District Review Report

Maynard Public Schools

Review conducted January 21-24, 2014

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

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

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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

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

Maynard Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2013-2014 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Maynard Public Schools was conducted from January 21-24, 2014. The site visit included 33 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 60 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted three focus groups with four elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and eight high school teachers.

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 43 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

Maynard has a town manager 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.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2010. The district leadership team includes the interim director of curriculum, the business advisor, and the director of student services. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past three years. The district has three principals leading three schools. There are assistant principals at each school. There were 123 teachers in the district in 2013-2014. Grade 8 was moved to the high school in September 2013.

In the 2013-2014 school year, 1,418 students were enrolled in the district's 3 schools:

Table 1: Maynard Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Green Meadow	EES	PK-3	522
Fowler School	ESMS	4-7	466
Maynard High School	HS	8-12	430
Totals	**3 schools**	**PK-12**	**1,418**
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2009 and 2014 overall student enrollment increased by 7 percent (93 students). Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 49 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2012: $13,696 compared with $11,883 (see District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance[1]

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

- The 2013 cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) for the district was 49 for all students and 42 for high needs students, with the target being 75.
- Maynard High is a Level 1 school in the 68th percentile of high schools with a 2013 cumulative PPI of 91 for all students.
    - There are two Level 2 schools in Maynard, Green Meadow (PK-3) and Fowler (grades 4-8). [2]
    - Green Meadow's 2013 cumulative PPI is 74 for all students and 32 for high needs students.
    - Fowler is in the 50th percentile of elementary-middle schools with a 2013 cumulative PPI of 42 for all students and 42 for high needs students.

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

- ELA CPI was 86.8 in 2013, below the district's target of 89.3.
- Math CPI was 74.2 in 2013, below the district's target of 82.1.
- Science CPI was 77.6 in 2013, below the district's target of 84.8.

ELA proficiency was above the state rate for the district as a whole and for most tested grades.

- ELA proficiency for all students in the district was 70 percent in 2010 and 72 percent in 2013, 3 percentage points above the state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency in 2013 was above the state rate by 2 to 5 percentage points in grades 5, 7, and 10, and by 11 percentage points in grades 3 and 6.
    - ELA proficiency was higher in 2013 than 2010 by 7 to 14 percentage points in grades 5, 6, 7, and 10.
- ELA proficiency was below the state rate by 3 to 4 percentage points in grades 4 and 8. ELA proficiency was lower in 2013 than 2010 by 6 to 9 percentage points in grades 3, 4, and 8.

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

[2] Fowler served grades 4-8 during the years for which data is provided in the report. Grade 8 was moved to the high school in September 2013.

Math proficiency rates for all students in the district and grades 3 through 8 were lower than the state proficiency rate in 2013. Math proficiency rates for high needs students and students from low income families were below the state rates.

- Math proficiency for all students in the district was 51 percent in 2013, 3 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 54 percent, and below the 2013 state rate of 61 percent.
- Math proficiency in 2013 was below the state rate by 2 percentage points in grade 3, 8 percentage points in grades 6 and 7, and 14 to 19 percent in grades 4, 5, and 8.
    - Math proficiency was lower in 2013 than in 2010 by 4 to 8 percentage points in grades 3, 7, and 8, and by 18 percentage points in grade 4.
- Math proficiency for high needs students was 23 percent in 2013, 4 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 27 percent, and 17 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 40 percent.
- Math proficiency for low income students was 24 percent in 2013, lower than the 2010 rate of 31 percent, and 17 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 41 percent.

Science proficiency for all students in the district was lower in 2013 than in 2010. The overall decline was driven by drops in science proficiency in grade 5.

- Science proficiency for all students in the district was 50 percent in 2013, 3 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 53 percent, and the 2013 state rate of 53 percent.
- In grade 5 science proficiency was 44 percent in 2013, 18 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 62 percent, and lower than the 2013 state rate of 51 percent.
- In grade 8 science proficiency was 39 percent in 2010 and 37 percent in 2013, 2 percentage points below the state rate of 39 percent.

Grade 10 made large improvements in ELA, math, and science proficiency rates and performed above the state rate in each subject.

- Grade 10 ELA proficiency was 93 percent in 2013, 14 percent points higher than the 2010 rate of 79 percent, and 2 percentage points above the 2013 state rate of 91 percent.
- Grade 10 math proficiency was 83 percent in 2013, 15 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 68 percent, and 3 percentage points above the 2013 state rate of 80 percent.
- Grade 10 science proficiency was 78 percent in 2013, 15 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 63percent, and 7 percentage points above the 2013 state rate of 71 percent.

Maynard reached the 2013 four year cohort graduation target of 80 percent and the five year cohort graduation target of 85 percent.

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 86.8 percent in 2013, higher than the 2010 rate of 84.3 percent, and the 2013 state rate of 85 percent.[3]
- The five year cohort graduation rate was 82.8 percent in 2012, lower than the 2009 rate of 88.2 percent, and lower that the 2012 state rate of 87.5 percent.
- Between 2010 and 2013 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate for Maynard was consistently lower than the state rate and was 1.7 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 2.2 percent.

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

Maynard Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. The Maynard school district is characterized by a culture of collaboration.

A. The superintendent of schools has communicated a vision for the Maynard Public Schools and a process through which this vision is to be realized.

1. In an interview with the district leadership team, the superintendent spoke of his vision of having the district embrace 21st century learning. In defining his vision, the superintendent stressed the importance of providing expanded opportunities for student learning, developing college and career partnerships, integrating technology into the classroom, and having a global vision.

2. The superintendent's vision has been realized in a number of ways.

   a. His desire to expand student learning has been realized through the creation of a Spanish immersion program, the implementation of a senior capstone project, and the overall expansion of the academic program at the high school.

   b. The high school has developed, with Mass Bay Community College, a program that enables Maynard High School students to receive college credit for high school courses.

   c. Maynard High School has implemented a one-to-one iPad program, and plans are being formulated to increase student access to technology at Green Meadow and Fowler.

   d. The superintendent's global vision was observed during the onsite visit as he met with the president of the YuanBo Education Group to explore forming a partnership with a Chinese school. Through this partnership, the superintendent hopes to host 15 Chinese students at Maynard High School in 2014-2015.

3. Interviews and a document review showed that the superintendent operates a school system collaboratively and communicates effectively.

   a. During his first weeks as superintendent, the superintendent conducted a series of focus groups as he constructed an entry plan. One such meeting involved a group of parents whose students attended a Spanish immersion pre-school; these parents expressed an interest in bringing the program to the elementary school. School committee members told the review team that the superintendent worked collaboratively and effectively with these parents and the program was thriving.

b. Recently the district considered moving grade 3 students to the Fowler school. The issue was considered at several school committee meetings, several parent meetings were held, and a variety of data was reviewed. As a result, the decision was made to maintain the current school configuration.

B. This vision has been both accepted and reflected by key stakeholders of the Maynard school community.

1. The vision and mission statements of the school committee reflect the district's focus on 21st century learning and the importance of educating all students.

2. In interviews principals spoke of the importance of innovation and new programs, while praising the importance of being service-oriented and communicating well.

3. In interviews conducted at Green Meadow and Fowler, teachers articulated an understanding of the district's vision. Teachers focused on the importance of helping all students reach their potential through the use of differentiated instruction and other interventions. They also spoke of the importance of maintaining a safe school environment and in using technology to promote student learning.

