



Westborough Public Schools Review of District Systems and Practices Addressing the Differentiated Needs of English Language Learners

November 2010

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



This document was prepared by Class Measures on behalf of the Center for District and School Accountability of the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Members

Ms. Maura Banta, Chair, Melrose
Dr. Vanessa Calderón-Rosado, Milton
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Jamaica Plain
Mr. Gerald Chertavian, Cambridge
Mr. Michael D'Ortenzio, Jr., Chair, Student Advisory Council, Wellesley
Ms. Beverly Holmes, Springfield
Dr. Jeff Howard, Reading
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline
Dr. James E. McDermott, Eastham
Dr. Dana Mohler-Faria, Bridgewater
Mr. Paul Reville, Secretary of Education, Worcester

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public.

We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148 781-338-6105.

© 2010 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

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



Table of Contents

Overview	1
Purpose	1
Selection of Districts	1
Methodology	2
Westborough Public Schools	3
District Profile	3
Student Performance.....	4
Findings	8
Leadership and Governance.....	8
Curriculum and Instruction	11
Assessment.....	16
Human Resources and Professional Development	18
Student Support	21
Recommendations.....	24
Appendix A: Review Team Members.....	27
Appendix B: Review Activities and Site Visit Schedule.....	28

Overview

Purpose

The Center for District and School Accountability (CDSA) in the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) is undertaking a series of reviews of school districts to determine how well district systems and practices support groups of students for whom an achievement gap exists. The reviews will focus in turn on how district systems and practices affect each of four groups of students: students with disabilities, English language learners, low-income students, and students who are members of racial minorities. Spring 2010 reviews aim to identify district and school factors contributing to relatively high growth for limited English proficient (LEP) student performance in selected schools, to provide recommendations for improvement on district and school levels to maintain or accelerate the growth in student achievement, and to promote the dissemination of promising practices among Massachusetts public schools. This review complies with the requirements of Chapter 15, Section 55A, to conduct district audits in districts whose students achieve at high levels relative to districts that educate similar student populations. The review is part of ESE's program to recognize schools as "distinguished schools" under section 1117(b) of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which allows states to use Title I funds to reward schools that significantly closed the achievement gap. Districts and schools with exemplary practices identified through the review process may serve as models for and provide support to other districts and schools.

Selection of Districts

ESE identified 36 Title I schools in 14 districts where the performance of students with limited English proficiency (LEP students) exceeds expectations. All Massachusetts schools receiving Title I funds were eligible for identification, with the exception of reconfigured schools or schools that did not serve tested grades for the years under review. ESE staff analyzed MCAS data from 2008 and 2009 to identify schools that narrowed performance gaps between LEP students and all students statewide. The methodology compared the MCAS raw scores of LEP students enrolled in the schools with the predicted MCAS raw scores of LEP students statewide. The methodology also incorporated whether LEP students improved their performance from 2008 to 2009. "Gap closers" did not have to meet AYP performance or improvement targets, but did have to meet 2009 AYP targets for participation, attendance and high school graduation, as applicable. Districts with gap closers were invited to participate in a comprehensive district review to identify district and school practices associated with stronger performance for LEP students, as part of ESE's distinguished schools program (described above), "Impact of District Programs and Support on School Improvement: Identifying and Sharing Promising School and District Practices for Limited English Proficient Students."

Methodology

To focus the analysis, reviews will explore five areas: **Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Student Support**. The reviews will seek to identify those systems and practices that are most likely to be contributing to positive results, as well as those that may be impeding rapid improvement. Systems and practices that are likely to be contributing to positive results were identified from the ESE's District Standards and Indicators and from a draft report of the English Language Learners Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's Committee on the Proficiency Gap¹. Reviews are evidence-based and data-driven. Four to eight team members will preview selected documents and ESE data and reports before conducting a two-day site visit in the district and a two-day site visit to schools. The team will consist of independent consultants with expertise in each of the five areas listed above, as well as English language learner education (to collect evidence across all areas).

¹ *Halting the Race to the Bottom: Urgent Interventions for the Improvement of the Education of English Language Learners in Massachusetts and Selected Districts*, December 2009

Westborough Public Schools

The site visit to the Westborough Public Schools was conducted from May 24-May 27, 2010. The site visit included a visit to the Mill Pond Intermediate School (4-6), which was identified as a “gap closer” for its limited English proficient students, as described above. Further information about the review and the site visit schedule can be found in Appendix B; information about the members of the review team can be found in Appendix A.

District Profile²

The Westborough Public Schools district had a total student enrollment of 3,581 during the 2009-2010 school year. These students attended one of the district’s six schools including: J. Harding Armstrong Elementary (K-3, 407 students); Annie E. Fales Elementary (K-3, 278 students); Elsie A. Hastings Elementary (pre-K-3, 423); Mill Pond Intermediate School (4-6, 789); Sarah W. Gibbons Middle School (7-8, 557); and Westborough High School (9-12, 1,099). During the 2009-2010 school year the district’s teaching staff included 259.3 teachers, and 100 percent of the core academic classes were taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The district’s English language learner (ELL) population has grown in recent years, and in 2009-2010 there were 6.0 full time teachers as well as 7.6 tutors to provide services to the district’s 256 ELL students.³ The community is very supportive of the schools, and students in the district’s schools successfully meet state performance levels on the MCAS test. The motto of the district is $C + 2R = S$ which translates as consistency plus rigorous and relevance equals student success. In the aggregate, Westborough’s students outperform their counterparts in the state. Data provided by the district indicates that parents in Westborough show their support of the schools, as during the past five years 97 to 99 percent of school age children in the community were enrolled in the public schools. The Mill Pond Intermediate School, the focus school for this review, was awarded the Massachusetts School of Character Award in 2008.

Table 1 below gives student demographic data for the Westborough Public Schools.

² Student demographic data derived from ESE’s website, ESE’s Education Data Warehouse, or other ESE sources.

³ In this report, the terms “ELL student” and “LEP student” are used interchangeably.

**Table 1: Westborough Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity & Selected Populations
2009-10**

Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity	Percent of Total	Selected Populations	Percent of Total
African-American	1.3	First Language not English	15.4
Asian	17.7	Limited English Proficient	7.1
Hispanic or Latino	4.9	Low-income	7.5
Native American	0.0	Special Education	12.5
White	73.7	Free Lunch	4.6
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0.0	Reduced-price lunch	2.6
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	2.4		

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website

Student Performance⁴

In 2009, Westborough had no accountability status in both English language arts (ELA) and mathematics under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law. Westborough students have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both ELA and mathematics for the years 2006-2009 in the aggregate in grades 3 through 12. At grades 3 through 5, special education students did not make AYP in both ELA and mathematics. However, special education students did make AYP in mathematics in 2007 and 2008. At grades 6 through 8 special education, low income and Hispanic/Latino students did not make AYP in mathematics in both 2008 and 2009. At grades 9 through 12 all subgroups made AYP in both ELA and mathematics in 2009.

