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Executive Summary

In April 2017, the town of Framingham voted to accept a new charter that would transform their community of more than 71,000 residents from a representative town meeting system to a city with a mayor-council form of government. Also, in April 2017, the current superintendent joined the school district. In just two years, the schools have shown signs of revitalization with a more inclusive equity focused culture and new staffing patterns, structures, systems, and practices to better address the needs of its growing and increasingly diverse student body. Although some new initiatives are still in the early stages of implementation, leaders and teachers are becoming clearer about the direction the district must take to improve student achievement and well-being and are demonstrating the energy and resolve to learn new practices to achieve district and school goals.

Since 2014, student enrollment has increased by approximately 5.5 percent (from 8,280 in 2014 to 8,822 in 2018) and the racial and ethnic composition of the student body has changed. Based on October 1st enrollments in 2014, the student body was 23.2 percent Hispanic and 61.4 percent white. In 2018, it was 27.4 percent Hispanic and 55.7 percent white. Between 2014 and 2018, the percentage of high needs students[[1]](#footnote-1) increased from 55.3 percent to 58.6 percent. Also, during that period, the distribution of other student groups has changed: the percentage of students whose first language is not English increased from 36.1 percent to 45.0 percent and the percentage of English Learners grew from 13.4 percent to 22.4 percent. Between 2014 and 2018, the percentage of students with disabilities stayed roughly the same: 22.8 percent in 2014 and 22.9 percent in 2018. Between 2015 and 2018, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students[[2]](#footnote-2) increased from 26.9 percent to 33.0 percent. In 2018, students were 57 percent White, 7 percent African-American/Black, 27 percent Hispanic/Latino, 5 percent Asian, and 4 percent Multi-Race.

Guided by a new strategic plan (2017-2020), well-aligned school improvement plans, and sufficient funding, the district’s current improvement approaches are positioned to respond to the schools’ unique contexts.[[3]](#footnote-3) For example, the district has proactively categorized the schools into one of three tiers. Tier assignments are based on student growth and achievement and criteria for intervention to help each school address its improvement goals. The district allocates resources intended for improvement efforts more equitably. Those with greater needs receive greater support such as time to collaborate, support personnel and additional oversight. The three tier 3 schools, all elementary schools (Brophy, McCarthy and Wilson), are the district’s targeted assistance schools. Their leaders and teachers work directly with staff from DESE’s Statewide System of Support (SSoS) to implement a Collective Turnaround Plan (CTAP). One tier 3 school has two ELA coaches instead of one,[[4]](#footnote-4) more walkthroughs by district and school leaders to monitor progress, and more time for various teacher teams to meet as a result of targeted investments in collaboration time. The two tier 2 schools (Barbieri Elementary School and Fuller Middle School) also receive added resources from the district and SSoS staff provide support to their Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs). The other 9 schools are in tier 1 and receive no supplementary resources.

A new staffing structure brings a new approach to leadership roles. District leaders now include three newly designed assistant superintendent positions (one each for elementary education; secondary education; and equity, diversity and community). Their mandate is to build closer alliances and provide technical support at the schools. In addition, the former loosely aligned system of semi-autonomous schools is now emerging as a more collaborative, inclusive, interdependent network of schools.

To improve teaching and learning, educators are starting to use more unified research-based practices. These include implementing a new curriculum review cycle to renew the curriculum and align all curriculum to current Massachusetts frameworks. The district has created a five-year plan to develop and administer common formative assessments districtwide and use assessment data and other evidence to make better decisions for interventions; although expertise in using disaggregated student data is still an emerging skill. Professional development is aligned to district and school goals to strengthen teachers’ and leaders’ capacity to improve instruction and create positive conditions for learning. Another research-based practice prioritized by the district is teacher collaboration to plan instruction and reflect on student progress; examples include common planning time and professional learning communities.

However, the educator evaluation system, while closely aligned to DESE’s model, is unevenly implemented and lacks the focus and quality needed to meaningfully improve instruction to address students’ learning needs.

