

# District Review Report

Uxbridge Public Schools

Review conducted February 10-14, 2014

---



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

## Organization of this Report

Uxbridge Public Schools District Review Overview.....	1
Uxbridge Public Schools District Review Findings.....	6
Uxbridge Public Schools District Review Recommendations.....	28
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule .....	40
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....	42
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	53

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



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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2014 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper

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



# Uxbridge 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 system wide 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 Uxbridge School District was conducted from February 10-12 and February 14, 2014. The site visit included 27.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 80 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 11 elementary school teachers, 7 middle school teachers, and 3 high school teachers. The site visit was interrupted by a one-day school cancellation because of a snowstorm on Thursday, February 13.

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 46 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

## District Profile

The Uxbridge school district has a town meeting form of government, and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are seven members of the school committee and they meet monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2012. The district leadership team includes the business manager, the director of pupil services, the curriculum director, and the principals. Central office positions have changed over the past four years with two superintendents since 2010. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are two assistant principals at the middle and high schools. In 2013-2014 there were 125.3 teachers in the district. In 2012, a new high school was completed, and in 2013 the district reorganized from three schools to four.

In the 2013-2014 school year, 1,898 students were enrolled in the district's four schools:

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

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Taft Early Learning Center	EES	PK-2	523
Whitin Elementary School	ES	3-5	428
McCloskey Middle School	MS	6-8	469
Uxbridge High School	HS	9-12	478
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4 schools</b>	<b>PK-12</b>	<b>1,898</b>
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2009 and 2013 overall student enrollment decreased by seven percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures matched the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 school districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2013; \$12, 506, compared with \$12,506. Actual net school spending has been below what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance<sup>1</sup>

**Uxbridge is a Level 2 district because all of its schools with reportable data are in Level 2.**

- Whitin Elementary is in the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary schools with a Cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) of 61 for all students and 53 for high needs students (target is 75).
- McCloskey Middle is in the 34<sup>th</sup> percentile of middle schools with a cumulative PPI of 48 for all students and 42 for high needs students.
- Uxbridge High is in the 36<sup>th</sup> percentile of high schools with a cumulative PPI of 71 for all students.
- The cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI) for the district was 50 for all students and 43 for high needs students.

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

- ELA CPI was 86.1 in 2013, below the district's target of 91.5.
- Math CPI was 80.6 in 2013, below the district's target of 84.8.
- Science CPI was 80.8 in 2013, below the district's target of 84.5.

**ELA proficiency for the district as a whole and grades 4 through 7 were below the state average and declined between 2010 and 2013, with particularly large decreases in grades 6 and 7.**

- ELA proficiency for all students in the district decreased 3 percentage points from 68 percent in 2010 to 65 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 69 percent.
  - 4<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 5 percentage points from 46 percent to 41 percent, state 53 percent.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 3 percentage points from 63 percent to 60 percent, state 66 percent.
  - 6<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 12 percentage points from 74 percent to 62 percent, state 67 percent.
  - 7<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 14 percentage points from 78 percent to 64 percent, state 72 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also student performance tables in Appendix B.

- ELA proficiency was above the state average in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades and increased notably in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade between 2010 and 2013.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade ELA proficiency was 68 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 57 percent.
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA proficiency was 79 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 78 percent.
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade ELA proficiency increased 14 percentage points from 73 percent in 2010 to 87 percent in 2013, but remained below the state rate of 91 percent.

**Math proficiency in the district was above the state average in the 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grades and below the state average in the 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grade. Between 2010 and 2013 there were notable increases in math proficiency in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades and a large decrease in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade.**

- Math proficiency was above the state average for grades three through five located at the Whitin Elementary school and the sixth grade at McCloskey Middle.
  - Math proficiency rates were higher in 2013 than 2010 by 10 and 14 percentage points in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades, and 2 and 3 percentage points in the 8<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> grade: 67 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 66 percent.
  - 4<sup>th</sup> grade: increased 10 percentage points from 48 percent to 58 percent, above the state rate of 52 percent.
  - 5<sup>th</sup> grade: increased 14 percentage points from 49 percent to 63 percent, above the state rate of 61 percent.
  - 6<sup>th</sup> grade: 63 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 61 percent.
- Math proficiency was below the state average in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades located at McCloskey Middle and in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at Uxbridge High.
  - 7<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 9 percentage points from 51 percent to 42 percent in 2013, 10 percentage points below the state rate of 52 percent.
  - 8<sup>th</sup> grade: 46 percent in 2013, nine percentage points below the state rate of 55 percent.
  - 10<sup>th</sup> grade: 77 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 80 percent.

**Science proficiency trends between 2010 and 2013 varied by grade.**

- 5<sup>th</sup> grade: decreased 7 percentage points from 59 percent to 52 percent in 2013, state 51 percent.
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade: increased 5 percentage points from 34 percent to 39 percent, equal to the state rate of 39 percent.

- 9<sup>th</sup> grade: increased 22 percentage points from 56 percent to 77 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 71 percent.

**Students with disabilities' ELA and math proficiency rates decreased from above the state rate in 2010 to below the state rate in 2013.**

- ELA proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 29 percent in 2010 to 21 percent in 2013, state 30 percent.
- Math proficiency for students with disabilities decreased from 23 percent in 2010 to 16 percent in 2013, state 22 percent.

**Uxbridge met the four-year cohort graduation rate target of 80.0 percent and the five-year cohort graduation rate target of 85.0 percent.<sup>2</sup>**

- The four-year cohort graduation rate was 86.2 percent in 2012, above the state rate of 84.7 percent.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased from 81.2 percent in 2008 to 85.6 percent in 2011, slightly below the state rate of 86.3 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for Uxbridge increased from 1.1 percent in 2009 to 2.7 percent in 2012, above the statewide rate of 2.5 percent.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

# Uxbridge Public Schools District Review Findings

---

## Strengths

### *Human Resources and Professional Development*

- 1. The Uxbridge school district collaboratively negotiated, ratified, and is now implementing a new educator evaluation system consistent with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework.**
  - A.** In accord with the state's new educator evaluation regulations and with the ongoing support and leadership of the superintendent, the district collaboratively negotiated and ratified its new educator evaluation agreement and is now in the first full year of implementation of its new educator evaluation system.
    1. Administrators and teachers' association representatives explained that a joint task force had worked together for over six months during the second half of the 2011-2012 school year to negotiate the necessary amendment to the teacher collective bargaining agreement (CBA). The new CBA was subsequently ratified at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year.
    2. District administrators and teachers' association leaders confirmed that their new educator evaluation agreement contained only minor differences and was in all important respects fully aligned with key requirements of the state educator evaluation system. The superintendent indicated that ESE had reviewed the district's new educator evaluation system. In November 2012 ESE's Office of Educator Preparation, Policy, and Leadership reviewed and provided feedback on the district's new educator evaluation system.
    3. Interviewees and district records confirmed that, using a combination of external consultants and internal trainers, all ESE-required training hours in support of the new evaluation system have been provided to both teachers and administrators. In addition, the superintendent subsequently provided further formal training for all administrators through the Research for Better Teaching (RBT) institute. There was general agreement, however, that additional and ongoing training for administrators and faculty was essential to ensure the continued success of the system.
    4. The district purchased a comprehensive software program (TeachPoint) to support, to facilitate, and to manage the extensive volume of documents and data generated by the new evaluation system. With the exception of Uxbridge's new high school, convenient access to this system for both administrators and teachers was limited by inadequate/outdated technology infrastructure in many of the district's older schools.
    5. Although teachers and administrators expressed varying degrees of clarity about the numerous steps, stages, and expectations of the new system, there was general agreement that a genuine effort was being made across the district to follow all the requirements and



timelines contained in the new CBA. For example, according to interviewees and district documents, all administrators and teachers had completed their self assessments, goal setting, educator plans, and evidence documentation. Further, examples of requisite classroom observations and mid cycle formative assessment reports were provided to the review team.

6. Teachers expressed general support for the new evaluation system. They cited among the benefits of the program increased administrative visibility in classrooms, greatly improved feedback and expanded conversations about teaching and learning, and more frequent and substantive professional collaborations with colleagues.
  7. Administrators were more equivocal in their support of the new evaluation system. Although they recognized its numerous benefits, they expressed concern that the demands of the new system were burdensome and would compete with their many other responsibilities. They also acknowledged some inconsistencies in their interpretations of their responsibilities within the new system. Finally, principals at all levels expressed the view that currently there were too few evaluators to properly meet the increased supervision and evaluation requirements of the new state regulations.
- B.** The strong support and leadership demonstrated by the superintendent throughout the implementation of the district's new educator evaluation system has been essential to its success.
1. The superintendent set a positive example for all the district's educators by having the school committee develop his 2012-2013 annual performance review according to the new state educator evaluation system.
  2. The superintendent wrote comprehensive summary evaluations for the 2012-2013 school year for each of the district's principals and central office administrators. These evaluations corresponded fully with the requirements and expectations articulated in the new state regulations.
  3. District leaders reported that the superintendent was carefully monitoring the implementation of the new evaluation system to ensure its fidelity to the language in the CBA. He maintained an ongoing dialogue with them to reinforce his expectation that all steps, stages, and timelines were met and he reviewed and provided timely feedback on evaluative documents, reports, and data.
  4. The superintendent created an Educator Evaluation Facilitator Team to provide a "direct link between management and staff" and serve as a formal mechanism to "evaluate staff feedback, discuss plans to move the system forward based on that feedback, and look forward to the next phases of implementation" of the evaluation system. This committee was chaired by the director of curriculum; it was composed of administrators and 10 teachers who receive stipends and who meet monthly. The superintendent's continued

willingness to invest substantial time and resources to support the work of this team served as evidence of his publicly stated belief that it was “pivotal to the success of the educator evaluation system implementation.”