Table 2 below shows that all students in the district in grades 3 through 10, and all LEP students in the district in grades 3 through 6 consistently scored above the state proficiency rates in both ELA and mathematics.

⁴ Data derived from ESE's website, ESE's Education Data Warehouse, or other ESE sources.

Table 2: Percentages of All Westborough Students and Westborough LEP Students Achieving Proficiency on the 2009 MCAS tests by Subject and Grade in Comparison with All Students and LEP students in the State

Grade Level	All Westborough Students	All State Students	Westborough LEP Students	State LEP Students
Grade 10 ELA	96	81	*	20
Grade 10 Math	95	75	*	32
Grade 8 ELA	94	78	*	24
Grade 8 Math	72	49	*	12
Grade 7 ELA	90	70	*	15
Grade 7 Math	71	49	*	11
Grade 6 ELA	88	66	58	18
Grade 6 Math	79	57	59	19
Grade 5 ELA	87	63	57	17
Grade 5 Math	76	54	50	21
Grade 4 ELA	67	53	50	17
Grade 4 Math	62	48	47	18
Grade 3 ELA	73	57	34	23
Grade 3 Math	82	60	67	30

*Results are not given for subgroups of fewer than 10 students.

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website

There was no data available for Westborough LEP students in grades 7 through 10, since the number of ELL students taking the MCAS tests was fewer than 10. In the other grades tested, the data shows that the percentage of Westborough LEP students achieving proficiency in ELA in grades 5 and 6 exceeded the state proficiency rates by 40 percentage points in both grades. In grade 6 mathematics, the difference was also 40 percentage points. Westborough LEP students exceeded the state proficiency rate by the smallest margin, 11 percentage points, in grade 3 ELA.

Table 3 below shows that the CPIs for LEP/FLEP students in ELA at the Mill Pond Intermediate School exceeded the statewide CPIs for LEP/FLEP students within a range of 20.7 to 23.7 points in grades 4 through 6. The CPIs for LEP/FLEP students in mathematics at the Mill Pond Intermediate School exceeded the statewide CPIs within a range of 20.8 to 27.4 points in grades 4 through 6.

**Table 3: 2009 Mill Pond School LEP/FLEP ELA and Mathematics CPIs
Compared to State LEP/FLEP CPIs**

Grade Level	Mill Pond School	State	Difference
ELA			
Grade 4	81.9	61.2	20.7
Grade 5	90.2	66.5	23.7
Grade 6	86.1	64.8	21.3
Mathematics			
Grade 4	83.9	63.1	20.8
Grade 5	85.7	58.3	27.4
Grade 6	80.6	58.4	22.2

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website.

Table 4 below shows that ELL students at the Mill Pond Intermediate School exceeded the statewide CPIs for LEP students in both ELA and mathematics in grades 4-6. Mill Pond Intermediate School students exceeded the state CPI in ELA within a range of 21.7 to 26.3 points, and the state proficiency rate in mathematics within a range of 20.7 to 29.9 points.

**Table 4: 2009 Mill Pond School LEP ELA and Mathematics CPIs
Compared to State LEP CPIs**

Grade Level	Mill Pond School	State	Difference
ELA			
Grade 4	76.6	54.9	21.7
Grade 5	83.9	57.6	26.3
Grade 6	77.1	53.9	23.2
Mathematics			
Grade 4	78.3	57.6	20.7
Grade 5	73.2	50.2	23.0
Grade 6	79.2	49.3	29.9

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website.

In 2008 the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) developed a student growth model in order to compare changes in a student's MCAS test scores to changes in the MCAS test scores of other students with similar score histories. Student growth percentiles range from 1-99, with higher numbers representing higher growth and lower numbers representing lower growth. Increases or decreases of more than 10 points are considered meaningful.

In ELA in 2009, the median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELL Mill Pond Intermediate School students was 48, indicating moderate growth, while the median SGP for formerly ELL students was 67.5, indicating notably high growth. The median SGP in ELA for all students at the Mill Pond School was 60, higher than the median SGP of ELL students, but lower than the median SGP of the formerly ELL students.

In mathematics in 2009, the median SGP for ELL students at the Mill Pond Intermediate School was 54 as compared with the median SGP of 76.5 for formerly ELL students, and the median SGP of 59 for all Mill Pond School students.

Findings

Leadership and Governance

The community of Westborough provides significant support to its school system. The school committee, superintendent, and central office administration encourage and justify this support by communicating information about the school system to the community.

Community support for the Westborough Public Schools can be measured in several ways. Westborough residents believe in the quality of their schools, and demonstrate this belief by enrolling their children in the public schools at rates higher than both the statewide rate, and the rates in comparable communities. The percentage of school age children enrolled in the Westborough public schools ranged from 97 to 99 percent during the past five years, according to the ESE data, as compared with the statewide rate of 90 percent during the same period. The percentage enrollment of school-age children in comparable districts ranged from 92 to 94 percent.

The review team interviewed 10 parents with children enrolled at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Five parents were native English speakers, and five spoke a primary language of Spanish, Portuguese, or Danish. All of the parents praised the teaching staff for being enthusiastic and caring. They were pleased with what was taught and how it was taught. Parents of English language learners were very pleased by how quickly their children learned to speak English. Some parents expressed the need for gifted and talented programs in kindergarten through grade 6, and some ELL parents expressed the need for additional reading and writing support. They added that an ELL parent support group would be helpful to increase understanding of cultural differences. The chairperson of such a group would likely become a member of the superintendent's advisory council.

Parent advisory and support groups provide many voluntary services as well as financial support for the schools. These groups include the Westborough Special Education Parent Advisory Council, Westborough Music Parents Association, Westborough Athletic Boosters Association, Westborough school parent groups, the Superintendent's Advisory Council, and the Westborough Education Foundation. The Mill Pond Intermediate School Parent Group furnishes volunteers for twenty-five activities including a school committee liaison, classroom volunteers, and the ice cream social committee. The Westborough Education Foundation, a non-profit organization, has provided over \$30,000 during the past two years to support educational projects and programs.