The district’s commitment to equity is demonstrated in part by a variety of professional development courses that help teachers to include diverse voices and ensure that instruction reflects culturally relevant pedagogy. Professional development also includes presentations by the black student union, the Jewish student union, the F-Word feminist club, and presentations on racial equity. In addition, racial equity in the classroom is the topic of a four-credit course for high-school teachers, designed by the district in collaboration with Framingham State University.

Given its culturally and linguistically diverse student body, the district supports a broad English language development (ELD) program led by a director. In addition to school-based programs for English learners (ELs), there are two dual language schools: Barbieri Elementary School for English-Spanish and Potter Road Elementary School for English-Portuguese (new this school year). There are plans to add two more dual-language schools (one Spanish and one Portuguese) for the 2019-2020 school year.

Leaders and teachers also understand that school culture and climate can set the stage for high quality teaching and learning. To improve learning conditions districtwide, the schools administer the Panorama school climate survey to all students, teachers and families in Grades 3-12 and use results to define and set improvement goals and identify data to monitor progress. A recent benefit has been the introduction of Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS) in more elementary and middle schools to address students’ social-emotional and behavioral needs, with widespread use planned for the next school year. However, many new and emerging practices are still in the developmental stage.

Student achievement remains a concern. The district’s MCAS results remain meaningfully below state rates in almost all tested content areas and for almost all tested grades, and gaps persist among student groups on many important indicators of student performance and outcomes. The district has demonstrated an intentional focus on strengthening its data culture, resulting in practices such as data chats and the analysis of i-Ready assessment results. It will be important to continue this focus to ensure that planning and decision-making are informed by an understanding of students’ progress and needs.

Structures such as the ILTs, collaborative team time, focused leadership, coaching, walkthroughs, and professional development all contribute to the positive momentum to improve teaching in the district. However, based on classroom observations, even more work still remains in order to achieve the high-quality instruction to which the district aspires.

**Instruction**

The team observed 91 classes throughout the district: 26 at the high school (including the Thayer Campus), 18 at the 3 middle schools, and 47 at the 8 elementary schools. The team observed 37 ELA/English classes, 27 mathematics classes, 16 science classes and 11 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 34 inclusion education classes, and 7 ELL classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using DESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

Overall, classroom climate reflected a respectful and positive learning environment at all schools. In observed lessons, however, middle school lessons were generally more effective than at other levels. More middle school students took seriously their responsibility to learn and actively engaged in lessons. Learning objectives were clearly stated and explained, and students experienced frequent formative classroom assessments to verify how well they understood concepts, topics and content-based vocabulary. At the elementary and middle schools, most teachers prepared lesson strategies that more effectively addressed the differences in learning needs of all students. Although the curriculum throughout has the potential to challenge students with complex topics and ideas, there were missed opportunities for students to more fully immerse in rigorous thinking, to explore and solve problems collaboratively, and to use and apply newly gained knowledge, particularly at the high school.

The district’s school buildings were observed to be clean and safe environments, although most have not been renovated for some time. A newly constructed Fuller Middle School is already in the works and given recent enrollment projections, particularly for the high school, the district will need to address an impending shortage of classroom space imminently.

The district’s commitment to systemic improvement appears unequivocal. Although the progress achieved thus far has been uneven, it is nonetheless promising and authentic. The observations and recommendations contained in this report are intended to acknowledge the district’s authentic achievements and provide clear direction to inform and guide the important work that surely follows.

**Strengths**

* During the two years before the onsite review, the superintendent and school committee worked collaboratively and strategically to implement organizational structures, systems, and policies that increase equity throughout the school district.
* The superintendent promotes a culture of collaboration and communication among school committee members, district staff members, families, students, and other stakeholders.
* The district created a curriculum review and renewal cycle to align curricula with the current Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and make curricula more challenging and engaging for students and accessible to all teachers.
* The district has created distributed leadership roles and established inclusive structures to systematically oversee and manage improvements to teaching, learning, and the curriculum. Many of these are in the developing stage.
* The district has made great strides in compiling, organizing, and making available to all educators a wide range of student engagement and academic performance data.
* The district demonstrates a genuine commitment to building a racially diverse faculty.
* The district has taken steps to create a school culture and climate characterized by safe, positive, inclusive, and welcoming learning environments in schools.
* The district has taken steps to ensure that each school develops strong collaborative relationships with families, community partners, and other stakeholders.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