**Impact:** The district’s efforts to adopt and implement Massachusetts’ new educator evaluation system reflect its commitment to comprehensive and systemic school improvement. If the superintendent and his administrative team remain committed to the full and faithful implementation of the new evaluation system, continuous and comprehensive improvements in learning opportunities, educational programs, and academic outcomes for all students will likely result.

**2. The district is in the process of developing a new professional development system that is coordinated, collaborative, appropriately differentiated, data driven, and aligned with district goals.**

- A.** In an effort to improve its professional development (PD) system and involve faculty more directly in its planning and implementation, the district created the Professional Development Committee (PDC), an inclusive and collaborative team that assumed responsibility in 2013-2014 for the overall design, coordination, and delivery of PD programs and services across the district.
1. The PDC is chaired by the director of curriculum and composed of teachers representing each of the district’s schools. The teachers receive stipends, are considered PD leaders and liaisons in their respective schools, and attend and actively participate in the monthly PDC meetings where all short and long term PD planning is conducted. Members of the PDC reported that this new leadership structure has already done much to promote meaningful and ongoing collaboration and sharing of ideas between teachers and administration resulting in more timely, targeted, and relevant PD planning and implementation.
  2. The PDC is making increasing use of data to establish priorities, inform planning, monitor progress, and measure the effectiveness of programs, services, and supports. PDC members indicated that these include MCAS tests data, district common student assessments, TELL (Teaching Learning and Leading Survey) Massachusetts results, and ongoing collection and systematic and timely analysis of teacher feedback.
  3. The PDC is working to improve the alignment of PD programming with core district initiatives. Consequently, PD planning in 2013-2014 has focused primarily on providing training in the areas of educator evaluation, common assessments, and technology integration.
  4. While focusing to the degree possible on a well defined set of targeted district priorities, the PDC endeavors to design programs and activities that are appropriately differentiated, acknowledging that staff members have varying levels of expertise, readiness, interest, and need. Interviewees and PD agendas confirmed that PD programming is designed to be flexible and therefore is delivered in different ways, including whole staff workshops, small study groups, mini workshops, and paired and independent focused work sessions.

**Impact:** The district has displayed a renewed commitment to creating and sustaining a PD program that is aligned with state and district priorities, informed by data relevant to student achievement and staff needs, and by assessments of instructional practices and programs in each of its schools. In the PDC the district has created a potentially powerful vehicle for administrators and teachers to collaborate in structured and purposeful ways, thereby creating a culture, support systems, and strategies conducive to ongoing professional growth and shared responsibility for student learning. Ultimately, this work lays a foundation for significant and lasting improvements in instructional practices, curriculum, and student academic opportunities, experiences, and outcomes.

### ***Student Support***

#### **3. Student support staff use data to identify students with cognitive and behavioral needs and are responsive to their needs with a variety of programs, reflecting a district-wide commitment that “students come first.”**

- A.** Student support personnel use performance and assessment data as a source of information in making decisions about placements and services.
  - 1. Interviewees reported that high school administrators, adjustment counselors, and guidance staff monitor seniors’ progress toward graduation by reviewing attendance and course credits. Credit recovery is possible via online course opportunities, with students returning for a semester after cohort graduation as “Super Seniors,” or through a dual-enrollment option at Quinsigamond Community College or Framingham State College. A special education teacher at the high school has used data to benchmark proficiency for high-risk students and students accessing special education services, and then implemented different monitored approaches to move all students to proficiency.
  - 2. Interviewees said that the new middle school mathematics specialist position was created to target and provide support to the lowest performing 10 percent to 15 percent of students who are not identified for special education services. The mathematics specialist uses a variety of data sources, including MCAS tests, STAR (new in September 2013), grades, and teacher recommendations to identify those struggling students and then to create tailored interventions.
  - 3. Progress has been made on the district improvement goal of developing data measurement guidelines to evaluate skills in reading, writing and mathematics for all special education pullout classrooms. Small special education teams in each school have either chosen one or more standard common assessments, developed their own skill lists, or created or adapted rubrics. Some measures have been benchmarked.
- B.** Many student support services throughout the district support the cognitive and social-emotional needs of students, including those described below.

1. Full inclusion in general education classrooms at all levels is an option for students on Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs), allowing them access to high quality instruction in the least restrictive environment. Sixty-four percent of students on IEPs receive instruction in full inclusion general education classrooms.
  2. Response to intervention (RTI) has been implemented at the elementary level. Administrators reported that 30 minutes a day is dedicated to RTI in ELA and reading, and that Title I students are assigned to Tier 2.
  3. One elementary school also houses the New England Center for Children Partnership classroom. Interviewees described it as an intensive instructional model for students with autism, allowing them to stay in district and participate in some classroom activities with peers.
  4. Support personnel described the middle school “flex center” as a drop-in center offering responsive academics and social skills support, crucial for students on the autism spectrum, and particularly helpful since there is no pullout mathematics support class in the middle school.
    - a. Student support staff are collaborating and communicating vertically about a “flex plan” across all schools to “help fill in the continuum of services.”
  5. The Mosaic Mill integrated courses are a “full-time, self-contained program that services students with emotional and behavioral needs.” Interviewees said that Mosaic Mill courses are for students who have not been successful in traditional classrooms and who need behavioral rather than academic support.
  6. Interviewees described the integrated pullout courses in mathematics and ELA at the high school as useful for those students on IEPs who require more small-group support than can be offered in inclusion classrooms.
- C. The district has implemented a variety of academic and practice-based options, combined with oversight at the high school level to ready students for college and careers.
1. Tenth graders take the PSAT and that data is analyzed as an early indicator of college-readiness
  2. AP courses are open to all students with a two-week trial period for those for whom AP coursework is challenging.
  3. Guidance staff tracks attendance and reviews the status of students, especially seniors, in danger of failing a class after each marking period. Student assessment teams monitor the progress of underachieving at-risk students via bi-weekly meetings.

- D.** The director of pupil services, team chairs, school guidance staff, and paraprofessionals have created strong relationships with students and their families.
1. The superintendent and interviewees reported that “kids come first” and “it’s a community of caring.”
  2. An adjustment counselor at each school in the district supports students at transition points, and two at the high school address students on the autism spectrum needing support with social issues and others for whom behavior interferes with learning.
    - a. Adjustment counselors and social workers were described by an interviewee as very proactive with parents, especially less involved parents, because they develop individualized strategies to facilitate meetings and to help make parents feel “less intimidated” and “more welcome.”
  3. Interviewees working with students accessing special education services specified that vertical communication was consistent between staff in different schools, making transitions easier for families and students. One reported that the adults in the students’ life “do a lot of conversing.” Student support personnel visit students at the earlier level school before they transition.
  4. Child study teams at the elementary, middle, and high school levels and the Student Review Committee at the PreK-2 level respond to teachers’ and parents’ requests for social-emotional support for students. At the high school, requests by parents prompt these reviews more often than request by teachers.
  5. High school seniors spoke about a course that aided seniors applying to college. One stated, “I would not have gotten the college process done” without participating in College and Careers.
  6. Interviewees identified several career readiness options, including high school internships, the Independence Project offering internships for students through age 22 on IEPs, and high school courses aligned with careers (e.g., Auto-cad, Family & Consumer Science). At the high school, Naviance software is used for career interest profiling beginning in grade 9 and the middle school recently obtained Naviance software to support exploration of colleges and careers.
- E.** The district’s support for special education services is reflected in budgeting and hiring practices.
1. According to the district’s fiscal year 2015 School Department Budget Proposal, in fiscal year 2014, the district employed 21 FTE special education teachers, 13.70 FTE special education specialists, and 54.1 FTE paraprofessionals. The superintendent told the team that all paraprofessionals in the district are in special education. According to the proposal, in fiscal year 2014 the ratio of students with disabilities to paraprofessionals (FTEs) was approximately 5:1.

- a. According to ESE data, in 2013 there were 22.7 special education teachers, 1.0 special education support, 12.8 special education related staff, and 58.1 special education paraprofessionals. The ratio of students with disabilities to paraprofessionals was 10.4:1, compared with the state ratio of 15.4:1.

**Impact:** District student support personnel explore and provide a wide variety of plans and activities to respond to students' needs, supported by consistent communication among specialists at all levels, and with families and students. They have created an environment that reflects their commitment to putting students first.

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

#### **4. The district has a solid and well-structured budget development and dissemination process that includes input from teachers, principals, and central office administrators.**

- A. The superintendent developed a detailed and transparent fiscal year 2015 budget proposal that includes budget goals and priorities. The proposal includes school improvement plan goals and articulates the rationale for budget requests for each district school, including how the budget request addresses school improvement goals, connects to district goals, and meets the instructional needs of the school. Staffing and salary information is included for each school as well as for central office positions.
  1. The proposal provides a budget calendar that includes 16 timelines for actions related to the approval of the budget. The calendar is accessible to the public on the district's website.
  2. District leaders told the team that they developed, as directed by the school committee, a level services budget for fiscal year 2015 and the budget development process begins by using cost estimates from the prior year. Limited analysis of student achievement data is performed during the budget process to determine the allocation of resources across the district.
  3. Principals and directors submit budget estimates for supplemental needs, such as expected out-of-district special education costs or other programmatic changes. Directors and principals meet with the superintendent or business manager to explain supplemental requests. School budget proposals with supporting information, including the methodology that was used to determine budget needs, are submitted to the business manager by early December.
  4. Principals and directors are able to present budget needs formally and informally to the school committee, and school site councils make presentations to the school committee about the school improvement plans and the funding needed to implement the plans.