In interviews with the review team, principals, teachers, and parents stated that the school department budget met the educational needs of students. Residential, commercial, and industrial property are taxed at the rate of 16.98 percent in Westborough resulting in a fiscal year 2010 tax levy revenue of \$57,603,680. This amount was \$104,060 below the levy limit. Education expenditures in fiscal year 2009 amounted to \$39,006,371. According to ESE data, in fiscal year 2009, the per-pupil cost in Westborough amounted to \$13,357, compared to a per-pupil cost of \$11,621 in a comparable community, and the statewide per-pupil cost of \$13,060. The per-pupil

cost in Westborough has increased during the past five years by 22.1 percent as compared to 24.2 percent in a comparable community and 23.2 percent statewide. This reflects a slightly slower growth in Westborough during a financial challenging period. ESE data for fiscal year 2008 indicates that Westborough was 32 percent above the foundation budget, compared with 21 percent in a comparable community and 16 percent statewide. Westborough was 41 percent above required net school spending, compared with 27 percent in a comparable community and 14 percent statewide.

According to ESE data for 2009-2010, 553 Westborough students spoke a first language other than English, and 256 were ELL students. There is no separate expenditure line item in the budget for ELL; however, elementary principals told the review team that they were provided between \$1,500 and \$5,000 per school (depending on enrollment) for ELL costs such as textbooks, workbooks and other supplies.

The community is informed about the school system in several ways. The district website provides current information about events, programs and policies. Also, the district website has a link to the NCLB Report Card on the ESE website. The NCLB Report Card provides enrollment and educator data, as well as state and national testing results. In February 2010, school committee members, the superintendent, and central office administrators made a presentation about the importance of maintaining educational excellence during a time of decreasing revenues to school councils, parent groups, and staff. The presentation included financial information and strategies for providing for school needs in order to ensure student success. The presentation encouraged a collaborative effort to advocate for a school department budget that will ensure academic excellence for all students, within the financial capability of the Town of Westborough.

The continuing commitment of Westborough to its schools through funding and active volunteerism has had a positive impact on student achievement. According to the 2009 AYP data summary, Westborough has very high performance and on-target improvement ratings in both ELA and mathematics. In 2009, ELL students at the Mill Pond Intermediate School had CPIs more than 20 points above the state CPIs for ELL students in both ELA and mathematics. According to district administrators, energy savings, fees, and cost reductions have resulted in a slower rate of increase in the per pupil costs without sacrificing educational excellence. Providing all stakeholders with programmatic, staffing, and financial information has resulted in a better understanding of the school system, and few concerns are raised during the passage of the annual budget at Town Meeting.

In the judgment of the review team, Westborough is in a position to sustain high student performance as it continues to be guided by the established goal of academic excellence for all students at a cost within the financial ability of the town. The system fosters volunteerism by effectively communicating with the community about student achievement and needs.

The district does not have a written strategic plan to attain the goal of the school committee, superintendent, and community to promote high achievement for all students; however, the district stakeholders set goals and make plans according to a shared vision of education. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) have common elements, but are not aligned with specific district objectives, timelines, designated resources, and measurable outcomes.

School committee goals are established annually as part of the budget development process. The goals are listed in the budget, posted in the school committee meeting room, and displayed in other district documents. The superintendent developed a detailed entry plan shortly after assuming the position of superintendent on July 1, 2005. According to a review of this document and interviews with the superintendent, as part of the development of that plan the superintendent held individual and group meetings with the school committee, community members, teachers, administrators, parents, and students. In addition, the superintendent reviewed contracts, district and school documents, outside documents, and research. Areas of pride were identified, including high-achieving students and strong financial support from the Town of Westborough.

The entry plan was based on the five goals adopted by the school committee that year and three superintendent goals. These included maintaining class size at specified levels; improving programs to ensure that student needs are met; restoring staff development; establishing ongoing support for instructional technology; reducing student fees within two to three years; reviewing and updating the policy manual and district information; improving strategies for staff recruitment; and retaining and improving internal and external communications. Most goals were followed by a clarifying paragraph and a list of recommended actions ranging in number from 4 to 57, with most goals having 8 to 16 activities for accomplishment. Developing a parent support group for parents of ELL students and increasing the involvement of ELL families in the school community were goals included in the entry plan. It is apparent that this document has guided the superintendent in improving the district; the superintendent stated that 80 percent of the plan has been accomplished. The entry plan was not a public document and did not contain components for providing direction and monitoring progress.

In interviews with the review team, the superintendent, central office administrators, and school administrators described a series of regularly scheduled formal meetings with agendas and minutes. These meetings are used to coordinate planning. The superintendent conducts a monthly administrative council meeting with central office administrators, principals, and the directors of pupil personnel, finance, technology and athletics. Agenda items include operational activities, professional development, policies, supervision and evaluation, budget information and process, teacher attendance data, and staffing and facility issues. Goals in SIPs are also presented and discussed.

The assistant superintendent meets twice monthly with principals, vice principals, and coordinators, including ELL and kindergarten through grade 6 literacy staff. The agenda topics include curriculum, support services such as ELL, professional development, supervision and evaluation, and grants. The ELL coordinator is not a member of the administrative council

because the position is non-administrative and falls under the collective bargaining unit. District and school leaders ensure that ELL students' needs are met, given the district's strong communications systems under the current administrative structure. The superintendent conducts an annual two-day retreat attended by central office administrators and principals. The 2009 agenda listed functions characterized as "done right," including leadership encouragement and support, financial and staff resources, community support, staff support and student focus, and functions characterized as "in need of improvement," including supervision and evaluation policies and procedures, accountability monitoring, and the evaluation process. In addition, the superintendent conveyed how the goals established by the school committee and department leaders are reviewed and developed in more detail.

The review team found common elements in a review of all 2009-2010 SIPs. For example, the Mill Pond Intermediate SIP includes school facilities, curriculum and instruction, technology, communication, and school culture. Also, the students-at-risk section of the plan establishes a range of appropriate support and instruction for ELL students, such as sheltered instruction, inclusion support, pull-out language acquisition instruction, and after-school ELL homework club.

Generally, an accepted practice for successful school districts is for goals and priorities to be widely known, carefully communicated, and constantly reinforced. A lack of a documented linkage of school and district priorities reduces the value of the periodic assessment and evaluation of the improvement plans and the consistency of focus of the district and schools. In the judgment of the review team, clear, effective, and constant communications exist as part of the district structural functions and systems. Vision, goal-setting, and planning have been implemented as part of district operations. A district strategic plan can be readily developed within the current organizational framework that will galvanize the district and schools as partners in sustaining high student achievement and effective support for ELL students.

Curriculum and Instruction

The ELL curriculum is integrated with the district's curriculum providing students access to the regular curriculum. The district's ELL curriculum is based on the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes (ELPBO).