* The district has not developed and implemented comprehensive and consistent procedures for analyzing and using disaggregated data in its strategic and School Improvement Plans.
* In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent across school levels, with overall stronger practices observed K–­­8. In fewer than half of observed elementary and high-school classrooms, team members saw sufficient and compelling evidence of student engagement and rigor/higher-order thinking, both of which are district instructional priorities.
* The district has not fully established a culture that uses data to improve teaching, learning, and classroom-level decision making.
* The district’s educator evaluation system does not prioritize opportunities for educators to receive high-quality feedback[[5]](#footnote-5) that helps them improve their practice.
* The district’s professional development (PD) program is missing a designated and coordinated leadership structure, measurable goals and objectives, and formal teacher collaboration in PD planning and leadership.
* The district’s policies and practices are not improving graduation, dropout, and chronic absence rates, particularly for some groups of students.
* Although most teachers, students, and families interviewed by the team said that they believed that the high school environment was safe, some expressed a need for clarification about the response procedures to follow if the school were to have a crisis.
* The district and the city do not have an up-to-date, written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of the schools.

**Recommendations**

* In order to increase the effectiveness of all district plans, including strengthening the plans’ focus on equity, the district should improve processes for selecting, analyzing, and managing disaggregated data.
* The district should ensure that all teachers provide effective instruction that challenges and supports all students.
* The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the efficient collection, use, and sharing of a range of assessments at the middle schools and the high school.
* The district should promote educators’ growth by fully implementing all components of the educator evaluation system, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that all educators receive high-quality feedback.
* The district’s PD program should be directed by a designated and collaborative joint committee or another representative group. This leadership team should be responsible for developing, implementing, and monitoring a comprehensive PD plan that includes well-defined and measurable goals, and ensuring that consistent PD policies, practices, and structures are in place in all schools across the district.
* To better support its most at risk and vulnerable students, the district should conduct root cause analyses to examine and eliminate obstacles to attending and staying in school.
* The district should complete the schools’ safety audits and conduct periodic up-to-date safety drills at all schools. It also should consider providing additional training for faculty and clarify with staff, students, and families the procedures and protocols for responding to a crisis.
* In compliance with 603 CMR 10.05, district administrators and city officials should update the written agreement that details the calculation process and/or amounts to be used in calculating municipal expenditures that are provided to the district.

Framingham Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of systemwide functions, with reference to the six district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE): 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. In addition to providing information to each district reviewed, DESE uses review reports to identify resources and/or technical assistance to provide to the district.

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, students, and students’ families. Team members also observe classroom instruction. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to DESE. DESE edits and fact-checks the draft report and sends it to the district for factual review before publishing it on the DESE website.

Site Visit

The site visit to the Framingham Public Schools was conducted from February 25–28, 2019. The site visit included 35 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 144 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, high-school students, families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 4 focus groups with 23 elementary-school teachers, 4 middle-school teachers, and 12 high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instruction in 91 classrooms in 14 schools. The team collected data using DESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

In April 2017, Framingham residents voted in favor of adopting a charter to transition from a representative town meeting system to a mayor-council form of government. The community transitioned to city status on January 1, 2018. The nine members of the school committee are elected by district. The mayor serves *ex-officio*, votes only to break a tie vote and cannot serve as chair, vice chair or clerk. The school committee meets twice monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since April 2017. The district leadership team includes an assistant superintendent for elementary education; an assistant superintendent for secondary education; an assistant director for elementary education; an assistant director for secondary education; an assistant superintendent for equity, diversity, and community development; an assistant superintendent for human resources; an executive director of finance and operations; and a media and communications manager. There are also directors of bilingual education, special education, health and wellness, fine/performing arts, technology, parent information, community resource development, adult ESL, early childhood education, the early childhood alliance of Framingham, buildings and grounds, food services, safety and security, Title I and grants, and transportation. In the two years before the onsite in February 2019, central office positions decreased as the superintendent reorganized and redefined district leadership roles. The district has 13 principals leading 13 schools, a coordinator of the Thayer Campus (the alternative high school program), and a director of early childhood leading the pre-K school. In addition, there are 4 vice-principals and an associate principal at the high school and 16 vice principals. In the 2018–2019 school year, there were 696.5 FTE teachers in the district.