- B.** Budget documents provided at public meetings and at school committee meetings are transparent and include line item information. The district website includes the line item detail of the fiscal year 2015 budget as well as a recent school committee budget update.
1. The team was provided documents related to budget presentations to students and families, the community, staff, and the town finance committee.
  2. Principals reported that they are required to submit to the superintendent a budget narrative request outlining the budget needs of the school, including staffing needs. They stated that they include in the narrative feedback on budget requests from teachers.
  3. The school committee receives budget updates from the business manager at school committee meetings. The finance subcommittee of the school committee meets twice monthly to discuss the budget and other financial issues and advises the full committee on the budget.

**Impact:** Having a strong and accountable budget development process that includes well-defined roles and responsibilities for all budget stakeholders helps to create an atmosphere of shared commitment to academic excellence. This process will serve the district well if it faces budget shortfalls and additional student attrition.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

### *Leadership and Governance*

**5. Administrative turnover in Uxbridge over the past five years has resulted in the schools acting independently rather than collaboratively as a school system.**

- A.** Many administrators have changed in both the central office and at the school levels since the 2009-2010 school year.
1. During this time period, according to a document made available to the team, there have been two different superintendents, three different curriculum directors, and three different directors of pupil services.
  2. Also from the 2009-2010 school year to the 2013-2014 school year, there have been changes in some of the principal positions: There have been three different middle school principals, two different elementary school principals, and in 2012-2013 with the opening of the newly constructed high school and the reconfiguration of the district, an addition principal at the Early Learning Center.
- B.** Interviewees told the team that changes in both central office and school administrators had an impact on the district.
1. The superintendent said that while the schools were functioning as “fiefdoms” and principals were not working as a collaborative team in 2012-2013, they had made “great strides” in working together in 2013-2014.
  2. Principals spoke about the instability in the school system and inconsistencies in school policies and programs.
  3. Elementary school teachers also spoke about the effects of administrator turnover in the district including fluctuation in priorities, inconsistency, absence of clarity, confusion, and absence of focus about curriculum coordination and development.
  4. Middle school teachers’ comments about the impact of changes in the district and school leadership included: “We don’t have a consistent avenue to follow because our superintendents and principals keep changing”; “It’s difficult to keep our bearings”; “[We are] rudderless,” “[We are] bombarded with initiatives”; “There’s a sense of confusion”; and “Too much change all at once.”
  5. High school teachers said that every new administrator brought in his/her own ideas and changes, so “we shift to follow their vision; then someone new comes in and we switch again and try to get settled.” They noted that at the end of the year they ask, “What’s the next change going to be?” One teacher described a succession of schedule changes from a



4 X 4 block schedule, to a trimester schedule, and finally to a semester schedule.

6. Teachers' association representatives said that priorities were always changing; there was no consistency; many new ideas and initiatives caused stress and exhaustion; there were morale concerns across the district; and the schools were not unified.
- C. The current superintendent, who has been in the district for approximately a year and a half, has taken steps to begin to unify the school system and to build a culture of collaboration and high standards.
1. The superintendent had teachers, principals, and directors provide input toward the development of the fiscal year 2015 school department budget proposal.
  2. The superintendent also worked collaboratively with the teachers' association to negotiate, adopt, and implement the new educator evaluation system. The superintendent also supported the establishment of an Educator Evaluation Facilitator Team, composed of administrators and teachers, to address issues associated with the implementation of this system.
  3. A review of the principal and director evaluations that were prepared by the superintendent showed that he was holding administrators accountable to high standards and modeling effective supervision and evaluation for the district.
  4. The establishment of the Professional Development Committee, consisting of administrators and teachers enabled these committee members to seek input from the staff to determine their professional needs, to plan professional development programs, and to evaluate the feedback from the staff that attended the programs.
  5. At the time of the onsite visit, the administrative team and teacher leaders were working collaboratively with the superintendent to develop a 2014-2015 District Improvement Plan.

**Impact:** The turnover of administrators in the district has resulted in inconsistencies in policies and programs, absence of clarity, fluctuating priorities, and too many initiatives. In addition, the schools had not established a culture of collaboration. The current leadership is in the early stages of unifying the four schools and establishing clear district priorities through a collaborative process.

**6. From fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2014, between 9 percent and 10 percent of students each year have enrolled in out-of district public schools at a cost of approximately \$1 million in school choice tuition annually. The ratio of choice-out to choice-in students was approximately 3 to 1 in fiscal year 2012.**

- A. According to ESE data, the number of Uxbridge students leaving the district under the school choice program has increased every year since 2012. In combination with the decrease in district enrollment from 1,915 in 2012 to 1,898 students in 2014, this means that the proportion of

choice students leaving the district was one percentage point higher in 2013-2014 than it was in 2011-2012 (10 percent compared with 9 percent).

**B. Stakeholders expressed various opinions about district losses to school choice.**

1. The superintendent told the team that 102 out of 167 Uxbridge grade 8 students entering grade 9 applied to a technical school for the 2013-2014 school year. He went on to say that he had surveyed the parents of students leaving the district to determine the reasons, but the response rate was fewer than 5 percent. In addition, the superintendent said that the district was trying to focus on student and parent expectations. He added that the district was not attempting to duplicate the programs of a regional vocational technical high school and needed to improve its pathways for students to go on to college.
2. A school committee member expressed the view that losses under school choice increased after the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) placed Uxbridge High School on probation approximately ten years ago because of the condition of the former high school facility. He added that it was important to ensure that seventh and eighth grade students remained in the district. Another school committee member stated the need to promote the academic quality of district high school level programs.
3. In focus groups teachers provided various reasons for the losses to school choice, including people taking different sides on the various proposals for school renovation and construction projects; fewer programs than promised; a decrease in Advanced Placement classes; and the availability of only one foreign language in the school system.
4. Teachers' association representatives told the team that an incomplete K-12 curriculum contributed to the loss of students, adding that the elimination of certain programs and courses because of budget reductions had also contributed.
5. School council parent members expressed concern about budget constraints, classrooms with more than 30 students, the condition of some of the older schools, and an absence of rigor in some district programs and courses.

**C. According to district documents provided to the team, the district expended \$1,019,285 in school choice tuition in fiscal year 2013 and \$983,780 in fiscal year 2012. No amount was available for fiscal year 2014. According to ESE data, the district spent \$1,080,582 in fiscal year 2014, \$1,017,870 in fiscal year 2013 and \$983,870 in fiscal year 2012.**

**Impact:** Although the district has a new high school, it is still confronted with the issue of students opting for out of district school choice placements as well as enrollment in vocational/technical, private, and parochial schools. Student attrition presents a significant fiscal challenge to the district.

**7. The district does not have a comprehensive 2013-2014 District Improvement Plan.**

- A.** The superintendent stated that the district has six district improvement goals rather than a District Improvement Plan (DIP) for 2013-2014. Principals said that while a comprehensive 2013-2014 document did not exist, there were other planning documents with a narrower scope.
1. The six district goals focus on (a) Educator Evaluation, (b) MCAS Achievement & Growth, (c) Curriculum Standards-Based Unit Design, (d) District Determined Measures, (e) Continuum of Specialized Instruction Services, and (f) Instructional Technology Integration. Key actions and benchmarks accompany each goal.
  2. The superintendent told the team that the administrative team and teacher leaders were assisting him with the development of the 2014-2015 DIP which was a “work in progress.” The principals confirmed this work.
- B.** Each of the four schools had a 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIPs used various formats, but their goals were aligned, for the most part, with the district goals.
1. Not all SIP goals were SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results-focused; and timed and tracked). For example, one goal was “to improve student achievement by integrating best practices in the classroom in an effort to increase Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) scores and attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).” Another stated that “all teachers will be implementing the Empowering Writers program in all academic areas in order to track student progress in the different forms of writing (narrative, expository, opinion/persuasive writing) using the grade level writing rubrics.”
  2. A review by the team showed that SIP goals were mostly aligned with district goals. Three principals said that their teachers aligned their own goals with SIP goals. Another principal stated that the SIP had to be revamped after the teachers’ SMART goals were submitted. Teachers told the team that the SIP goals influenced their goals, especially the student achievement goals. Administrators told the team that their own goals were aligned with both district and SIP goals.

**Impact:** Without a 2013-2014 DIP, the school committee, administrators, key stakeholders, and the community do not have a detailed road map as to the future direction of the school system and a plan for reaching consensual goals. Absence of a DIP also leads to uncertainty throughout the school system and community; stakeholders do not know the “who, what, when, where, how, and why” that is associated with every strategy or action step necessary to accomplish each district improvement goal.

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

The team observed 46 classes throughout the Uxbridge school district: 18 at the high school 11 at the middle school and 17 at the two elementary schools. The team observed 23 ELA, 11 mathematics, 5 science, 4 social studies/history, and 3 other classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes

in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

**8. The district has initiated a three-stage process to develop curriculum materials aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. However, the continued development, consistent use, and effective delivery of the curricula have been jeopardized by a number of factors.**

- A.** In 2011 the Uxbridge Public Schools purchased Rubicon Atlas, a web-based curriculum management tool.
  - 1. The tool provides a digital warehouse for curriculum maps.
  - 2. According to the district's procedural manual, "teachers are responsible for ensuring aspects of the curriculum maps are fully addressed. The maps illustrate the common essential teaching and learning."
- B.** Project Connect was initiated in 2011 by the director of curriculum to connect Uxbridge student learning experiences with the content standards. The three-stage project delineates the following timetable for the development of the essential components of the district's maps:
  - 1. Stage 1: 2011-2014 – enter the standards... what students need to know;
  - 2. Stage 2: 2013–2017 – create power standards and their related assessments; and
  - 3. Stage 3: 2014-2018 – develop model lessons... teaching and learning experiences.
- C.** The use and utility of the web-based curriculum management tool has been compromised by many factors.
  - 1. For budgetary reasons, teacher licenses are limited. Approximately one-third of Uxbridge's professional staff does not have a license necessary to access the web-based Rubicon Atlas curriculum warehouse. For the 2013-2014 school year, the district purchased 50 licenses for staff.
  - 2. The district's elementary schools and the middle school do not have the necessary infrastructure and hardware for staff to access the digital warehouse.
  - 3. In multiple interviews, staff mentioned a number of other factors that have contributed to disrupting the Project Connect initiative and the utility of the web-based curriculum management tool.
    - a. The opening of a new high school in 2012 and the resulting grade reorganization resulted in the faculties of the middle school and high school moving to different buildings. The accompanying grade reconfiguration resulted in teacher movement: the former pre-K to grade 5 school became a pre-K to grade 2 school; elementary grades 3-5

shifted to the middle school; grades 6-8 shifted to the former high school, and grades 9-12 entered a new building.