4. Town officials described the school district as a "partner" and said that a collaborative environment had opened the door to a number of shared initiatives.

Impact: The Maynard school district's emphasis on caring and collaboration resonates through the community. It is likely that this culture has led to community support for the schools as evidenced by the vote in October 2010 to construct a new high school and the annual funding of the schools well above net school spending. Each group of stakeholders appears to be invested in the progress of the district, in each school's improvement and in raising student achievement.

Assessment

2. The district uses a variety of assessments in its elementary, middle, and high schools to monitor student progress.

A. Teachers and school leaders indicated that a variety of formative and benchmark assessments are used in the elementary schools.

1. In the elementary school teachers primarily use the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early LIterary Skills (DIBELs) and the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA).

2. The elementary school has implemented the use of technology (netbooks) to monitor and assess their own academic progress.

3. Reflex Math is used in grades 2 to 6 and gives students information directly so that they can assess their learning daily.

B. Teachers and administrators reported that the middle school uses the following assessments:

   1. In grades 5 to 7, literacy assessments are used to inform educational decisions for student learning. Teachers use DIBELs to assess student reading levels.

   2. Teachers use unit tests and teacher-created tests to assess content knowledge,

C. Teachers and administrators told the team that the district has recently implemented the Renaissance Learning Program for Mathematics and English Language Arts in grades 2 to 8. This program provides immediate assessment for the purpose of student re-teaching and acceleration and can be used in individual classrooms or across grades and between elementary and middle schools.

D. Interviews and a review of documents revealed that the high school uses a variety of methods to assess student learning.

   1. The high school uses tests, oral presentations, reports, research papers, a senior project, and student evaluation.

   2. The 2012 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) report stated that the high school consistently used rubrics aligned with the curriculum. Teachers consistently provided students with appropriate rubrics before summative assessments.

   3. In the 2011 self-study survey done by the Endicott Research Center in preparation for the evaluation of the high school by the visiting committee, 85 percent of students reported that they understood in advance what work they had to accomplish to meet teacher expectation and rubrics were used to assess their work, particularly in English and mathematics. The 2012 NEASC report stated that a variety of summative assessments were used across all content areas.

   4. Administrators and teachers told the review team that department or team-based pre- and post-tests are used to assess student understanding.

Impact: Because assessments are used consistently in the elementary, middle, and high schools they are able to provide teachers with reliable data to adjust instruction and plan interventions to improve student achievement. The use of Renaissance in grades 2 to 8 provides the district with information about program and instructional strengths and areas in need of improvement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

3. As a Race to the Top district, Maynard began to implement the new educator evaluation system in 2012-2013 and is working to improve its effectiveness.

A. Interviews and a document review showed that the district has fully implemented the educator evaluation system for all educators.

1. A review of 2012-2013 educator evaluations showed that 63.7 percent of educators (n=84) were evaluated, including 10 school leaders, 52 teachers with professional status, and 19 teachers without professional status. District leaders reported that, in fact, 100 percent of staff were evaluated under the new system but all 100 percent were not identified in an electronic transfer because of software glitches.

B. The district adopted the ESE's model language after collaborative meetings with the Maynard Education Association.

1. The model language is part of the 2011-2014 Agreement between the Maynard school committee and the Maynard Education Association. The school committee voted to accept the ESE model on August 23, 2012.

2. According to district and teachers' association leaders, the implementation of the educator evaluation model grew out of discussion between the superintendent and association leaders. A management and labor team (MALT), made up of representatives from the district, association leadership, and teachers, met at least monthly to discuss and develop the evaluation model. The MALT met 8-10 times in 2012-2013 to monitor the implementation of the model.

C. The district conducted evaluator training in the summer of 2012.

1. All primary evaluators and teachers received training, according to district leaders and a review of 2013-2014 district goals.

2. A review of professional development calendars and of the status of district goal activity, as well as information provided by the superintendent, showed that in August of 2012, teachers received training from Kim Marshall and Teachers 21 in self-assessment and the development of SMART goals. District leaders indicated that the district needed to improve the self-assessment and goal setting process and the 2013-2014 professional development calendar includes follow-up training PK-12 facilitated by principals and teacher leaders.

D. The superintendent said that the new evaluation system has resulted in the principals being in the classroom more often. Principals told the review team that this gave them an opportunity to have "rich conversations" with teachers and helped define what was needed for proficient teaching.

1. Teachers told the team that they were comfortable with and liked the new evaluation process because it gave them a full picture of their work. They said that they welcomed the feedback they received.

E. The district uses TeachPoint as the educator evaluation management system. Evaluation information such as self-assessments, mini-observations, formative and summative assessments, and SMART goals and action plans are uploaded to the TeachPoint system.

F. A review of 12 randomly selected teacher personnel files showed that they all included self-assessments, mini-observations, formative or summative assessments, and SMART goals and action plans. Three files were for teachers without professional status who were all on directed growth plans. Nine files were for teachers with professional status. Eight were for teachers on self-directed plans and one was for a teacher on a developing plan. All evaluations were informative, instructive, and conducive to learning. All teachers held an appropriate license.

G. A review of the personnel files of ten administrators, including the superintendent, showed that all administrators who were scheduled for an evaluation had been evaluated. All had summative evaluations that included goals, commendations, and in a number of cases, recommendations. All administrators were licensed.

1. School committee minutes from July 26, 2012, noted that principals, directors, and superintendents were required to follow educator evaluation guidelines set by the state.

2. School committee minutes showed that the goals of the superintendent were discussed and updated from goals initially set at school committee meetings.

H. In September 2013, the district submitted a District-Determined Measures (DDM) Piloting Plan to ESE. The plan contained the required DDMs for the district, including DDMs for early grade literacy (K-3) and mathematics (grades 2-3), middle grade mathematics (grades 5-8), high school writing to text (grades 9-12), and physical education (grades 9-12).

1. Professional development about DDMs was scheduled at the three schools on seven early release days during the 2013-2014 school year.

Impact: The district has fully implemented the new educator evaluation system and has developed a district goal to monitor the effectiveness of the system. This will likely lead to improved teaching and learning and increased student proficiency and growth.

Student Support

4. The district has a process in place in all schools to identify and respond to students' academic and non-academic needs. The district provides interventions for struggling students and opportunities for students ready for accelerated work.

A. Each school has a building-based student support team (BBST).

1. Administrators, teachers, and support staff, including school counselors, team chairpersons, and school psychologists, told the team that each school has a BBST. Documents reviewed by the team indicated that students may be referred to a BBST by a teacher, by a team, or by a parent (at the elementary level).

2. BBST teams meet weekly at the elementary and middle schools and monthly at the high school.

3. A review of documents showed that teachers at the elementary and middle schools referring students to BBST teams for academic concerns provide specific data about ELA and mathematics performance.

4. At the high school a more open-ended referral form is circulated among all the teachers of a particular student to gather information about subject difficulties, strengths, challenges, and successful strategies.

B. Academic interventions are in place in each school.

1. Interviewees said, and documents confirmed, that reading interventions are provided during literacy blocks at the elementary level with Title I support for students who have been identified from classwork and data results. Title I interventions are 30 to 40 minutes per day, three to five days a week.