The Westborough school system uses an ongoing curriculum review process. Review committees are continually re-examining Westborough's curriculum through a curriculum mapping process to ensure that the curriculum addresses the needs of all students. With guidance from the district's assistant superintendent/director of curriculum, school administrators, the kindergarten through grade 6 ELA specialist, department heads, the ELL director, and staff review—and revise, when necessary—the content of the curriculum and the methods for delivering instruction for all students. A review of the curriculum documents, curriculum maps, and the English Language Learner Staff Handbook and interviews with staff revealed that the district's curriculum is aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (MCF) and that

the ELL curriculum is based on the ELPBO. Furthermore, interviewees told the team that the district supplied funding to purchase curricula and time for curriculum writing by both content and ESL teachers that resulted in content-based ELD classes in science and social studies.

Interviews with the superintendent revealed that when she arrived in the district, a site-based management system was in place at each school. The leadership worked to change from a site-based management system to one that brought togetherness and the essential communication and collaboration among the district's schools. Previously, in kindergarten through grade 3, each school had its own curriculum and materials. As a result, when the students entered the Mill Pond Intermediate School, the students had different skill sets. The district's K through 3 schools now teach the same content and have the same curriculum, materials, and curriculum maps for social studies, science, and mathematics, and the alignment is now horizontal and vertical.

Westborough has developed curriculum maps for mathematics, social studies, and science in kindergarten through grade 12. According to interviewees and documents reviewed, mapping is complete through grade 8, and at least 75 percent of the mapping is complete at the high school. The district purchased a software program to organize the mapping process. The district is in the process of putting the maps online for staff. The district provided the review team with a sampling of mathematics, social studies, and science curriculum maps. The maps reviewed include essential questions, content, skills, assessment, the learning standards, and a timeline for instruction. The ELL director provided the team with samples of ELL content templates and curriculum maps for grades 7 and 8. These maps contain the learning standard, student knowledge and skills, learning experiences, instructional strategies, ELD focus, and assessment evidence.

The teachers in the district have monthly curriculum meetings according to the subject they teach. Interviewees from the middle school and high school said that they meet monthly by department on Mondays known as "Curriculum Mondays." The ESL teachers take part in these meetings and collaborate with staff as needed. The district provides opportunities for vertical planning; interviewees stated that vertical articulation and alignment was needed from the middle school to the high school level.

The district's K through 6 ELA curriculum is based on a balanced approach to teaching literacy. The K through 6 ELA curriculum guides contain the state standards, a scaffold for instruction throughout the year to meet the standards, and the literacy approaches and resources for best practice in a balanced literacy classroom. There is an ELL section that includes the stages of language acquisition and a book list for teaching strategies for ELL learners: using cognates, vocabulary work maps, and graphic organizers with ELL students. The middle school English curriculum focuses on the writing process, grammar, vocabulary, and literacy genres. The high school English program includes honors, accelerated, and advanced placement courses, and MCAS prep courses. In addition, it offers ESL Academic Support, ESL 1 for newcomers, ESL 2, Sheltered English, and ESL Reading for recently arrived students.

The district's kindergarten through grade 5 mathematics curriculum is Everyday Mathematics, and in grades 6, 7, and 8, the district uses Impact Math. Interviewees told the team that because Everyday Mathematics is so language-based the staff modify the tests in the third grade by reading the questions and scribing the answers for ELL students when necessary. The mathematics program is designed so that all students have exposure to algebraic topics to allow more students to be able to take algebra I in grade 8. The curriculum has a built-in scope and sequence and assessments. The high school curriculum includes algebra, AP Calculus BC, statistics, and MCAS prep courses.

The district has a Resource Handbook for Mainstream Teachers of English as a Second Language Learners. This guide is intended to help classroom teachers understand the needs of students who are learning English as a second language, and to help mainstream teachers of newcomer ELL students plan and implement strategies and activities that newcomers can do in the classroom. It contains strategies for newcomer ELL students at the elementary level and some for secondary level ELL, as well as suggested resource materials.

The district's ELL program has two components: English Language Development (ELD) via a pull-out model, especially for those students who are just beginning to learn English, and Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) through a category-trained content area teacher. The SEI component follows the district's curriculum, and the ELL staff has worked with the content teachers to integrate the ELPBO into each content area.

ELL students are grouped by language proficiency. Schools with larger ELL populations have a licensed ESL teacher and ESL tutors. The ESL teacher and tutors support students in the regular education classroom and withdraw students for pull-out ELD instruction. Teachers assess students to determine the need for additional and specific types of academic support. The ELL students receive ELD services until they are proficient in English. The review team visited the ELD classrooms at the Mill Pond Intermediate School and found that classrooms have ESL resources and texts to teach the ELL curriculum. According to interviewees, the district recently added a budget line item for the ELL program. The ESL teacher frequently reviews data and plans with the teams to shelter instruction and include ELPBO objectives that are integrated into the content.

According to interviews with administrators and staff, curriculum is an ongoing process and not a finished product. The curriculum evolves around the needs of the students. The resulting curriculum is closely aligned to state standards and aligned horizontally. As mentioned previously, additional work is needed in vertical alignment between the middle and high school levels. The current leadership structure for coordinating the development of the K through 12 general and ELL curriculum is resulting in proficiency and academic achievement for students.

The Mill Pond Intermediate School ELL teams, led by team leaders, enhance collaboration, communication, and in-depth planning, leading to higher achievement and proficiency for ELL students.

The review team spent a day and a half at the Mill Pond Intermediate School. It was evident during classroom observations and interviews with staff that the school has a culture that promotes a safe, nurturing social and emotional environment for students. School administrators and staff emphasize high academic expectations. The teachers challenge and provide appropriate support for their ELL students as well as special and regular education students.

The school uses the team approach at each grade level. Each team has a team leader. There are three instructional teams at grade four (12 classes), four teams at grade five (12 classes), and three teams at grade six (11 classes). Teams are composed of four classroom teachers, with the exception of one grade 6 team with three teachers. Each team is either an ELL team or a special education team. The school clusters ELL students and special education students on separate teams so that students receive appropriate instruction, accommodations, and modifications. Grades 4, 5, and 6 each have one ELL team.

The team leaders told the review team that they meet with their respective teams more than once a week, some daily. The meeting may be scheduled during an activity period, when students go to specialists, or during common planning time. Team leaders and their teams use the common planning time to gather and analyze student assessment data to inform curriculum and instruction and to place students in the appropriate grouping according to instructional need. Each team decides how to organize instruction, and there is therefore variability. For example, in one fourth grade team of four teachers, all teach ELA, mathematics is leveled with a teacher assigned to each level, and two teachers teach social studies and two science. Grade 5 operates in a similar manner. The teachers in grade 6 teach four sections of mathematics, social studies, science, and English.

Teachers told the review team that they do a substantial amount of planning and co-planning with their team leaders, ELL and special education teachers, and tutors. MCAS data for 2009 shows that in ELA the CPI for Mill Pond Intermediate School ELL students is 79.2, compared with the district CPI for ELL students of 78.9 and the statewide CPI for ELL students of 57.2. The 2009 CPI for Mill Pond ELL students in mathematics is 76.8, compared with the district CPI for ELL students of 80.1 and the statewide CPI for ELL students of 53.1. The CPI for both subjects has trended upward from 2005 - 2009.