- b. Interviewees cited the discontinuity caused by administrative turnover at the district level and in the schools as impediments to Project Connect's progress.
  - c. Uxbridge staff attributed the excess of new initiatives and "committee fatigue" as reasons progress was stalled. Staff referred to the educator evaluation system, aligning to the Common Core, the PARCC assessment, RETELL and ACCESS, and District Determined Measures as competing initiatives that required their attention.
- D. Key instructional staff said that these issues have made it challenging to use, contribute to, and benefit from the district's powerful web-based resource. They told the team that as a consequence of these factors they had created alternative curriculum resources. For example, staff at one of the elementary schools had uploaded their curriculum maps to Google Docs and staff at another school had made hard copies of their maps.

**Impact:** The instructional staff's limited access to the district's curriculum management program has stalled progress toward developing an aligned, documented, and viable K-12 curriculum. The desired collaborative dialogue and contributions to the overall process of advancing and improving the learning experience of all students has been diminished. The curriculum tool's potential to generate communication and facilitate the Uxbridge's educational community's focus on improving teaching and learning is not being fulfilled.

**9. Teachers demonstrated high content knowledge and created a positive environment and appropriate conditions for learning in observed district classes. Some characteristics of effective instruction were either not prevalent or inconsistent from level to level. Use of technology by teachers and students as a tool for learning was limited throughout the district.**

- A. There was clear and consistent evidence of teachers demonstrating knowledge of subject and content in 87 percent of observed district classes.
- B. Observers found clear and consistent evidence of conditions conducive to learning in district classes, including positive interactions between teachers and students and among students (87 percent); clearly communicated standards of behavior (70 percent); and a classroom arrangement that provides access to learning activities for all students (72 percent).
- C. Certain practices and provisions were inconsistent from level to level throughout the district.
  - 1. Rituals and routines promoting transitions with minimal loss of instruction time were prevalent in 88 percent of elementary, 64 percent of middle school and 39 percent of high school classes.

2. Multiple resources to meet the needs of all students were evident in 82 percent of elementary, 36 percent of middle school, and 33 percent of high school classes.
  3. Strategies promoting a learning environment where students may take risks, make predictions, make judgments, and investigate were evident in 76 percent of elementary, 39 percent of high school, and 27 percent of middle school classes.
  4. Teachers using frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction was evident in 61 percent of high school, 29 percent of elementary, and 27 percent of middle school classes.
  5. Students assuming responsibility for their own learning was evident in 67 percent of elementary, 55 percent of middle school and 39 percent of high school classes.
- D.** Some characteristics of high quality instruction were low incidence in observed district classes, including lessons reflecting rigor and high expectations (37 percent); students engaging in challenging academic tasks (31 percent); students articulating their thinking orally or in writing (37 percent); and students elaborating about content and ideas when responding to questions (17 percent).
- E.** Students were observed to be using technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding in only 13 percent of observed district classes.

**Impact:** Without employing a range of instructional methods based on best practices' research and maintaining high expectations for all students, the district's instructional staff cannot sufficiently support or challenge its student learners. Without a breadth of effective instructional methods, the achievement of students of all ability levels is compromised. The underuse of existing technological resources for teaching and learning removes a potential resource for improving student achievement.

### ***Assessment***

**10. The district does not have in place a balanced set of assessments that can be used for school, educator, and student improvement. There was some evidence of data-driven decisions.**

- A.** At the K-2 and 3-5 grade levels, schools were beginning to collect data to monitor ELA and mathematics progress. According to documentation and interviews, the district uses the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Learning Skills (DIBELS) K-1, the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA II) K-2, , and the Diagnostic Online Reading Assessment (DORA) in grades 2-5. The Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) was also used for students who continued to struggle in reading in later grades.

- B. At the middle and high schools, data was collected primarily in mathematics, using STAR, with some reading assessment conducted at the middle school for selected students.
- C. The district also began piloting STAR math in September 2013 in grades 1-8; it was being administered three times per year, and more frequently for at risk students. At the elementary level some grades were piloting STAR ELA and comparing the results with the results from DORA. At the middle school, some reading measures, including STAR, were used for students with skill deficits.
- D. At the high school all students took the PSATs and results were used to schedule classes and to identify students who could participate in the Advanced Placement (AP) program.
- E. A district leader told the team that there was not yet a balanced system of assessments and more work was needed on the development of formative assessments. However, work had begun in developing common benchmark assessments at all levels.
  - 1. There were benchmarks in reading at the elementary level, pre and post writing assessments at the middle school, and common assessments in mathematics and ELA at the high school.
  - 2. As part of the Project Connect, schools were establishing power standards and identifying common assessments for these standards. The anticipated completion date of common assessments, including uploading to Rubicon Atlas (Stage 2) in 2014-2015, was June 2015.

**Impact:** While the district is moving toward a deeper analysis of student performance data, it has not systematized its practices or fully implemented its pilot tools. As a result, the district cannot ensure accurate, high quality, and the timely dissemination of data to improve teaching and learning.

**11. The district has taken the first steps to build a data-driven system of decision-making focused on results. A culture shift of data-based decision-making had begun to take place at the district, school leader, and teacher-leader level, but was not fully in place at the classroom teacher level.**

- A. Some school leaders reported that they had begun to make data-based decisions to improve programs and student learning.
  - 1. At the elementary schools where two new mathematics series were being piloted, teachers were comparing student performance data on the different programs to help guide their selection.
  - 2. The middle school hired a mathematics coach based on the analysis of student performance on the MCAS tests.
  - 3. As a result of MCAS tests analysis there was now an emphasis on improving students' open response performance, and each level had developed writing rubrics.

4. The middle school began to use STAR to identify students who needed more support, and elementary teachers were using STAR to analyze students' skill needs.
  5. District leaders were using feedback from teachers to plan and to differentiate the professional development programs.
  6. The district's Educator Evaluation Facilitator team was using data from teacher surveys to monitor the educator evaluation process. For example, the team learned that while teachers were growing in comfort with the TeachPoint program, they were not seeing an increase in risk-taking. As a result, the Educator Evaluation Facilitator team was considering writing up dialogues following their classroom visits.
- B.** The district has identified a group of seven teachers to act as the districtwide data team; the team had not yet met at the time of the site visit but had scheduled its first meeting to take place shortly thereafter. Each school was represented on the districtwide team; however, no school-based data teams were in place. At the time of the visit, the responsibilities and purposes of the data team were not clear to team members.
- C.** School administrators said that there were "pockets of data use" by teachers, but not yet widespread use to inform instruction.
1. Certain teachers, serving as curriculum leaders and grade level leaders, had the responsibility for collecting, analyzing, and distributing data on student achievement in their subject area, or at specific grade levels.
  2. Teachers and school leaders told the team that the district had been slow in the adoption of a data-driven decision-making model for a number of reasons. The 2013-2014 districtwide focus was on the development of power standards and common assessments and on fully implementing the new model educator evaluation system including the establishment of District Determined Measures; further, there was an absence of common planning and meeting time for teachers to collaborate on data analysis and no training on the use of data to inform instruction.
    - a. District leaders said that they expected teachers to narrow their focus in 2013-2014 to develop the power standards in the curriculum. They noted that "teachers were cautious" and concerned that students would have to be sitting at a computer to measure what they know." Principals and teachers who discussed the new educator evaluation system also noted that some teachers were struggling with data as it related to their goals.
    - b. There was a little time districtwide for collaboration among teachers to analyze data. Middle school teachers had the most opportunities for collaboration and high school teachers the least. Middle school teachers had back-to-back common preparation periods within each cycle, elementary teachers had twenty minutes weekly, and high school teachers had no common planning time.



- c. District leaders noted that they were expecting to submit their District Determined Measures in June 2014, but that they had hoped to be able to pilot them for a year before having to use them.
- d. Although the district had planned to provide teacher training on data use and analysis, the plan was delayed when teacher feedback indicated a need for a slowdown in the implementation of initiatives for the 2013-2014 school year.

Teachers responsible for curriculum and instruction and grade team leaders told the team that there has been no training on analysis of data and that “once we have this data most teachers don’t know how to interpret it.” The curriculum director confirmed that there had been no training on data yet.

- e. District and school leaders and teachers told the team that the numerous changes that had taken place in the district in the past few years, including changes in personnel, and the more recent re-organization of the district had stalled many initiatives.
- D.** Widespread use of data by classroom teachers to improve instruction was greatly hampered by the limited access to technology at the elementary and middle school levels. Teachers at some levels had to rely on others to access and analyze the data for them.
- 1. School leaders and teachers confirmed that data reports were provided by the superintendent, the curriculum coordinator, some curriculum and instruction leaders, and some teacher leaders. The distribution and analysis of data depended on the skills of these individuals as well as on their own access to technology, particularly at the elementary and middle school levels.
  - 2. Teachers noted that at the high school, even with good access to technology, access to data depended on the curriculum and instruction leader. Similarly, elementary school teachers said that the curriculum and instruction leaders shared data, but this was not done nor analyzed formally or systematically. Middle school teachers confirmed that the new mathematics specialist analyzed data for teachers.