2. Interviewees reported that the middle school has a block of time set aside for interventions. During the site visit the team was told that the school uses two interventions blocks a week for mathematics and literacy support. Students are grouped according to what they need based on results from literacy and Renaissance assessments in math, and groups are flexible.

3. Administrators told the review team, and teachers confirmed, that the high school provides several opportunities for academic interventions.

a. There is academic support for struggling students during last period electives.

b. The high school has a homework club four days a week where teachers are available, and students are encouraged to attend.

c. Seniors are paired with underclassmen in the mentoring program to provide both academic tutoring and general high school support.

d. Peer tutoring is offered through the National Honor Society.

e. The high school also provides MCAS prep for mathematics.

C. Students' non-academic development is addressed in the district with support programs in class and interventions outside the classroom.

1. Interviewees reported that in addition to the BBST the elementary school has a family resource team, the middle school has a case management team, and the high school has regular principal's meetings to address student non-academic needs.

2. Interviewees described in-class support programs, including Al's Pals, Open Circle, and Responsive Classroom in the elementary school; and Responsive Classroom, Steps to Respect, and Second Step in the middle school.

3. Other interventions described by interviewees include "lunch bunch," social skills groups, counseling and support for the families through the Assabet Collaborative.

D. The district has created avenues to meet the needs of students who are ready for accelerated work.

1. The review team was told by central office administrators that the district is part of the Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth (CTY). The Center enrolls top students nationwide from grades 2 to 8 and is a gateway to participate in CTY's summer programs and online courses.

2. Interviewees reported that ten grade 5 students who were ready for more challenging math work were selected to work with the a grade 7 teacher who agreed to provide enrichment for them during a free period.

3. The team was told that the ten advanced placement classes are open to all students. Team members also were told by staff and students about the availability of courses through the Virtual High School. Interviewees said this high school is fully subscribed with 25 students.

Impact: Because the district has a reliable system to respond to students' academic and non-academic needs and because it has made provisions for students who are struggling or ready for accelerated work, the district is better able to improve their level of achievement.

5. The district has created a supportive environment for students with clearly communicated behavior expectations and positive behavior interventions.

A. The district has created a supportive environment.

1. Principals said that students often come to school with a lot on their plates and "we nurture them and support them." Others described their role as leaders as "being supportive."

2. Students said that one of greatest successes of the high school is that it is a small, close-knit community where they can talk with anybody and teachers are "approachable" and "easy going." They also said counselors are easily accessible.

3. The core values posted on schools' websites include: we are kind, we are safe, and we are learners (elementary school); respect, responsibility, results (middle school); academic competencies, social competencies (described as listening, communication and collaboration), and civic competencies (high school).

B. Behavior expectations are clearly communicated in the district.

1. The elementary school student handbook is available on the school's website in English, Spanish, and Portuguese. The handbook's outline of expectations of classroom behavior begins, "Students are expected to be verbally courteous to other students and to all adults." The outline of expected behavior is followed by a list of unacceptable behaviors and guidelines to behavior in the classroom, cafeteria, playground, hallways, assemblies, and restroom, and at arrival and dismissal times.

2. The middle school student handbook has a 15-page section entitled Student Code of Conduct, which includes Behavioral Expectations of Students. Additionally, the faculty handbook describes the expected protocol teachers are to follow using the Progressive Discipline Model.

3. High school students reported that the student handbook has information about behavior and consequences and said that the first five pages of the handbook are very specific about the code of behavior.

C. Positive behavior is recognized in each school.

1. Elementary staff serve on the Respectful School Committee. They plan assemblies, and perform skits; one member dresses up in a tiger suit to motivate students and students receive "paws" for good behavior.

2. The middle school's weekly post on its website includes congratulations to the "Do Right" students of the week. Principals and teachers noted that names are also read over the loudspeaker on Mondays.

3. High school students reported that one boy and one girl from each grade are recognized monthly for improvement, citizenship or acts of kindness. They receive certificates and their names are posted in class.

D. The review team found clear and consistent evidence of a positive learning environment in all the schools visited.

1. The tone of interactions between teachers and students and among students was positive and respectful in 100 percent of classrooms visited as noted in the instructional inventory (Appendix C).

2. Behavior standards were clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably in 95 percent of the classrooms visited.

Impact: Creating and maintaining a supportive environment with clearly outlined behavior expectations and recognizing students who demonstrate desired behaviors help to guarantee that all students have an environment focused on learning.

Financial and Asset Management

6. The school district has an effective budget development process and provides ample financial and school facility resources to meet the educational needs of students.

A. The budget development process is open, transparent, and participatory by stakeholders.

1. Funding schools has been described as an open process by school leaders and town officials. There is an environment of open communications between the district and town leadership and town meetings have been non-controversial with regard to the budget.

2. Administrators told the review team that there was a relationship between district goals, school goals, and the budget deliberation process.The budgeting and funding of math and literacy coaches, of the STEM coordinator position, and of the Spanish immersion programs are a few examples offered by administrators of how budget decisions were related to student needs.

3. The development of the school budget is a topic at parent council meetings.

4. Three budgets are generally developed: level funded, level service, and a growth budget. This enables the district to demonstrate the impact of budget decisions for the town leadership and for the community.

5. The district and town have a written agreement with municipal government expenses attributable to the district.

6. The town and school district share resources such as snow plowing, the completion of a facility condition assessment of the schools, and the creation of the position of town/school facility director.

B. The town provides ample financial resources in support of the school district. School district expenditures have exceeded the net school spending requirement by over 30 percent for fiscal years 2010-2013.

1. Town leaders including the selectmen, the finance committee, the town manager, and the town auditor meet with the school committee, the superintendent, and the business advisor to understand the needs of the district and to communicate the needs of the town.

2. The school budget is described as adequate by the superintendent and by the business advisor. New positions such as math and literacy coaches and the STEM coordinator have been added to the staff.

3. Total in- district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for 49 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2012: $13,696, compared with $11,883.

4. The Maynard community taxes to the levy limit.

C. Capital expenditures and the condition of the three school campuses demonstrate a commitment to the educational environment in which students learn and instruction takes place.

1. The community completed the construction of a new high school, which included the addition of the 8th grade.

a. In October 2010 the community voted to approve the construction of a $45 million high school and the high school opened in 2013.

b. The high school includes dedicated space for student programs such as art, music, technology, and the student-run WAVM radio and television station. Staff space includes common planning areas for each instruction area. And a one-to-one initiative for the use of iPads has been undertaken.

2. The town and school department created a joint facility director position to oversee all town buildings.

a. A facility maintenance management software program is being implemented to provide the structure for managing work orders, for preventive maintenance, and for the community use of schools.

b. Head custodians for each school are responsible for routine maintenance activities and communicate facility matters to the facility director, who helps with resolving issues.

This structure is designed to support the principals, who are responsible for the condition of the schools.

c. Equipment vendors provide professional development for custodial staff. The professional development for facility personnel enables the district to qualify for an insurance discount from the insurer.

d. Each of the three schools was clean, safe, and well maintained.

Impact: Because Maynard Public Schools have effectively managed their financial and capital assets they have been able to provide school facilities that support teaching and learning.

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

7. The Maynard school district has not yet established specific, measurable, rigorous, and time-bound (SMART) student performance goals.

A. A review of planning documents submitted by the central office and the schools showed that current school and district plans do not contain measurable goals that are connected to student performance.