In the 2018–2019 school year, 8,822 students were enrolled in the district’s 14 schools and the alternative high school program:

**Table 1: Framingham Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment,\* 2018–2019**

| **School** | **Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Juniper Hill School | Pre-K | Pre-K | 276 |
| Barbieri Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 672 |
| Brophy Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 464 |
| Charlotte A. Dunning Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 457 |
| Hemenway Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 563 |
| King Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 323 |
| Mary E. Stapleton Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 336 |
| Miriam F. McCarthy School | ES | K–5 | 528 |
| Potter Road Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 533 |
| Woodrow Wilson Elementary School | ES | K–5 | 539 |
| Cameron Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 581 |
| Fuller Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 546 |
| Walsh Middle School | MS | 6–8 | 733 |
| Framingham High School\* | HS | 9–12 | 2,271 |
| **Totals** | **14** | **Pre-K–12** | **8,822** |
| \*As of October 1, 2018  \* Includes enrollment for the Thayer Campus, the district’s alternative high school program | | | |

Framingham’s enrollment increased 8.2 percent between 2015 and 2019, from 8,153 in 2015 to 8,822 in 2019. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English learners (ELs) and former ELs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was higher than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for 12 K–12 districts of similar size (8,000–26,000 students) in fiscal year 2017: $17,232 as compared with $14,340. Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B3 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Note:** The Next-Generation MCAS assessment is administered to grades 3–8 in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics; it was administered for the first time in 2017. (For more information, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/parents/results-faq.html>.) The MCAS assessment is administered to grades 5 and 8 in science and to grade 10 in ELA, math, and science. Data from the two assessments are presented separately because the tests are different and cannot be compared.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Framingham Public Schools 2018 Accountability Data**  **Accountability Percentile, Criterion Reference Target (CRT) Percentage, Reason for Classification** | | | | |
| **School** | **Accountability Percentile** | **CRT Percentage** | **Overall Classification** | **Reason For Classification** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| King | -- | -- | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| Brophy | 11 | 55% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Dunning | 53 | 40% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Hemenway | 79 | 80% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Barbieri | 13 | 58% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Potter Road | 56 | 89% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Stapleton | 28 | 72% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| McCarthy | 9 | 55% | Requiring assistance or intervention | In need of focused/targeted support: Among the lowest performing 10% of schools |
| Wilson | 18 | 85% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Cameron Middle | 17 | 45% | Requiring assistance or intervention | In need of focused/targeted support: Low participation rate for Multi-race students and Non-Hispanic/Latino students |
| Fuller Middle | 9 | 13% | Requiring assistance or intervention | In need of focused/targeted support: Among the lowest performing 10% of schools |