**Impact:** The district had just begun to establish a culture and a system for using assessments for school, educator, and student improvement. Neither was embedded within each school, and efforts to make progress in the use of data to improve instruction and student learning had slowed considerably. As a result, the district has limited systems and practices in place for ensuring that teachers were well-supported in using an accurate, balanced set of assessments to guide instruction.

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

**12. Although the district's PD programming has become increasingly effective this year, it continues to be hindered by several significant factors. These include inadequate financial support, insufficient common planning and regular meeting time for staff, inconsistent communication practices and structures, and a neglected and underperforming mentoring program.**

- A. Interviewees concurred that the district provides insufficient time for regular and frequent faculty collaboration. Although there were currently three full and four early release PD days built into the school calendar, with the exception of some limited common planning time at the middle school, there were few opportunities for regular and frequent meeting and common planning for teachers across the district. Administrators and Professional Development Committee (PDC) members indicated that there was insufficient time in current school and teacher schedules for staff to adequately address the many demands imposed by state mandates and district and school initiatives.
- B. In various focus groups a number of teachers expressed limited knowledge of the role and responsibilities of the PDC. They indicated that information relative to PD programs and plans was often limited, frequently changed unexpectedly, or were not communicated in a timely manner.
- C. Teachers reported that the district's mentoring program had been neglected for some time. They indicated that no mentoring training had been provided in almost 10 years and that the quality and availability of mentors for new staff was consequently reduced. Administrators acknowledged the present state of the mentoring program and indicated that plans were in place to revitalize it in 2014-2015.

**Impact:** The district's concerted efforts to create an effective and comprehensive PD program for faculty and staff are impeded by inadequate common planning and regular meeting time for staff, inconsistent communication practices and structures, and a neglected and underperforming mentoring program. Needed improvements in teaching practices, professional competencies, and student learning opportunities and outcomes have been delayed or diminished as a consequence.

### ***Student Support***

**13. The district has not developed an overarching, well-implemented, integrated model of K-12 student support. Related factors have impeded this process.**

- A. The middle school had proposed, but not yet implemented, a Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) to expand on RTI efforts, targeting at-risk students.
  - 1. This new system would require a reconfiguration of teams and referral processes.

2. The team did not find evidence of a plan with a calendar, responsibilities, evaluation methods for effectiveness, or vertical articulation with elementary and high schools.
- B. Interviewees reported a rich variety of evolving pilot data collection and analysis activities targeting specific subject areas, school levels, and students struggling in general education classrooms. However, there is limited vertical communication about alignment to enable staff to follow students over time.
  - C. Some staff said that they did not have adequate training to support all students' learning. According to interviewees, special education paraprofessionals needed professional development in using assistive technologies and the team learned that such technologies were not always available and/or functional in classrooms at all levels.
    1. An administrator reported that teachers also needed more professional development to use technology to assist in student learning.
  - D. Interviewees, including teachers, stated that few teachers and administrators have been trained in SEI, RETELL, or ACCESS.
  - E. Although assessments guided placement of students in tiered instruction in general education classrooms, differentiated instruction did not appear to be well implemented across the district.
    1. Interviewees identified the need for professional development for teachers on how to effectively differentiate instruction. Further, interviewees said that some teachers were better at differentiation than others.
    2. Differentiation in instruction was clearly and consistently or partially evident in only 28 percent of all classrooms observed by the team.
      - a. Although "Inclusive learning" was stated to be one of the primary goals of the special education department, interviewees reported that at some levels across the district it has not been effective.

**Impact:** When there is not an integrated vision of support services for students, the programs may operate as a collection of frequently changing strategies. When staff is not sufficiently trained in differentiation or other student support strategies, success of support programs is undermined as are the efforts to establish a strong system for monitoring the progress of all students and providing them with a continuum of services to support high achievement.

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

14. The district does not have an up-to-date written agreement with municipal government detailing how school related costs will be accounted for in the municipal budget and charged back to schools. The town and school district do have an agreement to share revenue equally.

- A. Information included in the superintendent's entry plan indicates that three of the district's four schools are aging and require significant upkeep including roof replacements and air ventilation systems.
- B. According to 603 CMR 10:00, a written contract or agreement, signed by the parties, or comparable documentation shall be executed and retained to support all non-salary personnel expenditures and all service fees and charges reported by a school district or municipality.
  - 1. The district business administrator and town finance director indicated no current written municipal agreement was in place; however, the finance director indicated an agreement had been in place in past years. Although no current document is in place, the district includes on financial reports the school related costs reported by the town.
  - 2. The team was provided a document for fiscal year 2011 entitled: *Agreement on Allocation School Operating Costs Not Directly in the School Department Budget (Indirect Costs)*. The document was not signed.
- C. The district and town do have a revenue sharing agreement which details how revenue received by the town is shared by the school district and other town departments. According to information provided by town officials a specific formula is in place to calculate how revenue is shared. According to the current formula, revenue is shared equally (50/50).

**Impact:** The lack of a signed municipal agreement between the district and town precludes formalizing an agreed methodology for accounting how municipal charges are calculated on the End of the Year Report, Schedules 1 and 19.

**15. The physical environment and technology infrastructure of three district schools compromise teaching and learning and are an impediment to full implementation of the curriculum and the educator evaluation system.**

- A. Information included in the superintendent's entry plan indicates that three of the district's four schools are aging and require significant upkeep including roof replacements and air ventilation systems.
- B. District elementary and the middle schools require extensive and expensive renovations, including new roofs, carpeting, and asbestos remediation. The district has applied to the Massachusetts School Building Authority to obtain roof replacement funding.
  - 1. Several parents expressed concern about the condition of buildings, including mold and asbestos.
- C. The technology infrastructure at the Whitin, McCloskey, and Taft schools does not support high level use of technology and inhibits access to the Rubicon Atlas curriculum management tool, a web-based tool that requires internet access. Wi-Fi access is limited at the three schools, leaving some technology resources unable to support the educator evaluation system iPads that were provided to evaluators to collect observational data during formative assessment of

teachers. Technology, hardware and infrastructure were all listed as needs by elementary and middle school principals.

- D.** The town has a capital plan that displays the costs associated with numerous projects for the schools. For example, \$650,000 was requested for asbestos abatement at the McCloskey school and \$950,000 was requested for roof projects at the Whittin and McCloskey schools. District and town officials report that restricted funding of the capital plan allows only low cost projects to be completed.

**Impact:** Having school buildings in disrepair and unable to fully support instruction affects student and staff morale and inhibits full implementation of the curriculum and of other initiatives such as educator evaluation.

# Uxbridge Public Schools District Review Recommendations

---

## ***Leadership and Governance***

- 1. The superintendent should continue to use a collaborative approach to implementing the educator evaluation system and developing the budget and district plans.**
  - A.** The superintendent should continue to work with administrators and teachers to solidify the educator evaluation system and to resolve any problems that arise from its implementation.
    1. The Educator Evaluation Facilitating Committee composed of administrators and teachers has the potential to be helpful in this endeavor.
    2. The superintendent has set an example by having the school committee evaluate him using the new educator evaluation system. The superintendent should continue to hold administrators accountable for their responsibilities and duties through written evaluations. Likewise, administrators should hold teachers accountable for the teacher standards, indicators and goals, especially the goal of improving student achievement and closing the achievement gap.
  - B.** The superintendent should continue to seek wide input into the development of the annual school department budget proposal.
    1. The superintendent should share with the school committee and the community what stakeholders indicate is needed to provide a quality education for district students.
      - a. The superintendent and town manager should continue to work together to build the relationship among the school committee, board of selectmen and finance committee for the best interest of the community and district students.
      - b. The superintendent, school committee, town manager, and town officials should conduct annual reviews of any revenue sharing agreement between the municipality and the school department and any agreement between the municipality and the school department on municipal charges to the schools for services rendered.
      - c. The superintendent should continue to explain the educational needs of the district to the community in the superintendent's report for the annual Town Report.
  - C.** The superintendent and the administrative team should complete the development of the DIP. Upon completion, it should be presented to and approved by the school committee, and subsequently shared with all school employees and town residents.
    1. The DIP should contain a detailed roadmap showing where the school system is headed and how, by whom and when goals will be achieved.

- a. The DIP goals should be SMART goals, and the DIP components should include action steps, resources needed, person(s) responsible, benchmarks, deadlines, and measure(s) of accomplishment.
- b. The superintendent should report periodically to the school committee, the school staff and the community on the progress toward achieving DIP goals.
- c. 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.
- d. At the school level, SIP goals should be SMART goals that are in alignment with the DIP goals. Each 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. Principals should update their staff and other stakeholders periodically on progress toward the attainment of SIP goals.
- e. 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 include:

- *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 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/eval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples.

**Benefits:** By implementing these recommendations, the district will continue to build a unified school system through a collaborative, goal-oriented approach that engages all stakeholder groups by having them work together to address issues, share ideas and propose solutions to problems. Such participation will result in a greater commitment from stakeholders and more focused and purposeful progress.