1. The district plan, District Goals 2013-2014, contains a series of goals with related activities; however, the majority of goals are not time-based and none directly connect with measurable student achievement, nor do they assign responsibility to a particular individual.

2. The Green Meadow School Improvement Plan 2013-2016 is marked by a connection with the district plan through its emphasis on 21st century skills; however, its activities are not time-based, and neither a responsible party nor a specific process for achievement is identified.

3. The Fowler School Improvement Plan 2013-2015 contains goals and strategies and identifies responsible parties; however, the goals are general and contain no reference to measurement.

4. The Maynard High School Plan was submitted in the form of a copy of a PowerPoint presentation to the school committee on May 23, 2013. As such it consists of a series of bullet points that are related to ongoing improvement efforts in the school. There is little reference in this document to measurement or to the connection of the proposed activities to increased student achievement.

B. Principals told the review team that they agree that the district has not used a strategic approach to school improvement planning and that plans with benchmarks and timelines would be beneficial.

Impact:. Without the establishment of measureable targets, instructional focus and consistency in Maynard's schools may be compromised. The absence of improvement in MCAS scores in Maynard's schools in recent years could be connected to the district's missed opportunities to establish measureable targets for improved student performance in its improvement plans

Curriculum and Instruction

8. The elementary and middle schools do not have a complete set of curriculum documents that include the basic elements of standards, resources and materials, assessments, and sequence of learning aligned to the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. The district does not have a formal cycle of curriculum revision and review.

A. In both the elementary and middle schools, curriculum maps are incomplete or missing.

1. The elementary school does not have complete English language arts (ELA) documents that include writing, language and speaking, nor does it have complete mathematics or science documents.

    a. The curriculum map for elementary ELA includes only reading standards K-3; these are aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for ELA.
    b. The elementary school does not have math or science maps for grades 1 through 3.
    c. There is an aligned curriculum map for kindergarten math, but no science map.

2. The middle school has complete, aligned ELA documents for grades 4 through 7 but neither mathematics nor science maps.

    a. The maps at the middle school in ELA are robust and include all basic elements as well as well developed instructional strategies.

B. The high school has a complete set of curriculum maps for all subjects, electronically available to all teachers, students and parents.

1. The high school maps include robust elements but do not include instructional strategies.

C. According to administrators, the district does not have a formal plan of curriculum review or revision.

1. Teachers reported that the curriculum at the high school is revised during department meetings throughout the school year. Currently the district does not have formal alignment meetings in grades 6 through 12.

2. Teachers said that some ELA revision takes place during team meetings, but there is little alignment between the elementary and middle schools.

Impact: Without well-developed and aligned curriculum maps, teachers lack consistent expectations for content and may not consistently provide students with a guaranteed curriculum. Without regular and timely review the district cannot assure that the taught curriculum is aligned to state curriculum frameworks and to MCAS performance descriptions, nor that it is vertically aligned between grades and horizontally across grades and sections of the same course.

9. In its SIPs and district goals, the district does not have clear or measureable goals for student learning and achievement and there is a lack of clarity about who is responsible for leading and monitoring instructional improvement.

A. A review of current SIPs as well as of the 2013-2014 goals district found that goals included statements such as “improve literacy instruction,” “utilize curriculum frameworks,” “strengthen literacy,” “build capacity,” and “incorporate a variety of instructional practices.” However, the plans did not contain measureable goals tied to improving student achievement in these areas.

B. Neither the district goals in the 2013-2014 document nor the SIPs, except for Fowler, include a “person responsible” category.

C. Teachers and administrators had differeing views of who their instructional leaders were.

1. Interviewees identified teacher leaders, coaches, principals, the curriculum director, and Advanced Placement teachers as their instructional leaders.

a. Principals described their roles in instructional leadership in terms of inclusivity, support, and developing a culture of consensus building.

b. The director of curriculum is interim and part time and has many responsibilities in the district, including: curriculum alignment, data distribution, data analysis, the educator evaluation system, the professional development program, the mentoring program, monitoring SIPs, budget manager, and teacher leader and coach contact.

c. Coaches and teacher leaders described their work in terms of curriculum, instructional strategies, grouping, data analysis, and aligning curriculum.

Impact: Without having clear and measureable goals for student achievement, and with a lack of clarity about who is responsible for leading instructional improvement, the district may not achieve the goals in student achievement that it has set for itself.

10. The district provides a positive learning environment in most of its classrooms. However, instructional practices that promote high academic achievement for all students are inconsistently implemented throughout the district.

The team observed 43 classes throughout the district: 14 at the high school, 17 at the middle school, and 12 at the elementary school. The team observed 18 ELA classes, 13 mathematics classes, and 9 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were three special education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C. All results below are reported as an average of the scores from all classes observed in all three schools.

A. When asked what constitutes quality practices in instruction in the district, administrators suggested that the team would observe the following: use of agendas and mastery objectives, differentiated curriculum, active learners, good relationships, and a safe environment. As noted below, these practices were found in some, but not all, classrooms.

B. In nearly 100 percent of Maynard's classrooms the team observed a positive learning environment. The tone of interactions was positive and respectful in 100 percent of classrooms; behavioral standards were clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively in 95 percent of classrooms, and transitions and routines were well established with minimal loss of time in 93 percent of classrooms.

C. While the team found that teachers clearly and consistently demonstrated knowledge of subject and content, in 91 percent of classes visited there were inconsistent instructional practices leading to rigorous learning. For example:

1. The communication of clear learning objectives, use of multiple opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking, the use of questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses to demonstrate understanding, and the use of frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction were observed in 56 to 58 percent of visited classes.

2. The team saw clear and consistent evidence of lessons that reflect rigor and high expectations in 65 percent of classes.

3. Students elaborated about concepts and ideas when responding to questions in 33 percent of classes, and students articulated their thinking orally or in writing in 53 percent of classes. Nevertheless, students assumed responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups in 77 percent of classes, and teachers clearly and consistently implemented teaching strategies that promoted a learning environment where students could take risks, make predictions and judgments in 77 percent of classes observed.

4. Teachers used appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities, in 63 percent of visited classrooms.

Impact: District teachers provide a supporting and caring environment with clear behavioral expectations where all students can focus on learning. Because instructional practices to ensure high levels of achievement for all students are not fully implemented throughout the district, some students may not be provided with access to instruction and curriculum that is sufficiently rigorous to attain high achievement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

11. The district has provided sufficient time for professional development but does not explicitly link its professional development program to district and school improvement goals. It does not have a formal strategy to measure the success of its programs in raising student achievement.

A. The district has three full days of professional development which in 2013-2014 were held before the start of the school year so that teachers would be familiar with concepts and technology when classes started. Other scheduled professional development is provided during early release days. Maynard High School has 15 early release days; the Fowler School has 17 early release days; and the Green Meadow School has 22 early release days. On early release days, students are dismissed approximately two hours early and teachers attend professional development or planning sessions.

B. Although district leaders said that school and district goals, staff needs, and input from coaches drive professional development, the team found that professional development planning/scheduling documents do not show explicit alignment or connections to district, school, or teacher goals. Rather, documents include professional development as action strategies related to goals. For example, the district has a goal to improve literacy instruction K–12. One of the action strategies to meet this goal includes professional development on early release days to align and revise curricula. In another document, Professional Development Planning 2013-2014, the district outlines general professional development topics, such as social programming, technology, and literacy. Another document, entitled Professional Development Schedule 2013-2014, includes the professional development activities for early release days and identifies whether the activities are district or school based and lists the targeted attendees.