Team leaders stated that they meet with the principal and assistant principal twice a month. Agenda items may include time to speak about the teams' concerns, data, common assessments, curriculum, student progress, budget, and character education. Team leaders also meet with the assistant superintendent/director of curriculum four or five times per year. In addition to the team meetings, classroom teachers also attend monthly curriculum meetings organized by discipline and grade level. The K through 6 literacy specialist and Mill Pond administrators facilitate curriculum meetings.

According to the principal, team leaders are invaluable. The structure allows for greater collaboration and communication and the ability to do in-depth planning. Furthermore, the meetings of the all the team leaders with the administrators allow for greater understanding of what is happening in all the teams and all the grade levels, which is conducive to horizontal and vertical planning for curriculum and instruction, as well as transitional planning from grade to grade.

The review team observed a planning meeting. The team leaders led the group through the week's schedule and events. The team stayed on task and focused. The ESL tutor was an integral part of the team. The tutor stated that without this structure it would be difficult to integrate instruction and to know what was going on in all the classrooms. The team leadership structure is vital to the operation of the school. Planning time has led to greater coordination and informed program delivery for ELL students and has led to higher achievement for this subgroup.

Classroom observations indicated that there is solid evidence of effective instructional characteristics at the Mill Pond Intermediate School, which contributes to higher achievement levels for all students, including ELL students.

The review team visited 42 classrooms. Eight characteristics on the instructional inventory used by the team occurred with high frequency. The classroom climate was positive (98 percent); class time was maximized for learning (86 percent); instruction was linked to prior knowledge (79 percent); materials were aligned with students' developmental level (79 percent); content was within the students' developmental level (71 percent); the lesson was paced to ensure that all students were engaged (76 percent); students articulated their thinking and reasoning (74 percent); and the teacher used on-the-spot formative assessments to check for understanding (79 percent).

There was a combination of solid and partial evidence of other important characteristics. The review team observed that teachers gave the students opportunities and time to elaborate on their responses, and asked questions that promoted higher order thinking. Teachers took advantage of the international flavor of their classes. ELL students took part in high-level discussions of current international events. Teachers and ESL tutors emphasized and reinforced vocabulary development in the lessons. The review team observed lessons that culminated in quality products. Students were actively engaged in verbally sustained interaction in small groups in order to complete academic tasks assigned by the teacher. Observers found that students worked well independently and stayed on task. Routines and procedures were in place so that students were productive. The reviewers saw rigorous and challenging lessons presented. Furthermore, classrooms had support personnel such as Title I staff, ESL tutors, and paraprofessionals supporting student needs.

One characteristic occurred with less frequency. The review team saw solid evidence of a learning objective for the day's lesson only 38 percent of the time. Except for ELD classrooms, most classrooms did not have posted objectives.

The review team asked the teachers in a focus group why their ELL students were doing so well. The teachers replied that they hold all students to a high level of rigor and do not diminish expectations. ELL students are integrated in regular education classes, have access to subject content, contribute to discussions, and mix in socially. The teachers went on to tell the review team that because the larger Westborough community values education, ELL students also learn to value education, rise up, and do well. The feeder schools are now on the same page, and fourth grade students are entering the intermediate school with a good foundation. Teachers said that district and school leadership support them and that the ESL tutors work hard with their students and get good results. Furthermore, the review team found that ESL instructional time meets or exceeds the amount prescribed by ESE.

The district provides SEI professional development both through district personnel (the ELL director is a certified trainer), and through use of educational collaboratives. Although the district has not reached its goal of having all the teachers trained in all four categories, it has made substantial progress. Teachers stated that they benefited from the category training provided by the district. The teaching strategies and practices for ELL students benefit all students. They told the review team that their lesson presentations have improved. There is more clarity, more use of visuals, and they are checking more for understanding. Furthermore, they include in the curriculum mapping process what is essential that ELL students need to know. They said they do a lot of planning and co-planning with their team leaders and with the ELL and special education teachers and tutors. The teachers stated that the district also provides funds for joint curriculum planning between core teachers and ESL teachers during the summer. The district has increased ESL personnel and recently added a budget line item for ESL program development and materials for classroom use.

The district's professional development in category training and curriculum integration with ELL support personnel have allowed the faculty to grow professionally, resulting in consistently strong classroom instruction for all students, including ELL students.

Assessment

The district collects and disseminates some data, but does not make full use of data to inform decision-making and instruction.

In interviews with the review team, some administrators said that much more could be done with data in the district. The assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction has responsibility for professional development and human resources and is also responsible for data collection, analysis, and dissemination. The assistant superintendent at the time of the site visit had been appointed as the next superintendent, replacing the superintendent at that time, who was retiring. Interviewees told the review team that the incoming superintendent was a data person and that they expected the district to become more data-driven.

Most principals attended a one-day training on the use of the ESE Education Data Warehouse with the assistant superintendent, but in interviews with the review team, some principals stated that they were still not proficient in accessing and analyzing MCAS test and other student data. Another administrator said that the Education Data Warehouse was not sophisticated and that the district was looking into alternatives.

According to the assistant superintendent, MCAS test data is disseminated to principals and presented at staff meetings. Some principals delegate the responsibility to team leaders who present the data to teams of teachers during regular meeting times. Generally, an item analysis is available, and interviewees added that disaggregated data on subgroups is also available to teachers who choose to look at it. Teachers said that they had received no professional development on data analysis and that what they knew about the data was limited to the expertise of their team leaders or principals. In focus groups, teachers told the review team that while they used some assessment data, they were more people- than data-driven.

Administrators discussed the relative lack of student achievement on the 4th grade MCAS test in an interview with the review team. Since the scores for the other grade levels were higher, the administrators said that a good deal of time had been spent in speculating about why the 4th grade scores were not comparable. The district finally attributed the lower scores to flaws in the test.

Data relevant to the ELL population consists of the results of state mandated assessments including the Massachusetts English Language Assessment-Oral (MELA-O) and the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA). The ELL coordinator maintains assessment data, as well as data from the home language survey completed by parents of children entering the district. This data is used to determine placement. The ELL coordinator told the review team that the MEPA data is the most valuable assessment data for the ELL staff since it determines student classification and is also used for exit criteria and for progress monitoring. The ELL coordinator went on to say that there was little use of disaggregated MCAS test results for district ELL and FLEP students.