**2. The district should determine why students leave and identify strategies for promoting district programs, services and opportunities in order to maintain enrollment.**

- A.** Maintaining and increasing enrollment should be a priority for the district.
  - 1. The superintendent and administrative team should determine why students leave the district, especially at the secondary level where the transfer rate is the highest.
  - 2. This information might be obtained in a variety of ways, including paper or electronic surveys, telephone calls, focus groups, and interviews, as well as an internal self-assessment.
  - 3. The district should consider surveying recent graduates to determine how well the district prepared them for college, their field of work, or military service.
- B.** The district should analyze stakeholder input to identify specific program improvements, particularly at the secondary level.
  - 1. These improvements should be part of the district's ongoing planning, and should be considered for inclusion in the DIP.
- C.** The district should also implement strategies to publicize the programs, services, and opportunities available for district students.
  - 1. Strategies might include open houses, curriculum nights, career days, question and answer sessions with principals, and move-up days.
  - 2. Information sessions for students transitioning from one school to another should continue and expand to other grades. High school students might participate in these sessions by informing rising ninth grade students about programs at Uxbridge High School.
  - 3. Whenever possible, special events, activities and productions such as concerts, ceremonies, athletic games, guest speakers, competitions, recognitions of students and staff, and the graduation ceremony should be broadcast on local cable television to increase publicity. Principals might submit articles about their schools and photographs to the local newspaper, perhaps with assistance of parents from the school advisory councils.



Recommended resources include:

- 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. This could be a useful tool as the district seeks to identify areas for improvement in its effort to increase enrollment.
- ESE's *Conditions for School Effectiveness* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSE.pdf>) identify the research-based practices that all schools, especially the state's most struggling schools, require to effectively meet the learning needs of all students. This tool also defines what each condition looks like when implemented purposefully and with fidelity.
- The *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSESelf-Assesment.pdf>) is a tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus. This could be a useful resource as the district reflects on the quality of programming at the high school.

**Benefits:** Reducing the number of students leaving the district would result in a savings in school choice tuitions. This might allow the district to propose restoration of some eliminated or reduced positions, programs, and services. Determining the reasons for students leaving the district would help to guide the development of targeted improvements that meet the needs of all learners. Publicizing district programs services and opportunities would give Uxbridge residents a better understanding of the district and gain their informed support.

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

- 3. The instructional staff's knowledge and use of a variety of instructional methods should be expanded and supported. Pedagogical methodologies that promote inquiry, analysis of information, and evaluation of conceptual knowledge should be fostered.**
  - A.** The district's professional development committee should continue to align the PD program with district priorities and with educators' differentiated needs.
    1. The PDC should use a variety of resources to identify and offer teachers professional growth experiences, including embedded professional development such as coaching and common planning time, that focus on delivering rigorous instruction that promotes higher order

- thinking and other learning skills and incorporates the use of technology.
2. The committee should continue its use of data, including analyzing data from Uxbridge’s educator evaluation system and classroom observations to inform its professional development planning.
  3. The use of learning walks could assist in developing a shared, high quality pedagogical focus for the purpose of improving instructional practice.
- B.** The district’s new data team should use ESE’s Edwin Analytics (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) to analyze strengths and weaknesses and identify content and skills that instruction should more directly address.
- C.** Under the new educator evaluation regulations, “Educators whose summative performance rating is exemplary and whose impact on student learning is rated moderate or high shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement.” 603 CMR 35.08(7). The district is encouraged to support teacher growth by creating or expanding opportunities for exemplary staff to exercise instructional leadership. Opportunities could include serving as models of best classroom practice, or in other roles, such as data coaches, mentors, and curriculum developers.

Recommended resources include:

- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- *ESE’s 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 can be a useful reference for districts that seek a systematic approach to observing classrooms to discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

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

- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
- *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncc&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqt9EmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.

- *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.

**Benefits:** All of Uxbridge’s students will have a better opportunity to increase achievement when the breadth of the instructional staff’s pedagogical methods is expanded. Analysis of instructional trends and student performance data will help to clarify those practices that will best facilitate Uxbridge students’ academic success.

**4. Uxbridge’s leadership team should fully support the activities related to Project Connect and the use of the district’s web-based curriculum management tool.**

- A.** Uxbridge should strongly consider providing all its professional staff access to Rubicon Atlas resources. Fidelity of implementation of the curriculum requires full access to and utilization of the curriculum and related resources.
  1. In those schools where infrastructure and hardware present challenges, teacher work rooms or a professional library might be established to facilitate each faculty’s use and the realization of Atlas’ potential to improve learning.
  2. The Professional Development Committee (PDC) should provide ongoing workshops designed to orient and extend staff members’ capacity to make full use of Atlas.
  3. The PDC should create and monitor structured opportunities for collaborative, district-wide dialogue focused on topics such as the use of data, enrichment, working with English language learners, supporting at-risk students, enrichment and integration of technology.
- B.** The district’s instructional leaders should require teachers to use the district’s curriculum maps to plan their instruction.
  1. The district should consider requiring staff members to state a professional goal related to their use of Atlas resources.
- C.** Stage 2 of Project Connect should be completed, adding the district’s power standards and common assessments to Atlas.
  1. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) should periodically review Project Connect’s progress.
- D.** The instructional leadership team should address the vertical articulation of the district’s curriculum maps.

Recommended resources include:

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu\\_guide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf)) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The district's ILT might find this useful as it prepares for Project Connect's Stage 3.
- *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=PLTuqmiQ9ssgvx\\_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu](http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssgvx_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.

**Benefits:** An aligned, vertically articulated, and consistently delivered curriculum provides many benefits for teachers and students. Curriculum maps make clear the content that is valued. Digitally housed curriculum maps and materials allow every educator to work with the most up-to-date content. Adjustments due to new standards or district priorities can be made more easily. Inter-grade level communication about curriculum helps to ensure a shared knowledge of the students' learning continuum. Furthermore, curriculum coherency and consistency guards against redundancy and enhances student learning and achievement.

## **Assessment**

### **5. The district should continue to implement its plans for a district-level data team to inform instruction and raise student achievement.**

- A. The district should clarify the district data team's role regarding the use of data analysis and how their work will benefit teachers and students.

- B. District leaders should establish a form of routine communication that will serve to instruct and inform teachers, with examples of how district teachers are already using data to inform instruction.
- C. Building on the trust established around the educator evaluator system, the district should establish transparent norms about the uses of the data, including data from DDMs.
- D. The district should use the information about student performance on the STAR, and other student performance indicators, to evaluate program quality; encourage collaboration among the elementary, middle, and high schools; monitor patterns of student performance; and establish a continuum of support services to improve achievement.

Recommended resources include:

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
- ESE's *District-Determined Measures (DDMs)* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/>) includes a wealth of resources and information about the development and use of DDMs.
- *District-Determined Measures* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquEalxpfpzD6gG9zxvPWl0c>) is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).
- The *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC)* (<http://www.parcconline.org/>) website provides many resources to support planning and implementation, including a list of *PARCC implementation Resources for Educators* (<http://www.parcconline.org/for-educators>) and *PARCC Online Professional Learning Modules* (<http://www.parcconline.org/professional-learning-modules-parcc-assessments>).

**Benefit:** By establishing and communicating clearly to all stakeholders the work and purpose of the district data team, the district will help to clarify the role of data in the educator evaluation system. Data team members will serve as the key links between the classroom and leadership and can assist the district in taking the next critical steps in using data to improve student learning and achievement. By continuing to increase and support the use of data at all levels, the district will help to ensure that decisions and planning are based on students' specific strengths and needs.

- 6. The district should implement its plan to train teachers in the use and analysis of data to improve classroom instruction, and ensure that teachers can independently and easily access their own classroom and grade level performance data.**

- A. The district should provide teachers with professional development on how to assess learning in the classroom and how to modify instruction based on formal and informal classroom assessments. In particular, the training should focus on developing and using questioning strategies to raise the level of challenge within the classroom.
- B. The district should help teachers connect their work on curriculum power standards and common assessments to daily classroom assessments.
- C. The district should consider establishing school-based data teams to guide and facilitate data analysis, particularly where there is limited access to data. The teams could create data dashboards with critical information for each school.

**Benefit:** By ensuring that all teachers develop the skills to systematically collect, analyze, and use data, the district will ensure that teachers will be able to make informed decisions about daily classroom learning objectives and instructional activities to meet the needs of all students and raise student achievement.

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

- 7. The district is encouraged to provide increased opportunities for regularly scheduled planning and meeting time for faculty at all grade levels; improve internal communication of PDC objectives, plans, and activities; and move forward with its plans to redesign and invigorate its mentoring system.**
  - A. The district should consider how it can dedicate significantly more time to PD programs and activities. Time for these activities should be added to the district calendar and embedded within the master schedules of all of the district's schools.
    - 1. Regularly scheduled common planning time should be incorporated into teacher schedules and more frequent meeting and planning opportunities provided for teachers at every grade level.
    - 2. The district is encouraged to consult with other school districts in order to identify and explore appropriate scheduling models.
  - B. The role of those teachers serving on the district's PDC should be expanded and formalized within the individual schools they represent. For example, by providing and presenting PD information and timely updates as a regular part of the agenda at every faculty meeting, PD plans, goals, and activities would be communicated more effectively and reliably than is presently the case.
  - C. The district should move forward with its plans to restore the mentoring program. This program should be aligned with ESE's Guidelines for Induction Programs, meet the needs of both first

year and incoming teachers and administrators, and extend throughout a beginning teacher's second and third years of service.

Recommended resources include:

- The *PLC Expansion Project* website (<http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/>) is designed to support schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.
- ESE's *Educator Induction Programs* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/>) provides guidelines and resources for teacher and administrator induction programs.

**Benefits:** By providing additional embedded common planning and meeting time, the district would increase opportunities for curriculum development and coordination and for faculty to work together in sustained and properly supported collaboration; expand professional competencies and instructional practices; improve and expand assessment and data analysis skills; develop appropriate DDMs; and systematically enhance overall teacher effectiveness. Enriched learning opportunities and academic outcomes for all students would likely result.