   Teachers told the team that professional development is sometimes differentiated. For instance, on some early release days professional development includes small teacher groups and teachers can attend conferences related to their skill or content area; the district pays for these. Professional development is also differentiated for teachers through supervision and evaluation, mentoring, and recommendations from coaches.

C. The Agreement between the teachers' association and the school committee indicates that the superintendent was expected to establish a professional development advisory committee in consultation with the president of the association to make recommendations for professional

development. The president of the association and district and school leaders said that this committee was not functioning.

Impact: Numerous opportunities are in place for professional development in the district; however, the absence of alignment in professional development planning to district, school, and teacher goals and of a focused approach to measuring the effectiveness of professional development dilutes district and school resources, inhibits the professional growth of staff and limits progress toward meeting district and school goals.

Finance and Asset Management

12. The district does not have documented facility maintenance plans, energy management plans, or capital improvement plans.

A. Administrators told the review team that the district does not have a facility maintenance management plan.

1. A maintenance management software system was purchased and is in process of being implemented.

    a. While this system will give the district the ability to track work orders, preventive maintenance activities, and community use of schools, it does not eliminate the need for a facility maintenance plan.

2. Maintenance activities are not clearly defined or assigned to staff.

3. Common cleaning standards have not been documented for each school.

4. The district does not document safety inspections of, for example, bleachers, playground, athletic fields, and chemical storage.

B. The district does not have a documented energy management plan.

1. Some energy management activities have taken place such as classroom lighting and building automated systems. Also, the high school was designed and built to meet the Collaborative High Performance School (CHPS) standards.

C. The district does not have a documented capital improvement plan to maximize and prolong the effective use of school facilities although it does monitor facility improvements.

1. A spreadsheet list of facility improvements is maintained by the facility director.

2. Numerous upgrades have taken place at the Fowler such as carpet removal, tile installation, and boiler replacements. The new high school is operational in 2013.

3. An assessment of the condition of the schools was performed four years ago.

Impact: Without documented plans, effective planning is compromised. Without a facility maintenance plan the district may not be able to proactively maintain its schools. Without an energy management plan the district is without an energy policy,and may find it more challenging to engage in energy conservation activities, obtain equipment upgrades, review its operations to insure efficiency, or take advantage of energy conservation funding opportunities. Without a documented capital improvement plan, long range planning and community support may be more difficult to achieve.

13. Different accounting systems are used by the town and by the district, and financial reports are provided to the school committee "as needed."

A. Different accounting systems are used by the town and the schools. Consequently, there is double entry of data.

B. Financial reports are provided to the school committee "as needed." School committee members expressed the opinion that monthly financial reports are not needed.

Impact: The use of different accounting systems by the town and the schools is less efficient than the use of one system by both and may introduce errors into the accounts. Sporadic finance reporting to the school committee does not keep members sufficiently informed and up to date as they make financial decisions and may hinder ensuring that spending stays within budget limits. Regularly reporting on the budget versus actual expenditures to date along with projections for end-of-year spending demonstrates that regular and accurate tracking of spending, revenues received, and other transactions by district staff are being completed. Regular reporting also demonstrates that forecasting and control procedures are in place to ensure that spending remains within budget limits. Regular financial reporting to the school committee is a best practice.

Maynard Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

1. The Maynard School District should adopt a planning process that establishes SMART goals.

A. The superintendent should develop a multi-year District Improvement Plan (DIP).

1. The plan should be created with input from key stakeholders and reflect the vision that has been established by the superintendent and school committee.

2. This plan should be developed after an extensive review of current student achievement data and other important measures to determine areas for improvement.

3. The plan should use a SMART goal format: specific and strategic; measurable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results-focused; and timed and tracked.

4. The DIP should be reviewed each year and activities and benchmarks should be adjusted to meet current conditions.

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

B. Each school should develop School Improvement Plans (SIP) that contain SMART goals that are aligned with the DIP.

1. This plan should be developed after an extensive review of current student achievement data and other important measures.

2. Principals should seek the input of their school councils and other key stakeholders as they construct their annual plans.

3. Principals should review their School Improvement Plans annually with the school committee.

4. The superintendent and/or district leaders should meet regularly with principals to review progress being made on their goals, especially to those that relate to student achievement.

5. The principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and as evidence during implementation.

6. Teachers should consider aligning the goals in their Educator Plans with SIP goals. Team goals may be an appropriate opportunity to focus on addressing growth areas identified in the SIP.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *District Standards and Indicators* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/StandardsIndicators.pdf) identify the characteristics of effective districts in supporting and sustaining school improvement.
    - The *District Self-Assessment* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/district-self-assessment.pdf) frames the District Standards and Indicators, along with key questions, in a rubric for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.
- *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 PK-12 academic experience. They were written to provide an explicit connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts' definition of College and Career Readiness. They are not recommended for use as a checklist, evaluation tool, or as an assessment tool, but they could be a helpful resource for districts as they articulate a vision and engage in long-term planning.
- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for districts as they develop or refine their DIP and SIPs.

Benefits: Formulating plans using SMART goals marked by clear objectives, benchmarks, and deadlines will establish a road map for the district. By developing a DIP, and aligned SIPs, the district will increase focus while promoting continuous improvement.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. The district should clarify roles and responsibilities with regard to leadership of curriculum and instruction, continue to develop a quality instructional model, and continue to develop a robust set of curriculum maps.

A. The district should clearly communicate its expectation concerning instructional leadership so that all stakeholders have a common understanding of roles and responsibilities regarding curriculum and instruction.

1. Principals, coaches and teacher leaders should be given clear guidance regarding their roles, and this information should be communicated so that all staff members have a shared understanding of these roles.

2. The role of the curriculum director should be clarified, relative to the role of the principals and others with responsibility for curriculum.

B. The district and each school should plan to develop teachers' capacity to implement the district's emerging instructional model through appropriate professional development, support, and monitoring.

1. In particular, emphasis should be placed on instructional practices that encourage higher order thinking and students' articulation and elaboration of their ideas, as well as formative assessment strategies.

2. Highly focused and intentional walkthroughs as described in the next recommendation would be a way to continue to refine the district's definition of high quality instruction, to identify strengths and areas for growth in instructional practice, to provide feedback, and to inform the district's professional development plan.

C. The district should continue to develop robust curriculum maps for all subjects and establish a cycle for continuous curriculum revision.

1. The development of curriculum maps should continue, with priority placed on those subjects and grade levels that currently lack them.

2. The district should create a plan for ongoing curriculum review and renewal for all grades and subjects.

3. The plan should include opportunities for ongoing horizontal and vertical alignment.

4. District leaders should consider putting all curriculum into an electronic platform, which could enhance the sharing of grade-level curriculum development, as well as facilitate on-going revisions and reviews of the documents.

Recommended resources:

- 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.

- *Curriculum Mapping: How to Develop Curriculum Maps to Support a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum that Guides Instruction* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.

- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- The Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.

- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.