| Walsh Middle | 33 | 57% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Framingham High | 40 | 31% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| District | -- | 48% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Scaled Scores Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 274 | 484.6 | 486.8 | 2.2 | 490.3 | -3.5 |
| Asian | 181 | 505.3 | 508.8 | 3.5 | 511.6 | -2.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,164 | 482.7 | 483.1 | 0.4 | 489.7 | -6.6 |
| Multi-Race | 147 | 500.8 | 500.3 | -0.5 | 502.8 | -2.5 |
| White | 2,308 | 496.6 | 498.0 | 1.4 | 504.2 | -6.2 |
| High Needs | 2,587 | 482.6 | 483.9 | 1.3 | 490.1 | -6.2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,703 | 482.2 | 483.2 | 1.0 | 490.2 | -7.0 |
| SWD | 1,160 | 475.6 | 475.8 | 0.2 | 480.8 | -5.0 |
| EL | 1,313 | 477.9 | 481.7 | 3.8 | 488.4 | -6.7 |
| All | 4,080 | 492.5 | 493.6 | 1.1 | 500.5 | -6.9 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Scaled Scores Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 274 | 482.7 | 484.1 | 1.4 | 486.9 | -2.8 |
| Asian | 181 | 508.7 | 509.8 | 1.1 | 514.3 | -4.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,168 | 481.3 | 481.2 | -0.1 | 487.4 | -6.2 |
| Multi-Race | 147 | 497.7 | 494.6 | -3.1 | 499.7 | -5.1 |
| White | 2,310 | 496.6 | 496.8 | 0.2 | 501.8 | -5.0 |
| High Needs | 2,596 | 481.6 | 482.9 | 1.3 | 488.2 | -5.3 |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,709 | 480.8 | 481.0 | 0.2 | 487.7 | -6.7 |
| SWD | 1,155 | 474.4 | 474.9 | 0.5 | 479.2 | -4.3 |
| EL | 1,324 | 479.1 | 481.4 | 2.3 | 488.5 | -7.1 |
| All | 4,087 | 492.0 | 492.0 | 0.0 | 498.4 | -6.4 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 274 | 21% | 25% | 4% | 31% | -6% |
| Asian | 181 | 58% | 60% | 2% | 71% | -11% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,164 | 20% | 20% | 0% | 31% | -11% |
| Multi-Race | 147 | 51% | 49% | -2% | 54% | -5% |
| White | 2,308 | 44% | 46% | 2% | 58% | -12% |
| High Needs | 2,587 | 18% | 21% | 3% | 31% | -10% |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,703 | 19% | 20% | 1% | 32% | -12% |
| SWD | 1,160 | 9% | 9% | 0% | 14% | -5% |
| EL | 1,313 | 11% | 18% | 7% | 30% | -12% |
| All | 4,080 | 37% | 38% | 1% | 51% | -13% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 274 | 18% | 19% | 1% | 26% | -7% |
| Asian | 181 | 59% | 63% | 4% | 74% | -11% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,168 | 17% | 18% | 1% | 27% | -9% |
| Multi-Race | 147 | 45% | 42% | -3% | 49% | -7% |
| White | 2,310 | 45% | 46% | 1% | 55% | -9% |
| High Needs | 2,596 | 17% | 20% | 3% | 28% | -8% |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,709 | 16% | 17% | 1% | 27% | -10% |
| SWD | 1,155 | 8% | 9% | 1% | 14% | -5% |
| EL | 1,324 | 14% | 19% | 5% | 30% | -11% |
| All | 4,087 | 36% | 37% | 1% | 48% | -11% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 22 | 98% | 86% | -12% | 85% | 1% |
| Asian | 29 | 97% | 97% | 0% | 95% | 2% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 113 | 75% | 76% | 1% | 78% | -2% |
| Multi-Race | 17 | 100% | 88% | -12% | 93% | -5% |
| White | 324 | 93% | 90% | -3% | 94% | -4% |
| High Needs | 231 | 78% | 73% | -5% | 79% | -6% |
| Econ. Dis. | 148 | 80% | 73% | -7% | 81% | -8% |
| SWD | 100 | 74% | 71% | -3% | 69% | 2% |
| ELs | 77 | 48% | 49% | 1% | 64% | -15% |
| All | 506 | 90% | 87% | -3% | 91% | -4% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| African American/Black | 23 | 78% | 65% | -13% | 60% | 5% |
| Asian | 29 | 94% | 86% | -8% | 91% | -5% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 112 | 63% | 57% | -6% | 56% | 1% |
| Multi-Race | 17 | 95% | 88% | -7% | 79% | 9% |
| White | 321 | 89% | 86% | -3% | 85% | 1% |
| High Needs | 229 | 63% | 57% | -6% | 57% | 0% |
| Econ. Dis. | 147 | 66% | 57% | -9% | 59% | -2% |
| SWD | 100 | 57% | 48% | -9% | 40% | 8% |