### ***Student Support***

**8. The district should build on its existing programs and practices to establish a cohesive, effective system for monitoring student progress and responding quickly to student needs. The district should unify all student support with a single, integrated vision so that students experience a continuum of support throughout the grades and teachers have a clear understanding of their role in supporting students.**

- A.** The district should consider establishing a task force to articulate a unified vision of integrated pre-K-12 student services.
1. The task force, working with the director of pupil services, should build on the current work with teachers, child study teams, and student review committees at each level. It should include representation by one or more principals.
  2. The task force could examine practices of differentiation in regular education classrooms, as well as teachers' needs for professional development in the use of WIDA standards and in RETELL strategies, and make recommendations to the PDC for professional development at every level.
  3. The task force should connect resources, help the district to avoid duplication of services, and provide an integrated continuum of support across all school levels.
    - a. The McCloskey Middle School has proposed adoption of the Multi-tiered Support Services, a model that should be considered for integration district-wide.

4. The task force should analyze data and report on the progress of student subgroups, including those in inclusion classrooms and those struggling in regular education, in order to monitor the progress of students across the continuum of student services.

Recommended resources include:

- ESE's *Early Warning Indicator System* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html>) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to address systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.
- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

MTSS Self-Assessment Overview (includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*): <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/>

**Benefits:** Students benefit from a continuum of services when supports are well integrated with clear options communicated to all stakeholders. With appropriate training in differentiation of instruction and curriculum, teachers would be able to ensure that all students have access to the curriculum, and all students progress to higher proficiency levels. A unified vision of student support services, articulated by and advocated by a district-wide task force of multiple stakeholders, reflects a shared commitment that servicing students is the responsibility of everyone in the district.

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

9. **The district and town should consider developing an agreement on a proposed methodology to report municipal indirect expenditures for services provided to the school district by the town.**
  - A. The agreement should be in writing and signed by the superintendent of schools and the town manager.
  - B. The agreement should be drafted in accordance with CMR 10.04 and include specific calculations and methodologies used to determine municipal indirect expenditures not included in the school department budget.
  - C. The agreement should include indirect costs related to cost centers such as buildings and grounds, health insurance, insurance(s), Medicare, unemployment compensation, and debt.



- D. The district and town should consider the following resource in developing an agreement: State regulations on School Finance and Accountability at 603 CMR 10:00:

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html>

**Benefits:** Having a detailed agreement between the district and town clarifies how municipal costs related to the school district are calculated on the End of the Year Report, Schedules 1 and 19 and provides a layer of transparency and accountability.

**10. The district and town should consider commissioning a feasibility study of the Whitin, McCloskey, and Taft schools to develop priority options for future capital funding considerations.**

- A. The feasibility study should document existing conditions and program needs at each school. Alternatives should be evaluated and considered and cost estimates developed. Funding opportunities, guidelines, and resources related to school buildings may be accessed at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/sbuilding/>.
- B. The district should continue to elicit information from administrators, teachers, and parents regarding the conditions at the elementary and middle schools to determine if the conditions such as leaking roofs, old carpeting, and asbestos are affecting teaching and learning. Several parents indicated these conditions may affect whether they choose to send their children to another school district.
- C. District and school administrators should develop a technology plan that includes an upgrade of the technology infrastructures at the Whitin, McCloskey, and Taft schools.

**Benefits:** A feasibility study and technology plan will provide the district and town a cost analysis and record of the physical conditions at three schools in need of attention. The study will serve as an outline and rationale for scheduling and funding projects to improve school infrastructures.

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

---

### **Review Team Members**

The review was conducted from February 10-February 13 by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. John Kulevich, leadership and governance
2. Peter McGinn, curriculum and instruction
3. Christine Brandt, assessment and review team coordinator
4. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development
5. Janet Smith, student support
6. James Hearn, financial and asset management

### **District Review Activities**

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager, district personnel administrator, accounts payable.

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

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, director of curriculum, and director of pupil services.

The team visited the following schools: Uxbridge High School (grades 9-12), McCloskey Middle School (grades 6-8), Whitin Elementary School (grades 3-5) and Taft Early Learning Center (PK-2).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 4 principals and focus groups with 11 elementary school teachers, 7 middle school teachers, and 3 high school teachers.

The team observed 46 classes in the district: 18 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, and 17 at the two elementary schools. (The district cancelled school on day four of the visit because of a snowstorm.)

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

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

**Site Visit Schedule**

<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
02/10/2014	02/11/14	02/12/14	02/14/14
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Taft and Whitin for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to high and middle schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Taft, Whitin, middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals. (School cancelled Thursday, 2/13/2014.)

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Uxbridge Public Schools  
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	13	0.7%	81806	8.6%
Asian	36	1.9%	56517	5.9%
Hispanic	65	3.4%	156976	16.4%
Native America	7	0.4%	2292	0.2%
White	1746	91.8%	630150	66.0%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.1%	1020	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	33	1.7%	26012	2.7%
<b>All Students</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>954773</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2012

**Table B1b: Uxbridge Public Schools  
2012-2013 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	253	48.1%	13.3%	163921	35.5%	17.2%
Low Income	333	63.3%	17.5%	353420	76.5%	37.0%
ELLs and Former ELLs	19	3.6%	1.0%	73217	15.8%	7.7%
All high needs students	526	100.0%	27.7%	462272	100.0%	48.4%

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. 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 1,915 (2012); total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2a: Uxbridge 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	124	90.4	92.3	89.3	88.5	83.3	-1.9	-0.8
	P+	124	67.0%	71.0%	71.0%	68.0%	57.0%	1.0%	-3.0%
4	CPI	162	79.4	81.8	76.3	76.7	78.9	-2.7	0.4
	P+	162	46.0%	45.0%	46.0%	41.0%	53.0%	-5.0%	-5.0%
	SGP	151	46.5	43	23.5	27	49	-19.5	3.5
5	CPI	146	87.1	86.8	83.1	82.2	84.7	-4.9	-0.9
	P+	146	63.0%	63.0%	56.0%	60.0%	66.0%	-3.0%	4.0%
	SGP	141	42.5	42	38	44	52	1.5	6
6	CPI	156	88.5	87.5	83.1	85.3	85.1	-3.2	2.2
	P+	156	74.0%	67.0%	63.0%	62.0%	67.0%	-12.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	150	41	33	33	35.5	52	-5.5	2.5
7	CPI	165	93.3	92	90.7	85.6	88.4	-7.7	-5.1
	P+	165	78.0%	77.0%	74.0%	64.0%	72.0%	-14.0%	-10.0%
	SGP	160	51	44	52	40	48	-11	-12
8	CPI	163	90	93.3	93.8	92.2	90.1	2.2	-1.6
	P+	163	75.0%	80.0%	84.0%	79.0%	78.0%	4.0%	-5.0%
	SGP	157	42	40.5	45	44	50	2	-1
10	CPI	101	90.7	96.3	95	96.3	96.9	5.6	1.3
	P+	101	73.0%	89.0%	81.0%	87.0%	91.0%	14.0%	6.0%
	SGP	92	38	52	45	42.5	57	4.5	-2.5
All	CPI	1017	88.4	89.8	87.1	86.1	86.8	-2.3	-1
	P+	1017	68.0%	70.0%	68.0%	65.0%	69.0%	-3.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	851	44	42	40	39	51	-5	-1

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

**Table B2b: Uxbridge 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	124	89.5	88.9	86.9	84.1	84.3	-5.4	-2.8
	P+	124	69.0%	71.0%	68.0%	67.0%	66.0%	-2.0%	-1.0%
4	CPI	164	82.2	80.5	77.5	84.5	80.2	2.3	7
	P+	164	48.0%	40.0%	48.0%	58.0%	52.0%	10.0%	10.0%
	SGP	152	65	39	29	59.5	54	-5.5	30.5
5	CPI	145	76.5	81.7	80.6	81.4	80.6	4.9	0.8
	P+	145	49.0%	58.0%	53.0%	63.0%	61.0%	14.0%	10.0%
	SGP	140	31.5	37.5	43	44.5	54	13	1.5
6	CPI	156	80.9	83.1	78.6	84.3	80.3	3.4	5.7
	P+	156	64.0%	62.0%	61.0%	63.0%	61.0%	-1.0%	2.0%
	SGP	150	54.5	50	43.5	56.5	50	2	13
7	CPI	168	77.7	73	78.1	71	74.4	-6.7	-7.1
	P+	168	51.0%	48.0%	52.0%	42.0%	52.0%	-9.0%	-10.0%
	SGP	163	43	44	45	35	46	-8	-10
8	CPI	161	70.6	76.7	73.9	73.8	76	3.2	-0.1
	P+	161	44.0%	50.0%	48.0%	46.0%	55.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	156	49.5	42	39	26	50	-23.5	-13
10	CPI	103	88.4	91.9	89.4	90	90.2	1.6	0.6
	P+	103	74.0%	83.0%	74.0%	77.0%	80.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	SGP	94	48.5	42	62	56	51	7.5	-6
All	CPI	1021	80.5	81.8	80.2	80.6	80.8	0.1	0.4
	P+	1021	56.0%	58.0%	57.0%	58.0%	61.0%	2.0%	1.0%
	SGP	855	47	42	42	45	51	-2	3

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

**Table B2c: Uxbridge 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	145	85.6	82	82.4	80.5	78.5	-5.1	-1.9
	P+	145	59.0%	53.0%	53.0%	52.0%	51.0%	-7.0%	-1.0%
8	CPI	161	69.4	74.7	73.7	73.9	71	4.5	0.2
	P+	161	34.0%	41.0%	43.0%	39.0%	39.0%	5.0%	-4.0%
10	CPI	96	82.5	90	90.7	92.7	88	10.2	2
	P+	96	55.0%	75.0%	75.0%	77.0%	71.0%	22.0%	2.0%
All	CPI	402	78.9	81.4	80.9	80.8	79	1.9	-0.1
	P+	402	49.0%	54.0%	55.0%	53.0%	53.0%	4.0%	-2.0%