- *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: By implementing this recommendation, the district will provide more consistent, effective high quality instruction to its students and guarantee access to an aligned, consistently delivered, and continuously improving curriculum. By clarifying instructional leadership roles, the district will ensure that it is efficiently and effectively supporting continuous instructional improvement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

3. District and school leaders should consider ways to more closely link professional development with district and school goals and to determine the effectiveness of professional development.

A. The district should evaluate its professional development program in light of its District Improvement Plan and School Improvement Plans (see Recommendation 1 above).

1. Professional development offerings should be revised as needed to ensure that they are carefully aligned with district and school goals.

B. The district should consider developing a protocol for a non-evaluative Learning Walk process to monitor the impact of professional development offerings on instruction and to inform professional development planning.

1. The Learning Walk process should be focused on standards-based practices and should include teachers and administrators.

C. In collaboration with the teachers' association, the superintendent should re-establish the professional development advisory committee to assist in the development of the Learning Walk process and/or other professional development planning.

D. Among other sources of data, staff surveys and the results of student assessments should inform professional development. The results of Learning Walks as well as student could also be used to determine what teachers are learning and where more training is needed.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

- *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.
- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/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.

Benefits: By using multiple sources of data to inform professional development planning, the district will ensure that its training and support for teachers is targeted to their needs and is designed to achieve short- and long-term goals. Reinstituting the professional development advisory committee will further enhance the culture of collaboration among teachers and administrators and will provide a way for teachers to have formal input into the district's professional development program.

Financial and Asset Management

4. **The district should develop formal and documented plans for school facility maintenance management, energy management, and capital planning.**

   A. The goal of a formal facility maintenance plan is to maximize and prolong the useful life of the facility while at the same time providing a safe, clean, well maintained environment that supports teaching and learning. Elements of the facility maintenance management plan would include but not be limited to: involving stakeholders, creating a vision, conducting a facility audit, establishing and identifying needs (such as cleanliness, student safety, addressing deferred maintenance), establishing priorities, collecting and using data to inform decisions, providing a safe environment, and managing staff and contractors.

   Benefits: The importance of a formal facility maintenance plan can serve as a master plan or "blueprint" for daily decision making. School facility maintenance planning will better protect the capital investment of the community, help to manage costs, and help to avoid equipment failure.

   B. Elements of the energy management plan would include but not be limited to: establishing a district policy, tracking energy consumption (electrical, heating, water, trash), conducting an energy audit, benchmarking, identifying an operations and management action plan, identifying quick and low cost initiatives, and recognizing and motivating staff.

   Benefits: An energy management plan would help the district reduce energy consumption and reduce energy costs. These funds could then be available for reallocation in the budget.

C. Elements of the capital plan would include but not be limited to: involving stakeholders, defining the dollar value of a capital project, conducting an audit of the facilities for capital projects, creating a process for conducting a facility needs assessment, utilizing life cycle modeling, planning for funding, and communicating with community leadership and members.

Benefits: A capital plan creates a process of identifying the facility needs of the district, projecting the due date for meeting facility needs and forecasting the funding and project completion dates. A formal well documented capital plan also provides the foundation for asset management and could help to prepare decision makers in planning for the replacement and upgrade of buildings and equipment.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *School Building Issues* web page (http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/sbuilding/) includes funding opportunities, guidelines, and resources related to school buildings.
- *Planning Guide for Maintaining School Facilities (*http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003347), from the National Center for Education Statistics, is intended to help school districts plan for efficient and effective operations. It addresses various topics, including conducting a facilities audit, planning and evaluating maintenance, and managing staff and contractors.
- *The Massachusetts School Checklist* (http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/gov/departments/dph/programs/environmental-health/exposure-topics/iaq/iaq-methods/the-mass-school-checklist.html) is a list of the most important environmental health and safety issues for schools to address. It includes regulations and industry standards/guidelines related to elements on the checklist, as well as additional resources.

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule

Review Team Members

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

1. Dr. Thomas Pandiscio, leadership and governance
2. Mary Eirich, curriculum and instruction
3. Dr. Kahris McLaughlin, assessment
4. James Hearns, human resources and professional development
5. Lenora Jennings, student support and review team coordinator
6. Roger Young, 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 advisor, town manager, town accountant, and town facilities director.

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

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, interim director of curriculum, business advisor, and director of student services

The team visited the following schools: Green Meadow (PK-3), Fowler School (grades 4-7), and Maynard High School (grades 8-12). Grade 8 was moved to the high school in September 2013.

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with three principals and focus groups with four elementary school teachers, five middle school teachers, and eight high school teachers.

The team observed 43 classes in the district: 14 at the high school, 17 at the middle school, and 12 at the elementary school.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Tuesday 01/21/2014	**Wednesday** 01/22/2014	**Thursday** 01/23/2014	**Thursday** 01/24/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association;	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; student focus group; parent focus group; and visits to Maynard High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Green Meadow and Fowler Schools and Maynard High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Green Meadow and Fowler Schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

Table B1a: Maynard Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	31	2.2%	82990	8.7%
Asian	37	2.6%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic	127	9.0%	162647	17.0%
Native American	1	0.1%	2209	0.2%
White	1173	82.7%	620628	64.9%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.1%	1007	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	48	3.4%	27803	2.9%
All Students	1418	100.0%	955739	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2013

Table B1b: Maynard Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	248	56.8%	17.4%	164336	34.8%	17.0%
Low Income	253	57.9%	17.8%	365885	77.5%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	29	6.6%	2.0%	75947	16.1%	7.9%
All high needs students	437	100.0%	30.6%	472001	100.0%	48.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2013. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,429; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,360.

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

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	129	90.5	82.7	85.6	86.6	83.3	-3.9	1
	P+	129	77.0%	60.0%	66.0%	68.0%	57.0%	-9.0%	2.0%
4	CPI	117	83.4	78.8	81.3	74.4	78.9	-9	-6.9
	P+	117	55.0%	44.0%	56.0%	49.0%	53.0%	-6.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	110	45	31	50	39	49	-6	-11
5	CPI	113	85.1	88.5	85.5	85.6	84.7	0.5	0.1
	P+	113	62.0%	66.0%	68.0%	71.0%	66.0%	9.0%	3.0%
	SGP	107	48	43	50	43	52	-5	-7
6	CPI	111	84.7	90.4	88.7	88.7	85.1	4	0
	P+	111	65.0%	71.0%	72.0%	78.0%	67.0%	13.0%	6.0%
	SGP	104	46	50.5	45	52	52	6	7
7	CPI	102	87.9	85.6	89.4	90.9	88.4	3	1.5
	P+	102	70.0%	64.0%	72.0%	77.0%	72.0%	7.0%	5.0%
	SGP	100	38	38	41	44.5	48	6.5	3.5
8	CPI	91	93.8	92.9	89.8	88.5	90.1	-5.3	-1.3
	P+	91	82.0%	84.0%	77.0%	75.0%	78.0%	-7.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	82	42	49	43	45	50	3	2
10	CPI	71	94	95.5	97.6	98.6	96.9	4.6	1
	P+	71	79.0%	90.0%	93.0%	93.0%	91.0%	14.0%	0.0%
	SGP	64	42.5	47	70	68.5	57	26	-1.5
All	CPI	734	88.2	87.2	87.8	86.8	86.8	-1.4	-1
	P+	734	70.0%	67.0%	71.0%	72.0%	69.0%	2.0%	1.0%
	SGP	567	43	42	51	47	51	4	-4