| EL | 76 | 35% | 39% | 4% | 44% | -5% |
| All | 503 | 83% | 79% | -4% | 78% | 1% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10, 2015–2018** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 109 | 30% | 24% | 38% | 27% | -3% | 30% |
| Asian | 90 | 74% | 72% | 73% | 57% | -17% | 68% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 462 | 24% | 21% | 27% | 21% | -3% | 30% |
| Multi-Race | 67 | 54% | 50% | 56% | 55% | 1% | 54% |
| White | 1,069 | 60% | 58% | 52% | 51% | -9% | 60% |
| High Needs | 1,008 | 28% | 25% | 26% | 23% | -5% | 31% |
| Econ. Dis. | 658 | 28% | 25% | 26% | 21% | -7% | 32% |
| SWD | 469 | 23% | 17% | 18% | 17% | -6% | 21% |
| EL | 433 | 12% | 13% | 13% | 14% | 2% | 20% |
| All | 1,800 | 50% | 47% | 46% | 42% | -8% | 53% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **N** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| 3 | 758 | 33% | 38% | 5% | 52% | -14% |
| 4 | 780 | 36% | 37% | 1% | 53% | -16% |
| 5 | 744 | 39% | 42% | 3% | 54% | -12% |
| 6 | 629 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 51% | -15% |
| 7 | 573 | 39% | 37% | -2% | 46% | -9% |
| 8 | 596 | 36% | 38% | 2% | 51% | -13% |
| 3–­8 | 4,080 | 37% | 38% | 1% | 51% | -13% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations in Grades 3–8, 2017–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **N** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **State (2018)** | **Above/Below** |
| 3 | 762 | 38% | 39% | 1% | 50% | -11% |
| 4 | 779 | 31% | 35% | 4% | 48% | -13% |
| 5 | 748 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 46% | -10% |
| 6 | 631 | 36% | 31% | -5% | 47% | -16% |
| 7 | 573 | 40% | 40% | 0% | 46% | -6% |
| 8 | 594 | 36% | 41% | 5% | 50% | -9% |
| 3–­8 | 4,087 | 36% | 37% | 1% | 48% | -11% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10, 2015–2018** | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State** |
| 5 | 747 | 38% | 37% | 36% | 36% | -2% | 47% |
| 8 | 593 | 34% | 32% | 27% | 20% | -14% | 35% |
| 10 | 460 | 84% | 83% | 82% | 81% | -3% | 74% |
| All | 1,800 | 50% | 47% | 46% | 42% | -8% | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13: Framingham Public Schools**  **English Language Arts and Math Mean Student Growth Percentile, 2018** | | | | | | |
|  | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | |
| **Grade** | **N (2018)** | **2018** | **State 2018** | **N (2018)** | **2018** | **State (2018)** |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 694 | 46.6 | 50.0 | 693 | 43.2 | 50.1 |
| 5 | 672 | 49.1 | 50.1 | 671 | 52.3 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 550 | 46.7 | 50.1 | 551 | 47.8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 528 | 50.8 | 50.0 | 527 | 62.4 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 543 | 47.9 | 50.0 | 545 | 53.6 | 50.0 |
| 10 | 405 | 53.9 | 49.9 | 404 | 51.6 | 49.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3-8** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | 30% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Brophy | 31% | 37% | 29% | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Dunning | 51% | 56% | 62% | -- | -- | -- | 57% |
| Hemenway | 56% | 74% | 72% | -- | -- | -- | 67% |
| Barbieri | 32% | 19% | 34% | -- | -- | -- | 29% |
| Potter Road | 62% | 37% | 54% | -- | -- | -- | 50% |
| Stapleton | 22% | 37% | 39% | -- | -- | -- | 34% |
| McCarthy | 38% | 25% | 34% | -- | -- | -- | 32% |
| Wilson | 15% | 25% | 26% | -- | -- | -- | 22% |
| Cameron Middle | -- | -- | -- | 28% | 30% | 33% | 31% |
| Fuller Middle | -- | -- | -- | 27% | 33% | 33% | 31% |
| Walsh Middle | -- | -- | -- | 50% | 47% | 47% | 48% |
| District | 38% | 37% | 42% | 36% | 37% | 38% | 38% |
| State | 52% | 53% | 54% | 51% | 46% | 51% | 51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | 36% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 36% |
