a: Millbury 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	144	90.1	92.9	88.9	87.5	82.6	-2.6	-1.4
	P+	144	72.0%	79.0%	69.0%	69.0%	57.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
4	CPI	96	80.6	80.5	86.2	83.9	79.1	3.3	-2.3
	P+	96	52.0%	54.0%	59.0%	61.0%	54.0%	9.0%	2.0%
	SGP	90	42	33	37	39	49	-3	2
5	CPI	143	92.4	85.5	90	90.4	84.5	-2	0.4
	P+	143	79.0%	63.0%	75.0%	73.0%	64.0%	-6.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	136	57.5	53	64.5	46	50	-11.5	-18.5
6	CPI	143	90.6	91.2	88.4	89.7	85.8	-0.9	1.3
	P+	143	72.0%	79.0%	68.0%	73.0%	68.0%	1.0%	5.0%
	SGP	135	57.5	52	53	49	50	-8.5	-4
7	CPI	123	91.1	87.7	93.4	86.8	88.3	-4.3	-6.6
	P+	123	73.0%	69.0%	80.0%	63.0%	72.0%	-10.0%	-17.0%
	SGP	113	48.5	46	35	46	50	-2.5	11
8	CPI	126	90.9	92.5	89	95.4	90.2	4.5	6.4
	P+	126	78.0%	81.0%	77.0%	87.0%	79.0%	9.0%	10.0%
	SGP	121	41	38.5	36.5	30	50	-11	-6.5
10	CPI	106	92.9	97.4	97.6	96.9	96	4	-0.7
	P+	106	78.0%	91.0%	94.0%	92.0%	90.0%	14.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	92	43	44	51.5	45.5	50	2.5	-6
All	CPI	881	89.9	89.5	90.4	90.1	86.7	0.2	-0.3
	P+	881	72.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	69.0%	2.0%	0.0%
	SGP	687	48	43	46	43	50	-5	-3

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: Millbury 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	145	89.7	86.1	86.3	87.2	85.1	-2.5	0.9
	P+	145	73.0%	67.0%	73.0%	73.0%	68.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	CPI	141	83.4	88.3	86.1	83.7	79.6	0.3	-2.4
	P+	141	55.0%	68.0%	60.0%	61.0%	52.0%	6.0%	1.0%
	SGP	132	79	71.5	63	53	50	-26	-10
5	CPI	144	90.2	81.9	89.3	85.8	80.4	-4.4	-3.5
	P+	144	78.0%	64.0%	73.0%	66.0%	61.0%	-12.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	137	68	66	52	48	50	-20	-4
6	CPI	143	80.1	88.4	83	86.2	80.2	6.1	3.2
	P+	143	57.0%	72.0%	66.0%	69.0%	60.0%	12.0%	3.0%
	SGP	132	45.5	45.5	49	47.5	50	2	-1.5
7	CPI	123	74.4	78.3	84	73.2	72.5	-1.2	-10.8
	P+	123	52.0%	55.0%	64.0%	50.0%	50.0%	-2.0%	-14.0%
	SGP	112	52	49.5	40	53.5	50	1.5	13.5
8	CPI	126	69.8	70.8	74.6	82.3	74.7	12.5	7.7
	P+	126	46.0%	45.0%	53.0%	61.0%	52.0%	15.0%	8.0%
	SGP	121	31	37	45	43	50	12	-2
10	CPI	105	92.2	92.3	91.2	90.2	90	-2	-1
	P+	105	79.0%	81.0%	79.0%	80.0%	79.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	SGP	92	57	58	52	57.5	50	0.5	5.5
All	CPI	927	82.3	83.8	85	84.1	80.3	1.8	-0.9
	P+	927	62.0%	64.0%	67.0%	66.0%	60.0%	4.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	726	55	53	49	50	50	-5	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 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: Millbury 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	144	89.1	85.8	91.8	89.9	79	0.8	-1.9
	P+	144	69.0%	65.0%	77.0%	72.0%	53.0%	3.0%	-5.0%
8	CPI	126	70.1	76.1	74.8	80.4	72.4	10.3	5.6
	P+	126	38.0%	46.0%	42.0%	47.0%	42.0%	9.0%	5.0%
10	CPI	97	84.2	89.9	87.9	86.3	87.9	2.1	-1.6
	P+	97	61.0%	71.0%	67.0%	68.0%	71.0%	7.0%	1.0%
All	CPI	367	80.2	83.6	84.9	85.7	79.6	5.5	0.8
	P+	367	55.0%	60.0%	62.0%	62.0%	55.0%	7.0%	0.0%

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE.