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

Table B2b: Maynard Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2010-2013

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	129	87.6	85.3	75.4	81.8	84.3	-5.8	6.4
	P+	129	72.0%	68.0%	50.0%	64.0%	66.0%	-8.0%	14.0%
4	CPI	123	80.2	77.6	79	66.3	80.2	-13.9	-12.7
	P+	123	51.0%	41.0%	46.0%	33.0%	52.0%	-18.0%	-13.0%
	SGP	114	47	36	48	35.5	54	-11.5	-12.5
5	CPI	112	74.4	80.1	76.6	71.7	80.6	-2.7	-4.9
	P+	112	46.0%	58.0%	54.0%	46.0%	61.0%	0.0%	-8.0%
	SGP	106	29	32	39	24.5	54	-4.5	-14.5
6	CPI	112	71.5	72.3	76.2	75.2	80.3	3.7	-1
	P+	112	48.0%	42.0%	53.0%	53.0%	61.0%	5.0%	0.0%
	SGP	104	34.5	28	27.5	48.5	50	14	21
7	CPI	103	74.2	70.8	72	68	74.4	-6.2	-4
	P+	103	48.0%	49.0%	46.0%	44.0%	52.0%	-4.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	99	47.5	55.5	64	41	46	-6.5	-23
8	CPI	90	75	73.4	67.9	68.3	76	-6.7	0.4
	P+	90	47.0%	48.0%	43.0%	41.0%	55.0%	-6.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	82	53	50	39	38.5	50	-14.5	-0.5
10	CPI	72	87.5	90.9	91.7	93.1	90.2	5.6	1.4
	P+	72	68.0%	81.0%	82.0%	83.0%	80.0%	15.0%	1.0%
	SGP	65	52	46.5	66	62	51	10	-4
All	CPI	741	78.5	78.5	76.8	74.2	80.8	-4.3	-2.6
	P+	741	54.0%	55.0%	53.0%	51.0%	61.0%	-3.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	570	43	41	48	42	51	-1	-6

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

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

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	112	84.3	79.6	80	76.3	78.5	-8	-3.7
	P+	112	62.0%	51.0%	55.0%	44.0%	51.0%	-18.0%	-11.0%
8	CPI	91	74.7	78.8	73.1	68.1	71	-6.6	-5
	P+	91	39.0%	51.0%	49.0%	37.0%	39.0%	-2.0%	-12.0%
10	CPI	65	85.3	88.8	94.1	93.1	88	7.8	-1
	P+	65	63.0%	73.0%	85.0%	78.0%	71.0%	15.0%	-7.0%
All	CPI	268	80.7	81.7	81.7	77.6	79	-3.1	-4.1
	P+	268	53.0%	57.0%	61.0%	50.0%	53.0%	-3.0%	-11.0%

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	229	75.1	73.9	74.5	72.3	-2.8	-2.2
		P+	229	44.0%	40.0%	44.0%	45.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	166	44	37	38	44	0	6
	State	CPI	237163	76.1	77	76.5	76.8	0.7	0.3
		P+	237163	45.0%	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	180087	45	46	46	47	2	1
Low Income	District	CPI	143	77.5	76.1	77.4	74	-3.5	-3.4
		P+	143	50.0%	45.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	103	41.5	37	40	42	0.5	2
	State	CPI	184999	76.5	77.1	76.7	77.2	0.7	0.5
		P+	184999	47.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	141671	46	46	45	47	1	2
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	133	67.6	67.6	66	64.7	-2.9	-1.3
		P+	133	31.0%	28.0%	33.0%	32.0%	1.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	93	45	41	36.5	37	-8	0.5
	State	CPI	88956	67.3	68.3	67.3	66.8	-0.5	-0.5
		P+	88956	28.0%	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	64773	41	42	43	43	2	0
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	22	64.5	68.2	69	63.6	-0.9	-5.4
		P+	22	21.0%	27.0%	33.0%	23.0%	2.0%	-10.0%
		SGP	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	46676	66.1	66.2	66.2	67.4	1.3	1.2
		P+	46676	32.0%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	31672	51	50	51	53	2	2
All students	District	CPI	734	88.2	87.2	87.8	86.8	-1.4	-1
		P+	734	70.0%	67.0%	71.0%	72.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	567	43	42	51	47	4	-4
	State	CPI	496175	86.9	87.2	86.7	86.8	-0.1	0.1
		P+	496175	68.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	395568	50	50	50	51	1	1

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

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	232	61.4	62.7	57.7	53.1	-8.3	-4.6
		P+	232	27.0%	31.0%	26.0%	23.0%	-4.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	167	38	45	37	34	-4	-3
	State	CPI	237745	66.7	67.1	67	68.6	1.9	1.6
		P+	237745	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	180866	46	46	46	46	0	0
Low Income	District	CPI	145	62.3	64.5	61.4	53.8	-8.5	-7.6
		P+	145	31.0%	33.0%	30.0%	24.0%	-7.0%	-6.0%
		SGP	105	36	40	42	29	-7	-13
	State	CPI	185392	67.1	67.3	67.3	69	1.9	1.7
		P+	185392	37.0%	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	142354	47	46	45	46	-1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	136	57	56.7	47.1	46.7	-10.3	-0.4
		P+	136	20.0%	22.0%	15.0%	17.0%	-3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	94	42	49	26	35.5	-6.5	9.5
	State	CPI	89193	57.5	57.7	56.9	57.4	-0.1	0.5
		P+	89193	21.0%	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	65068	43	43	43	42	-1	-1
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	23	48.8	54.2	63.1	46.7	-2.1	-16.4
		P+	23	15.0%	25.0%	33.0%	26.0%	11.0%	-7.0%
		SGP	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	47046	61.5	62	61.6	63.9	2.4	2.3
		P+	47046	31.0%	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	31986	54	52	52	53	-1	1
All students	District	CPI	741	78.5	78.5	76.8	74.2	-4.3	-2.6
		P+	741	54.0%	55.0%	53.0%	51.0%	-3.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	570	43	41	48	42	-1	-6
	State	CPI	497090	79.9	79.9	79.9	80.8	0.9	0.9
		P+	497090	58.0%	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	396691	50	50	50	51	1	1

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

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	87	72.5	66.9	63.3	65.5	-7	2.2
		P+	87	41.0%	29.0%	30.0%	30.0%	-11.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	96902	64.3	63.8	65	66.4	2.1	1.4
		P+	96902	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	53	75	68.6	68.4	68.9	-6.1	0.5
		P+	53	41.0%	28.0%	34.0%	34.0%	-7.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	75485	63.6	62.8	64.5	66.1	2.5	1.6
		P+	75485	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	4.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	49	68.1	63	53.1	62.8	-5.3	9.7
		P+	49	36.0%	23.0%	21.0%	27.0%	-9.0%	6.0%
	State	CPI	37049	59	59.2	58.7	59.8	0.8	1.1
		P+	37049	19.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.0%	0.0%
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	7	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	16179	51.8	50.3	51.4	54	2.2	2.6
		P+	16179	16.0%	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	3.0%	2.0%
All students	District	CPI	268	80.7	81.7	81.7	77.6	-3.1	-4.1
		P+	268	53.0%	57.0%	61.0%	50.0%	-3.0%	-11.0%
	State	CPI	209573	78.3	77.6	78.6	79	0.7	0.4
		P+	209573	52.0%	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-1.0%