A review of the documents provided by the district showed that a variety of assessments are administered to students. The review team examined two binders containing reading assessments for kindergarten through grade 6. Interviewees stated that these assessments are generally used to inform placement decisions and to monitor progress, rather than to plan instruction. The unit tests in the Everyday Mathematics program at the elementary level are also used for placement. However, according to interviewees the instructional groups are not fluid, and once students are placed in a group they rarely move from that group. Common assessments are being developed at the middle school and high school levels. According to interviewees, the district is about half-way toward completion of common assessments.

Westborough students score very well on the MCAS test, especially in the aggregate. While all of the staff interviewed were aware of the district's high MCAS test performance, very few were able to identify any changes resulting from analysis of the data. Interviewees did say that they

had looked at open response type questions on the MCAS tests because these questions were challenging, but did not mention other ways of using the data. The review team found little information about how data informs decision-making in the district. More importantly, there has evidently been little discussion about the discrepancy in the district between student achievement in the aggregate and the performance of the lower-achieving subgroups, aimed at closing the achievement gap.

Westborough will need to make greater and more effective use of data in order to improve its currently high level of student performance. When students are performing at high levels, their learning needs are less obvious. The district needs to make more diagnostic use of assessments to identify the root causes of problems interfering with accelerated learning. Westborough should also take steps to incorporate assessment strategies in the curriculum and provide more training for administrators and teachers in data use and analysis.

Human Resources and Professional Development

The district's philosophy of selecting the best candidates for teaching and paraprofessional positions has resulted in a faculty and support staff of high quality, including the teachers and tutors who instruct and support ELL students.

The team visited every classroom at the Mill Pond Intermediate School. Students were on task and challenged in the classes observed, and the teachers had high expectations for all students. The team found that the collegiality of the staff and their high degree of cooperation in instructing students met students' individual needs. When the Mill Pond teachers were asked during a focus group why ELL students' achievement scores have steadily increased, their answers varied, but almost all of them had the same theme: specifically, that ELL students are consistently held to the same rigorous standards as regular education students and that the staff working with those students provide many strategies to ensure success.

The district ensures that the ELL students in the various schools have adequate support. Westborough employs 6 full-time ESL teachers and 7.6 tutors to serve 256 ELL students. There is also a full-time ELL coordinator, who recently resumed officially observing and evaluating the staff, in addition to the assistant superintendent.

The principals stated that their goal was to select the best possible candidates to fit into the specific teaching assignments available in their schools, and added that there were no financial limitations imposed on them in the hiring process. Almost all of the ESL tutors in the district, including all three of the tutors at the Mill Pond Intermediate School, are certified teachers, and all have had category training. The impact of this practice is that ELL students are being well-served in the district's schools by effective staff.

It is the judgment of the review team that the success of the ELL students in the district is directly related to the quality and quantity of the professionals and paraprofessionals hired to

work with this population and the district's philosophy of maintaining high expectations for all its students, including ELL students.

The process used to evaluate principals in the district is timely, comprehensive, and instructive. There were no formal written evaluations of central office administrators.

The superintendent meets annually with each principal to establish goals, and regularly throughout the year to review progress toward the accomplishment of the goals. The team examined the evaluations of the principals by the superintendent dating back several years. These narrative written evaluations followed the Principles of Effective Administrative Leadership, and all evaluations examined by the review team were timely and instructive. The superintendent addressed the performance of the principals, especially with respect to the goals they had set. In a review of the evaluations it was evident that each principal was held to a high standard of performance. However, in interviews, the team found that no central office administrators had received a written performance evaluation from the superintendent.

Although examining teacher evaluations was not required for this review, both principals and teachers were asked during interviews about the process used to evaluate teachers. All interviewees concurred that the process used by supervisors in the district was timely, fair and both informative and instructive in nature. All teachers without professional teacher status are observed a minimum of four times during each of their first three years in the district, a minimum of two times each by the primary evaluator, usually the principal, and by the secondary evaluator, usually the subject area coordinator or the department head. The two evaluators collaborate to write the summative evaluation at the end of each year. All teachers interviewed stated that the process had helped them become better teachers during their formative years in the district. A teacher attaining professional status moves to the contractually specified four-year evaluation cycle that includes goal-setting sessions each year and observations by either the primary or secondary evaluator. All the principals and teachers interviewed agreed that the goal-setting aspect of the process was particularly valuable. The superintendent told the review team that to make better use of the evaluations to promote professional growth principals need to be more instructive and less descriptive in their comments, especially in the summative evaluations of teachers with professional status.

It is the judgment of the team that without formally evaluating central office administrators the district does not provide sufficient guidance and direction or ensure accountability. High quality administrators in a high-performing district deserve the support and direction needed to surpass their latest accomplishments and continue to grow professionally.

Despite spending less than the statewide average on professional development, according to principals and teachers the district has provided ample professional development opportunities for them to improve. Category training is a valuable component of the professional development program.

Westborough's per-teacher expenditure for professional development has been substantially below the statewide average and the average for comparable communities. Specifically, in the

years from 2005 to 2009 Westborough spent amounts ranging from \$1,035 to \$1,725 per teacher for professional development, while the statewide spending per teacher on professional development in these years ranged from \$2,482 to \$3,033. Interviewees agreed that one of the main reasons for the low cost for professional development was the district's philosophy of using its own teachers and administrators as presenters whenever possible, and rarely relying upon external consultants. Westborough has also consistently applied for and been awarded grants with professional development components through the state or federal agencies. A third reason for the low per-teacher expenditure has been that the district participates annually in the Assabet Valley Collaborative professional development day in January. Each year on that day, the collaborating communities pool their professional development resources and send their staff members to different locations for professional development.

During the teacher focus group at the Mill Pond Intermediate School, teachers were unanimous in their satisfaction with the professional development opportunities available to them. They told the review team that these opportunities are adequate and helpful in improving their instruction

In addition to the annual full professional development day in January, the district regularly schedules early-release days throughout the year for students to enable staff to participate in professional development. Furthermore, all teachers are required contractually to spend one two-hour session each month on professional development on Mondays. The district's professional development schedule also has vertical articulation days built into it to ensure a smooth transition as students move from one school to the next. The professional development opportunities offered to the district's teachers and paraprofessionals range from school-based initiatives to district initiatives. Recently, the district offered professional development in reading and writing across the curriculum and increasing the use of technology.

A sampling of other types of professional development opportunities recently available to staff included a seminar on using Cognitive Behavioral Therapy techniques in the classroom; classroom management skills for middle school teachers; Handwriting without Tears for primary teachers; and online technology training. Additionally, for the last several years the district has offered an extensive professional development summer session for its teachers and paraprofessionals.

The district has made a particularly strong effort to provide category training. On average, Westborough has had an ELL population of approximately seven percent. During the 2009-2010 school year, for instance, of the district's 3,581 students, 256 were ELL students. In pre-kindergarten through grade 8, where the majority of the ELL students are found, more than half of the staff, 139 of 259, are trained in at least one category, and 97 of the 139 are trained in two or more categories.