**Table B3a: Millbury 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	369	79.9	80	81.9	81	1.1	-0.9
		P+	369	49.0%	53.0%	55.0%	53.0%	4.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	271	49	37	42.5	37	-12	-5.5
	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
Low Income	District	CPI	268	83.7	84	86.3	84.5	0.8	-1.8
		P+	268	59.0%	61.0%	64.0%	59.0%	0.0%	-5.0%
		SGP	195	50	37	43	39	-11	-4
	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	168	70.7	67.4	69.6	68.6	-2.1	-1
		P+	168	27.0%	30.0%	30.0%	30.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	115	46.5	33	44	35	-11.5	-9
	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	26	0	75	82.1	76.9	76.9	-5.2
		P+	26	0.0%	40.0%	48.0%	42.0%	42.0%	-6.0%
		SGP	16	0	0	0	0	0	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	881	89.9	89.5	90.4	90.1	0.2	-0.3
		P+	881	72.0%	74.0%	74.0%	74.0%	2.0%	0.0%
		SGP	687	48	43	46	43	-5	-3
	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: Millbury 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	391	71.1	72.4	74.4	72.1	1	-2.3
		P+	391	41.0%	44.0%	48.0%	46.0%	5.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	287	50	48.5	48	49	-1	1
	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
Low Income	District	CPI	285	74.4	77.4	78.7	75.8	1.4	-2.9
		P+	285	49.0%	54.0%	57.0%	51.0%	2.0%	-6.0%
		SGP	205	54	48.5	48	49	-5	1
	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	177	61.3	59.4	56.4	54.7	-6.6	-1.7
		P+	177	23.0%	22.0%	19.0%	21.0%	-2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	123	48	52.5	44	47	-1	3
	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	30	0	64.3	78.6	69.2	69.2	-9.4
		P+	30	0.0%	36.0%	57.0%	43.0%	43.0%	-14.0%
		SGP	18	0	0	0	0	0	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	927	82.3	83.8	85	84.1	1.8	-0.9
		P+	927	62.0%	64.0%	67.0%	66.0%	4.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	726	55	53	49	50	-5	1
	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: Millbury 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	138	69.6	75.8	75.5	77	7.4	1.5
		P+	138	37.0%	45.0%	44.0%	45.0%	8.0%	1.0%
	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%
Low Income	District	CPI	97	70.1	77	78.2	79.6	9.5	1.4
		P+	97	38.0%	49.0%	50.0%	51.0%	13.0%	1.0%
	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	64	63.9	65.5	64.1	67.2	3.3	3.1
		P+	64	28.0%	26.0%	25.0%	25.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
	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	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
	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	367	80.2	83.6	84.9	85.7	5.5	0.8
		P+	367	55.0%	60.0%	62.0%	62.0%	7.0%	0.0%
	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: Millbury 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	1.1%	1.4%	1.6%	1.5%	0.4	36.4%	-0.1	-6.3%	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: Millbury 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	57	87.5%	81.4%	80.0%	86.0%	-1.5	-1.7%	6.0	7.5%	76.5%
Low income	42	86.0%	84.1%	76.7%	88.1%	2.1	2.4%	11.4	14.9%	75.5%
Students w/ disabilities	22	82.4%	70.0%	73.5%	68.2%	-14.2	-17.2%	-5.3	-7.2%	69.1%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.9%
All students	123	94.3%	90.2%	89.7%	91.9%	-2.4	-2.5%	2.2	2.5%	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: Millbury 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	50	83.6%	87.5%	88.1%	84.0%	0.4	0.5%	-4.1	-4.7%	79.2%
Low income	30	86.4%	86.0%	90.9%	83.3%	-3.1	-3.6%	-7.6	-8.4%	78.3%
Students w/ disabilities	34	82.1%	82.4%	80.0%	76.5%	-5.6	-6.8%	-3.5	-4.4%	72.9%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	70.9%
All students	116	90.0%	94.3%	94.3%	91.4%	1.4	1.6%	-2.9	-3.1%	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: Millbury 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	95.5%	95.6%	95.5%	96.2%	0.7	0.7%	0.7	0.7%	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: Millbury 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	6.4%	6.6%	6.9%	0.9%	-5.5	-85.9%	-6.0	-70.0%	2.1%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	3.6%	5.1%	5.2%	3.1%	-0.5	-13.9%	-2.1	-40.4%	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: Millbury Public Schools  
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$17,549,535	\$17,572,271	\$18,189,439	\$18,191,320	\$18,773,838	\$18,896,681
By municipality	\$5,750,227	\$5,878,475	\$6,030,656	\$5,986,716	\$6,249,135	\$6,297,285
Total from local appropriations	\$23,299,762	\$23,450,746	\$24,220,095	\$24,178,036	\$25,022,973	\$25,193,966
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$2,333,903	--	\$2,226,931	--	\$2,268,634
Total expenditures	--	\$25,784,649	--	\$26,404,967	--	\$27,462,600
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$6,566,950	--	\$6,638,870	--	\$6,745,942
Required local contribution	--	\$10,291,233	--	\$10,391,532	--	\$10,537,672
Required net school spending**	--	\$16,858,183	--	\$17,030,402	--	\$17,283,614
Actual net school spending	--	\$20,791,627	--	\$21,310,816	--	\$22,533,871
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$3,933,444	--	\$4,280,414	--	\$5,250,257
Over/under required (%)	--	23.3	--	25.1	--	30.4