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

Table B4: Maynard Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	1.6	1.0	1.4	1.7	0.1	6.2%	0.3	21.4%	2.2

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

Table B5a: Maynard Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	22	69.4%	60.7%	64.0%	72.7%	3.3	4.8%	8.7	13.6%	74.7%
Low income	12	60.0%	61.1%	64.3%	91.7%	31.7	52.8%	27.4	42.6%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	13	76.5%	50.0%	66.7%	53.8%	-22.7	-29.7%	-12.9	-19.3%	67.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	68	84.3%	84.3%	81.3%	86.8%	2.5	3.0%	5.5	6.8%	85.0%

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

Table B5b: Maynard Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	25	77.1%	69.4%	78.6%	68.0%	-9.1	-11.8%	-10.6	-13.5%	78.9%
Low income	14	73.9%	60.0%	83.3%	64.3%	-9.6	-13.0%	-19.0	-22.8%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	18	85.7%	76.5%	72.2%	72.2%	-13.5	-15.8%	0.0	0.0%	73.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	68.5%
All students	64	88.2%	85.3%	91.0%	82.8%	-5.4	-6.1%	-8.2	-9.0%	87.5%

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

Table B6: Maynard Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2010-2013

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	96.0%	95.9%	96.0%	95.4%	-0.6	-0.6%	-0.6	-0.6%	94.8%

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

Table B7: Maynard Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1	20.0%	0.5	500%	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	0.9%	2.3%	3.3%	1.1%	0.2	22.2%	-2.2	-66.7%	4.3%

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

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

	FY11		FY12		FY13	
	Estimated	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	$13,417,167	$13,424,262	$13,417,167	$13,302,819	$14,139,827	$14,719,621
By municipality	$6,976,549	$6,860,669	$6,491,515	$6,715,280	$5,441,743	$8,184,449
Total from local appropriations	$20,393,716	$20,284,931	$19,908,682	$20,018,099	$19,581,570	$22,904,070
From revolving funds and grants	--	$2,536,513	--	$2,525,501	--	$2,532,937-
Total expenditures	--	$22,821,444	--	$22,543,600	--	$25,437,007
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$3,515,408	--	$3,534,280	--	$3,990,865
Required local contribution	--	$8,480,324	--	$8,664,177	--	$8,836,949
Required net school spending**	--	$11,995,732	--	$12,198,457	--	$12,827,814
Actual net school spending	--	$15,597,212	--	$15,893,199	--	$16,815,294
Over/under required ($)	--	$3,601,480	--	$3,694,742	--	$3,987,481
Over/under required (%)	--	30.0	--	30.3	--	31.1

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

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

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

Data retrieved October 16, 2014

Table B9: Maynard Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010-2012

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012	2013
Administration	$641	$754	$737	$752.09
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$1,024	$1,164	$1,131	$1,128.91
Teachers	$4,609	$4,802	$4,633	$4,891.24
Other teaching services	$1,276	$1,301	$1,363	$1,404.97
Professional development	$231	$272	$345	$325.91
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$270	$307	$162	$190.01
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$357	$310	$400	$505.11
Pupil services	$1,026	$1,110	$1,043	$1,104.09
Operations and maintenance	$1,051	$1,114	$1,028	$1,007.83
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$2,609	$2,313	$2,854	$2,784.08
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$13,092	$13,447	$13,696	$14,094

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.	**ES**			12	**#**	0	0	43
	MS			17	**%**	0	0	100 %
	HS			14	**---**	---	---	---
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	**ES**			12	**#**	0	2	41
	MS			17	**%**	0%	5%	95%
	HS		2	12	**---**	---	---	---
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	**ES**			12	**#**	0	1	42
	MS		1	16	**%**	0%	2%	98%
	HS			14	**---**	---	---	---
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	**ES**		1	11	**#**	1	2	40
	MS			17	**%**	2%	5%	93%
	HS	1	1	12	**---**	---	---	---
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	**ES**		1	11	**#**	4	3	36
	MS	1	2	14	**%**	9%	7%	84%
	HS	3		11	**---**	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	**ES**	1		11	**#**	4	0	39
	MS	1		16	**%**	9%	0%	91%
	HS	2		12	**---**			
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	**ES**	2	4	6	**#**	8	7	28
	MS	3	2	12	**%**	19%	16%	65%
	HS	3	1	10	**---**	---	---	---
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	**ES**	3	1	8	**#**	14	5	24
	MS	5	2	10	**%**	33%	12%	56%
	HS	6	2	6	**---**	---	---	---
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	**ES**	4		8	**#**	16	1	26
	MS	5	1	11	**%**	37%	2%	60%
	HS	7		17	**---**	---	---	---
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**	3	1	8	**#**	14	2	27
	MS	7	1	9	**%**	33%	5%	63%
	HS	4		10	**---**	---	---	---
11. The teacher provides multiple opportunities for students' to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	**ES**	3	1	8	**#**	13	6	24
	MS	5	3	9	**%**	30%	14%	56%
	HS	5	2	7	**---**	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching (continued)	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	**ES**	4	1	7	**#**	13	5	25
	MS	5	2	10	**%**	30%	12%	58%
	HS	4	2	8	**---**			
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a learning environment where students can take risks---for instance, where they can make predictions, make judgments and investigate.	**ES**	3		9	**#**	8	2	33
	MS	4	2	11	**%**	19%	5%	77%
	HS	1		13	**---**	---	---	---
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	**ES**	2		10	**#**	7	3	32
	MS	3	1	13	**%**	17%	7%	76%
	HS	2	2	9	**---**	---	---	---
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	**ES**	3	2	7	**#**	14	4	25
	MS	4	1	12	**%**	33%	9%	58%
	HS	7	1	6	**---**	---	---	---
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	**ES**	2		10	**#**	14	1	28
	MS	7	1	9	**%**	33%	2%	65%
	HS	5		9	**---**	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Learning	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	**ES**	3	1	8	**#**	10	4	29
	MS	4	2	11	**%**	23%	9%	67%
	HS	3	1	10	**---**	---	---	---
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	**ES**	5		7	**#**	15	5	23
	MS	4	3	10	**%**	35%	12%	53%
	HS	6	2	6	**---**			
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	**ES**	4	1	7	**#**	13	3	27
	MS	7		10	**%**	30%	7%	63%
	HS	2	2	10	**---**	---	---	---
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	**ES**	5	2	5	**#**	19	9	14
	MS	8	1	7	**%**	45%	21%	33%
	HS	6	6	2	**---**	---	---	---
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	**ES**	2	2	8	**#**	14	5	24
	MS	6	3	8	**%**	33%	12%	56%
	HS	6		8	**---**	---	---	---
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	**ES**	5	1	6	**#**	16	2	25
	MS	9	1	7	**%**	37%	5%	58%
	HS	2		12	**---**	**---**	**---**	**---**
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	**ES**		3	9	**#**	4	6	33
	MS	2	3	12	**%**	9%	14%	77%
	HS	2		12	**---**	---	---	---
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	**ES**	5	2	5	**#**	24	8	11
	MS	11	1	5	**%**	56%	19%	26%
	HS	8	5	1	**---**	---	---	---