The Mill Pond Intermediate School category training statistics are even more impressive. Of the 64 staff members at the school over 80 percent (53) of the staff have been trained in at least one category and over 60 percent (41) have been trained in two or more categories. When asked during a focus group why so many teachers decided to take the training even though they knew

that they were not going to be teaching ELL students, the teachers responded that the training was beneficial to their pedagogy regardless of the type of students they had in their classrooms. Techniques learned in the category training include using specific methods to deal with struggling students and using visuals and manipulatives to facilitate learning. During the teacher focus group, one teacher recounted how a category training session had begun with the instructor teaching the lesson entirely in German, simulating for the participants what ELL students experience in making the transition to a new language and culture.

An effective professional development program for teachers has accelerated learning for ELL students in Westborough. The time spent and effort expended by the teaching staff in training and in collaborating with one another is critical to the success of the district's ELL students.

Student Support

Because of appropriate and strategic ELL support staffing, and districtwide category training, ELL students in Westborough are given the support they need for success.

A major focus of Westborough Public Schools has been staff support for the expanding ELL population in kindergarten through grade 12. Westborough has an extensive system of certified ESL teachers and trained and typically certified ESL tutors, assigned to the district schools according to need. The systemic method in Westborough is to front-load intensive ELL support in the earlier grades, so that students reach levels of English fluency that prepare them for reading to learn by the point in their education when this becomes most important to knowledge acquisition.

Interviews with district leadership and staff, as well as review of district-supplied documents, revealed that ELL staff is distributed among schools as the ELL population and student needs shift. For instance, the Hastings (pre-K-3) and Armstrong (K-3) schools, with 85 and 81 ELL students respectively, are assigned 1 ESL teacher and 2.5 ESL tutors and 1 ESL teacher and 2.0 tutors each, while the Fales School (K-3), with 8 ELL students, has just one .5 ESL tutor assigned to its staff. At the Mill Pond districtwide school for grades 4 to 6, the focus school for this review, there are 47 ELL students, representing 6.1 percent of the school's population of 771 students.

Mill Pond Intermediate School is staffed with one ESL teacher and 2.5 ESL tutors, and the learning teams at each grade are arranged in such a way as to offer maximum support to students in need of individual support. At each of the three Mill Pond grades, there are two teams where special education students are assigned among the three to four classes on the team, and one team where ELL students are assigned. In this way, the ESL teachers and tutors can concentrate their efforts on only four classes per grade for pullouts and inclusion support. An ELL student referred for special education services by parents or teachers is assessed using standard special education assessment procedures and if services are warranted remains on the ELL team, where the special education support is brought to the student.

The ESL tutors support ELL students at the twice weekly after-school homework club for ELL students at Mill Pond Intermediate School, which includes a late bus to assure that these students can avail themselves of this extra support. ESL tutors also staff the four-week summer support program for ELL students and newcomers at all of the schools in kindergarten through grade 6.

When non-English speakers enter the Westborough system, they are pulled out for the amount of time recommended by the state for ESL instruction and returned to the general population for mathematics instruction, with tutor support as needed, and as much content instruction as their level of understanding will permit. Those ELL students who need more content support are pulled out into regularly scheduled ELD content courses in science and social studies, which are taught by ESL tutors.

When ELL students are not pulled out, they are being instructed by a classroom teaching force that, according to documents and interviews, is highly trained in proven techniques for ELL students. Westborough has chosen to invest in high levels of category training for their elementary and middle school teaching force—especially in categories 1 and 2. In Mill Pond Intermediate School alone, 53 teachers out of 64 have completed at least one category training, and 41 have completed two or more. Therefore, even when ELL students are not in specific ESL or ELD support classes, their category-trained teachers are using proven pedagogical techniques to modify instruction: techniques that improve understanding for all students.

The rigorous schedule of ELL teaching and tutoring throughout the district, concentrating on students in the earlier grades, with the added support of category training, obtained and practiced by 54 percent of the teachers, specialists, and support staff in kindergarten through grade 8, has resulted in high growth and high achievement for ELL and FLEP students. A focus group of ELL parents concurred, stating that each of their children was speaking English fluently within months of their entering the ELL support system in Westborough. Families are very pleased with the ELL program in Westborough, but told the review team that they would like more support as they enter and navigate through the system, which is literally and figuratively very foreign to them.

Although there is significant staffing to support ELL and special education students, the district is not well equipped with assistive technology to supplement support for these students.

High-performing districts such as Westborough frequently provision schools with computer-based assistive technologies for both ELL and special education students to accelerate their attainment of goals in reading, writing, mathematics, communication, listening, and fluency. Interviews with district special needs and ELL administrative personnel and school teaching and support staff, as well as classroom observations, indicated that Westborough has little assistive technology for either special education, or ELL students. Only Lexia is listed as a computer learning program among the support programs in the district, yet no one interviewed, including the director of special education, had direct knowledge of it. The review team found that a text-to-speech program previously available in the district, Word Talk, was unavailable throughout

2009-2010, and that there was only one Kurzweil license in the district for struggling readers at the high school.

Additionally, in the Mill Pond Intermediate School, both the ELL and special needs learning centers were equipped with only two student computers and one teacher computer, which teaching staff stated are insufficient for their instructional needs, even without assistive technology. Although there are computer labs in the school, support staff also told the review team that these labs are filled with regular education classes every period, and that their students can only use the technology as a class when there are enough computers available for them to share.

Any student in an ELL program or with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) has instructional goals set forth for him or her, and the reason for providing computer-based assistive technology is to help enable students to meet those goals. There are many computer-based assistive technologies available, which provide solutions that enable students with different learning needs to be more independent and productive. These tools can also help students with limited English proficiency or learning disabilities to participate more fully in both the academic and social activities in a school. Assistive technologies can also be helpful to students who have not been identified as having differentiated learning needs. Providing all students with access to these devices helps realize the goal of universal design: accommodating the needs of all students, not just those with disabilities or limited English proficiency.

Recommendations

The district should develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) to provide a clear direction for the district and its schools in sustaining high achievement for all students, including English language learners.

Although the district administration ensures clear and effective communication through a series of regularly scheduled formal meetings, the district does not now have a written strategic plan. There is infrastructure and a process in Westborough for planning, coordination, and goal-setting. Westborough should use this process to develop a documented plan consisting of district goals, objectives, timelines, specific resources, persons responsible, and measurable evaluation in order to provide clear direction. SIP goals should be linked to DIP goals and priorities in order to ensure consistency of focus of the district and schools. A District Improvement Plan with linked SIPs will galvanize the district and schools as partners in sustaining high student achievement and effective support for ELL students.