\*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 January 29, 2015

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

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Administration	\$325	\$335	\$354
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$595	\$657	\$719
Teachers	\$5,083	\$5,194	\$5,267
Other teaching services	\$829	\$919	\$978
Professional development	\$135	\$128	\$138
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$329	\$293	\$245
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$386	\$340	\$383
Pupil services	\$1,075	\$1,173	\$1,224
Operations and maintenance	\$1,230	\$1,186	\$1,289
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,138	\$2,515	\$2,501
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$12,123</b>	<b>\$12,741</b>	<b>\$13,099</b>

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%
	JRHS	0%	10%	90%
	HS	0%	0%	100%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	1	39
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	3%	98%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	0%	17%	83%
	JRHS	0%	22%	78%
	HS	0%	0%	100%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	5	34
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	13%	87%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0%	6%	94%
	JRHS	0%	20%	80%
	HS	0%	17%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	5	35
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	13%	88%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	0%	13%	87%
	JRHS	10%	40%	50%
	HS	8%	8%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	2	7	28
	<b>Total %</b>	5%	19%	76%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	6%	17%	78%
	JRHS	30%	20%	50%
	HS	0%	8%	92%
	<b>Total #</b>	4	6	30
	<b>Total %</b>	10%	15%	75%
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0%	11%	89%
	JRHS	0%	10%	90%
	HS	0%	0%	100%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	3	37
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	8%	93%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	6%	50%	44%
	JRHS	20%	60%	20%
	HS	17%	25%	58%
	<b>Total #</b>	5	18	17
	<b>Total %</b>	13%	45%	43%

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	56%	17%	28%
	JRHS	40%	40%	20%
	HS	67%	0%	33%
	<b>Total #</b>	22	7	11
	<b>Total %</b>	55%	18%	28%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	ES	28%	28%	44%
	JRHS	20%	40%	40%
	HS	0%	25%	75%
	<b>Total #</b>	7	12	21
	<b>Total %</b>	18%	30%	53%
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	39%	28%	33%
	JRHS	80%	0%	20%
	HS	67%	8%	25%
	<b>Total #</b>	23	6	11
	<b>Total %</b>	58%	15%	28%
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	17%	50%	33%
	JRHS	50%	20%	30%
	HS	17%	25%	58%
	<b>Total #</b>	10	14	16
	<b>Total %</b>	25%	35%	40%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	22%	17%	61%
	JRHS	20%	40%	40%
	HS	17%	25%	58%
	<b>Total #</b>	8	10	22
	<b>Total %</b>	20%	25%	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%	28%	72%
	JRHS	0%	60%	40%
	HS	0%	17%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	0	13	27
	<b>Total %</b>	0%	33%	68%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students’ learning needs.	ES	0%	33%	67%
	JRHS	20%	40%	40%
	HS	0%	17%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	2	12	26
	<b>Total %</b>	5%	30%	65%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	6%	28%	67%
	JRHS	40%	50%	10%
	HS	17%	33%	50%
	<b>Total #</b>	7	14	19
	<b>Total %</b>	18%	35%	48%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	33%	22%	44%
	JRHS	20%	40%	40%
	HS	25%	25%	50%
	<b>Total #</b>	11	11	18
	<b>Total %</b>	28%	28%	45%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	6%	33%	61%
	JRHS	30%	50%	20%
	HS	8%	17%	75%
	<b>Total #</b>	5	13	22
	<b>Total %</b>	13%	33%	55%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	ES	28%	33%	39%
	JRHS	30%	60%	10%
	HS	25%	33%	42%
	<b>Total #</b>	11	16	13
	<b>Total %</b>	28%	40%	33%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	22%	50%	28%
	JRHS	50%	20%	30%
	HS	8%	50%	42%
	<b>Total #</b>	10	17	13
	<b>Total %</b>	25%	43%	33%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	39%	28%	33%
	JRHS	30%	50%	20%
	HS	42%	50%	8%
	<b>Total #</b>	15	16	9
	<b>Total %</b>	38%	40%	23%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	22%	50%	28%
	JRHS	10%	50%	40%
	HS	25%	25%	50%
	<b>Total #</b>	8	17	15
	<b>Total %</b>	20%	43%	38%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	44%	11%	44%
	JRHS	70%	10%	20%
	HS	67%	8%	25%
	<b>Total #</b>	23	4	13
	<b>Total %</b>	58%	10%	33%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	22%	22%	56%
	JRHS	10%	50%	40%
	HS	17%	0%	83%
	<b>Total #</b>	7	9	24
	<b>Total %</b>	18%	23%	60%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	56%	28%	17%
	JRHS	90%	10%	0%
	HS	67%	17%	175
	<b>Total #</b>	27	8	5
	<b>Total %</b>	68%	20%	13%