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: Uxbridge 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	282	78.3	78.9	73.6	72.8	-5.5	-0.8
		P+	282	43.0%	42.0%	41.0%	40.0%	-3.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	222	47.5	39	33	30	-17.5	-3
	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	173	80.5	81.3	77.1	78	-2.5	0.9
		P+	173	49.0%	50.0%	49.0%	46.0%	-3.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	139	48	40.5	32	29	-19	-3
	State	CPI	184999	76.5	77.1	76.7	77.2	0.7	0.5
		P+	184999	47.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	141671	46	46	45	47	1	2
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	146	73.1	71.4	64.9	61.5	-11.6	-3.4
		P+	146	29.0%	25.0%	23.0%	21.0%	-8.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	114	46.5	35	32	27	-19.5	-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	73.8	83	68.2	79.5	5.7	11.3
		P+	22	25.0%	52.0%	23.0%	50.0%	25.0%	27.0%
		SGP	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	1017	88.4	89.8	87.1	86.1	-2.3	-1
		P+	1017	68.0%	70.0%	68.0%	65.0%	-3.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	851	44	42	40	39	-5	-1
	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: Uxbridge 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	282	66.8	70	64	66.6	-0.2	2.6
		P+	282	33.0%	36.0%	32.0%	38.0%	5.0%	6.0%
		SGP	222	44	44	34	38	-6	4
	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	172	70.5	71.6	68.4	73.5	3	5.1
		P+	172	42.0%	40.0%	38.0%	50.0%	8.0%	12.0%
		SGP	138	44	44	37	40	-4	3
	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	147	60.9	61.6	52.5	52.7	-8.2	0.2
		P+	147	23.0%	20.0%	15.0%	16.0%	-7.0%	1.0%
		SGP	115	50	36.5	25	31	-19	6
	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	22	75	85	72.7	80.7	5.7	8
		P+	22	50.0%	68.0%	36.0%	59.0%	9.0%	23.0%
		SGP	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
	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	1021	80.5	81.8	80.2	80.6	0.1	0.4
		P+	1021	56.0%	58.0%	57.0%	58.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	855	47	42	42	45	-2	3
	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: Uxbridge 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	109	65.2	67	66.9	67.2	2	0.3
		P+	109	28.0%	28.0%	30.0%	32.0%	4.0%	2.0%
	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	66	72.1	65	69.7	71.6	-0.5	1.9
		P+	66	39.0%	29.0%	40.0%	39.0%	0.0%	-1.0%
	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	59	56	66.4	55.8	57.6	1.6	1.8
		P+	59	13.0%	23.0%	13.0%	15.0%	2.0%	2.0%
	State	CPI	37049	59	59.2	58.7	59.8	0.8	1.1
		P+	37049	19.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.0%	0.0%
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	8	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	402	78.9	81.4	80.9	80.8	1.9	-0.1
		P+	402	49.0%	54.0%	55.0%	53.0%	4.0%	-2.0%
	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: Uxbridge Public Schools  
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012**

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	1.1	3.1	2	2.7	1.56	1.42	0.66	0.33	2.5

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: Uxbridge Public Schools  
Four-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	42	61.1%	62.2%	51.9%	69.0%	7.9%	12.9%	17.1%	32.9%	74.1%
Low income	28	53.8%	63.9%	50.0%	71.4%	17.6%	32.7%	21.4%	42.8%	72.4%
Students w/ disabilities	21	63.2%	47.6%	53.8%	71.4%	8.2%	13.0%	17.6%	32.7%	68.6%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	61.1%
All students	116	85.2%	80.5%	79.8%	86.2%	1.0%	1.2%	6.4%	8.0%	84.7%

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: Uxbridge Public Schools  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011**

Group	Number Included (2011)	School Year Ending				Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011		State (2011)
		2008	2009	2010	2011	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	27	61.9%	69.4%	64.4%	63.0%	1.1%	1.8%	-1.4%	-2.2%	76.5%
Low income	18	70.4%	65.4%	66.7%	55.6%	-14.8%	-21.0%	-11.1%	-16.6%	75.0%
Students w/ disabilities	13	45.8%	68.4%	47.6%	69.2%	23.4%	51.1%	21.6%	45.4%	70.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.2%
All students	104	81.2%	87.8%	81.4%	85.6%	4.4%	5.4%	4.2%	5.2%	86.3%

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: Uxbridge Public Schools  
Attendance Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.6%	95.3%	95.5%	95.9%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	94.9%

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

**Table B7: Uxbridge Public Schools  
Suspension Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	1.2%	4.8%	3.6%	4.3%	3.1%	258.3%	0.7%	19.4%	3.4%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	3.9%	3.2%	3.3%	3.7%	-0.2%	-5.1%	0.4%	12.1%	5.4%

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: Uxbridge 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	\$17,931,091	\$17,875,371	\$18,160,446	\$18,407,575	\$18,765,842	--
By municipality	\$8,636,544	\$8,976,141	\$10,786,265	\$26,638,319	\$10,855,635	--
Total from local appropriations	\$26,567,635	\$26,851,512	\$28,946,711	\$45,045,894	\$29,621,477	--
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$1,811,289	--	\$1,743,162	--	--
Total expenditures	--	\$28,662,801	--	\$46,789,056	--	--
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$8,901,203	--	\$8,948,989	--	\$9,025,989
Required local contribution	--	\$9,663,507	--	\$9,962,236	--	\$10,285,734
Required net school spending**	--	\$18,564,710	--	\$18,911,225	--	\$19,311,723
Actual net school spending	--	\$22,221,182	--	\$22,926,647	--	\$22,725,156
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$3,656,472	--	\$4,015,422	--	\$3,413,433
Over/under required (%)	--	19.7%	--	21.2%	--	17.7%

\*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

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

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
Administration	\$482	\$312	\$336
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$792	\$816	\$873
Teachers	\$4,629	\$4,647	\$4,903
Other teaching services	\$1,130	\$1,141	\$1,268
Professional development	\$32	\$46	\$61
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$274	\$220	\$186
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$381	\$392	\$413
Pupil services	\$652	\$696	\$691
Operations and maintenance	\$727	\$785	\$780
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,012	\$2,276	\$2,372
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$11,111</b>	<b>\$11,330</b>	<b>\$11,883</b>

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

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

## Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.	ES	0	1	16	#	2	4	40
	MS	0	1	10	%	4%	9%	87%
	HS	2	2	14	---	---	---	---
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	ES	1	2	14	#	9	5	32
	MS	0	1	10	%	20%	11%	70%
	HS	8	2	8	---	---	---	---
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0	2	15	#	0	13	33
	MS	0	4	7	%	0%	28%	72%
	HS	0	7	11	---	---	---	---
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	ES	1	1	15	#	13	4	29
	MS	2	2	7	%	28%	9%	63%
	HS	10	1	7	---	---	---	---
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	1	2	14	#	13	9	24
	MS	4	3	4	%	28%	20%	52%
	HS	8	4	6	---	---	---	---

(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	1	15	#	4	2	40
	MS	1	0	10	%	9%	4%	87%
	HS	2	1	15	---	--	--	--
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	4	6	7	#	16	13	17
	MS	5	3	3	%	35%	28%	37%
	HS	7	4	7	---	---	---	---
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	ES	11	0	6	#	18	2	26
	MS	2	0	9	%	39%	4%	57%
	HS	5	2	11	---	---	---	---
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	ES	2	2	13	#	9	11	26
	MS	4	3	4	%	20%	24%	57%
	HS	3	6	9	---	---	---	---
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for ELLs 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	12	3	2	#	33	7	6
	MS	9	1	1	%	72%	15%	13%
	HS	12	3	3	---	---	---	---
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	6	6	5	#	23	10	13
	MS	7	1	3	%	50%	22%	28%
	HS	10	3	5	---	---	---	---

(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	3	10	#	14	10	22
	MS	5	2	4	%	30%	22%	48%
	HS	5	5	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	1	13	#	15	8	23
	MS	6	2	3	%	33%	17%	50%
	HS	6	5	7	---	---	---	---
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	4	4	9	#	12	8	26
	MS	2	2	7	%	26%	17%	57%
	HS	6	2	10	---	---	---	---
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	8	4	5	#	16	11	19
	MS	4	4	3	%	35%	24%	41%
	HS	4	3	11	---	---	---	---
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	17	0	0	#	34	3	9
	MS	9	0	2	%	74%	7%	20%
	HS	8	3	7	---	---	---	---

(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	4	8	4	#	13	18	14
	MS	5	3	3	%	29%	40%	31%
	HS	4	7	7	---	---	---	---
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	ES	3	7	7	#	12	17	17
	MS	2	3	6	%	26%	37%	37%
	HS	7	7	4	---	--	--	--
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	7	5	5	#	22	10	14
	MS	8	1	2	%	48%	22%	30%
	HS	7	4	7	---	---	---	---
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	7	5	5	#	27	11	8
	MS	9	0	2	%	59%	24%	17%
	HS	11	6	1	---	---	---	---
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	6	4	7	#	18	10	18
	MS	4	3	4	%	39%	22%	39%
	HS	8	3	7	---	---	---	---
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	15	1	1	#	33	7	6
	MS	10	0	1	%	72%	15%	13%
	HS	8	6	4	---	---	---	---
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	1	4	12	#	12	9	25
	MS	2	3	6	%	26%	20%	54%
	HS	9	2	7	---	---	---	---
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	9	7	1	#	30	11	5
	MS	5	2	4	%	65%	24%	11%
	HS	16	2	0	---	---	---	---