The district should also inform the community about progress toward the attainment of the goals in the DIP and SIPs. This communication, in conjunction with the information already provided by the school system to the community, will assist in sustaining community support for academic excellence for ELL students as well as the entire student population.

The district should continue to budget for and support the team leader structure that has been successful in advancing ELL achievement.

The team leader structure has been a key component of the success of the ELL program at the Mill Pond Intermediate School. It allows for greater collaboration and communication and the ability to do in-depth planning for instructional programming. Administrative meetings with all the team leaders allow for greater understanding of what is happening in all teams and at all grade levels, which is conducive to horizontal and vertical planning for curriculum and instruction as well as transitional planning from grade to grade. In addition, the district is building leadership capacity that may prove beneficial in the future as administrative vacancies occur.

The district should continue to implement ELD content classes as part of its service delivery model for ELL students.

The district attributes part of its success with ELL students to the implementation of ELD content classes in science and social studies. It supplied the funding for curricula and the time for curriculum writing by content and ESL teachers that resulted in these classes. It should continue to provide funds for summer curriculum planning by core teachers and ESL teachers to refine and augment ELD content classes.

The district should follow through on the process it has begun of establishing a curriculum library and putting the district's general and ELL curriculum maps online for teacher and administrator access.

Since, according to interviews, curriculum mapping is an ongoing process in the district and curriculum is not a finished product, the district needs to support staff in this process. The district should follow through on establishing the curriculum library it has begun and provide capacity to place all of the district's general and ELL curriculum maps online for teacher and administrator access. This will allow district staff to view what is transpiring in the district across grade levels and subjects, in order to be informed and to revise their work. Through the mapping process, the district can provide the time for staff to work on vertical alignment, especially at the middle and high school levels.

The district should develop a formal process for data collection, dissemination, and analysis, and create data teams in schools. The district should also offer professional development for teachers to increase their facility in data interpretation and their understanding of the usefulness of data for instructional planning and progress monitoring.

Data analysis and dissemination in the district is one responsibility of the assistant superintendent, among many others. While there are no data teams in the schools, data is discussed at certain team meetings and at whole school staff meetings. However, the use of data is fragmentary and ad hoc rather than systematic and planned, and the value of data analysis has not permeated the district. Teachers told the review team that they were more people- than data-driven. The ELL staff uses the data from its assessments of language acquisition and written language, but does not much use the data from summative assessments of content knowledge such as the MCAS test. Student achievement and assessment data needs to be used more effectively and staff need to be trained in methods of data analysis. This will allow staff to identify the root causes of problems interfering with accelerated learning and will assist in closing the achievement gap for subgroups in the district.

All district administrators, including the central office administrators, should be evaluated annually by the superintendent.

The superintendent uses an instructive and timely evaluation process, including goal-setting, to assess the performance of the district's principals, but does not evaluate central office administrators annually. The review team found that no central office administrators had received a written evaluation of their performance from the superintendent for several years. The district should make it a practice to evaluate all administrators annually, thus holding them accountable and helping them to improve their practice.

The district should continue striving to achieve the goal of having all professional staff trained in the categories and continue to give this goal high priority in professional development planning.

A significant number of Westborough teachers have been trained in at least one category. While this is laudable, the training should continue until all staff have received the recommended training. All students will benefit when teachers are trained in the categories because category training helps teachers improve their pedagogy.

The district should consider purchasing computer-based assistive technologies that will support and improve the achievement of ELL students and students with disabilities.

There are a limited number of computer-based assistive technologies available for both ELL students and students with disabilities to accelerate their achievement toward goals in reading, writing, mathematics, communication, listening, and fluency. At Mill Pond Intermediate School, both ELL and special needs learning centers were equipped with only two student computers and one teacher computer, which staff said was insufficient for students' instructional needs, even without assistive technology. There are many computer-based assistive technologies available that provide solutions that enable students with different learning needs to be more independent and productive.

Appendix A: Review Team Members

The review of the Westborough Public Schools was conducted from May 24-May 27, 2010, by the following team of educators, independent consultants to Class Measures, Inc., an educational consultancy firm engaged by ESE and the CDSA to conduct this district and school review.

Dr. Wilfred Savoie, Leadership and Governance

Helen Apostolides, Curriculum and Instruction and ELL Support

Dolores Fitzgerald, Assessment

William Wassel, Human Resources and Professional Development

Alison Fraser, Student Support

Dolores Fitzgerald served as the review team coordinator.

Appendix B: Review Activities and Site Visit Schedule

Review Activities

The following activities were conducted as part of the review of the Westborough Public Schools.

The review team conducted interviews and focus groups with the following representatives from the Westborough Public Schools central office administration: superintendent, assistant superintendent/director of curriculum and instruction, director of pupil personnel services, ELL coordinator, K through 6 literacy specialist.

The review team visited the following school in the Westborough Public Schools: Mill Pond Intermediate School (4-6) during school visit, the review team conducted interviews with the school principal, assistant principal, and teachers and parents in focus groups.

- The review team conducted 42 classroom visits for different grade levels and subjects at the Mill Pond Intermediate School.
- The review team also interviewed three elementary school principals, the middle school principal, and the high school principal.
- The review team interviewed five elementary, middle, and high school ESL teachers and five ESL tutors.

The review team reviewed the following documents provided by ESE:

- District Profile data
- District and School Data Review
- Latest Coordinated Program Review Report or follow-up Mid-cycle Report
- Reports on licensure and highly qualified status
- Long-term enrollment trends
- List of the district's federal and state grants

The review team reviewed the following documents at the district and school levels (provided by the district or schools):

- Organization chart
- School Improvement Plans
- School committee policy manual
- Curriculum guide
- High school program of studies
- Calendar of formative and summative assessments

- Copies of data analyses/reports used in schools
- Descriptions of student support programs
- Program evaluations
- Student and Family Handbooks
- Faculty Handbook
- Professional Development Plan and program/schedule/courses
- Teacher planning time/meeting schedules
- Classroom observation tools/Learning walk tools
- Job descriptions (for central office and school administrators and instructional staff)
- Principal evaluations
- Procedures and assessments to identify LEP students and assess their level of English proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

Site Visit Schedule

The following is the schedule for the onsite portion of the review of the Westborough Public Schools conducted from May 24-27, 2010.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday
May 24 Orientation meeting with district leaders; interviews with district staff and principals; review of documents	May 25 Interviews with district staff and principals; review of documents	May 26 School visit (Mill Pond Intermediate School): interviews with school leaders; classroom observations; teacher team meetings; teacher and parent focus groups	May 27 School visit (Mill Pond Intermediate School): classroom observations; teacher team meetings; follow-up interviews; team meeting; closing meeting with district leaders