| Brophy | 46% | 37% | 32% | -- | -- | -- | 38% |
| Dunning | 59% | 52% | 48% | -- | -- | -- | 52% |
| Hemenway | 54% | 68% | 56% | -- | -- | -- | 59% |
| Barbieri | 28% | 16% | 24% | -- | -- | -- | 23% |
| Potter Road | 56% | 34% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Stapleton | 28% | 34% | 40% | -- | -- | -- | 35% |
| McCarthy | 33% | 29% | 26% | -- | -- | -- | 29% |
| Wilson | 16% | 21% | 20% | -- | -- | -- | 19% |
| Cameron Middle | -- | -- | -- | 34% | 40% | 51% | 42% |
| Fuller Middle | -- | -- | -- | 16% | 22% | 20% | 19% |
| Walsh Middle | -- | -- | -- | 42% | 56% | 50% | 49% |
| District | 39% | 35% | 36% | 31% | 40% | 41% | 37% |
| State | 50% | 48% | 46% | 47% | 46% | 50% | 48% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 16: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2018** | | |
| **School** | **ELA** | **Math** |
| Framingham High | 89% | 81% |
| State | 91% | 78% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Brophy | -- | -- | 31% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 31% |
| Dunning | -- | -- | 40% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 40% |
| Hemenway | -- | -- | 63% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63% |
| Barbieri | -- | -- | 26% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Potter Road | -- | -- | 51% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 51% |
| Stapleton | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| McCarthy | -- | -- | 26% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 26% |
| Wilson | -- | -- | 14% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 14% |
| Cameron Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 18% | -- | 18% |
| Fuller Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10% | -- | 10% |
| Walsh Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27% | -- | 27% |
| Framingham High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 83% | 83% |
| District | -- | -- | 36% | -- | -- | 20% | 81% | 42% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 35% | 74% | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting and Exceeding Expectations by School, 2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **EL** | **African American** | **Asian** | **Hispanic** | **Multi-race** | **White** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | 30% | 19% | 12% | 20% | 17% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Brophy | 33% | 22% | 19% | 9% | 18% | 38% | 80% | 20% | -- | 46% |
| Dunning | 57% | 33% | 40% | 15% | 31% | 50% | 68% | 32% | 80% | 58% |
| Hemenway | 67% | 41% | 46% | 20% | 50% | 57% | 62% | 59% | 75% | 69% |
| Barbieri | 29% | 12% | 11% | 4% | 10% | 10% | -- | 18% | -- | 54% |
| Potter Road | 50% | 36% | 37% | 30% | 34% | 46% | 58% | 65% | 64% | 48% |
| Stapleton | 34% | 17% | 19% | 6% | 10% | 27% | -- | 11% | -- | 40% |
| McCarthy | 32% | 20% | 22% | 6% | 14% | 20% | -- | 11% | 35% | 46% |
| Wilson | 22% | 20% | 18% | 4% | 21% | 31% | -- | 20% | -- | 22% |
| Cameron Middle | 31% | 16% | 17% | 4% | 15% | 9% | 73% | 13% | 35% | 35% |
| Fuller Middle | 31% | 16% | 17% | 8% | 9% | 17% | 75% | 11% | 59% | 46% |
| Walsh Middle | 48% | 23% | 23% | 10% | 18% | 30% | 60% | 27% | 58% | 60% |
| District | 38% | 21% | 20% | 9% | 18% | 25% | 60% | 20% | 49% | 46% |
| State | 51% | 31% | 32% | 14% | 30% | 31% | 71% | 31% | 54% | 58% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19: Framingham Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting and Exceeding Expectations by School, 2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **EL** | **African American** | **Asian** | **Hispanic** | **Multi-race** | **White** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | 36% | 17% | 6% | 10% | 17% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 33% |
| Brophy | 38% | 26% | 22% | 15% | 23% | 31% | 80% | 26% | -- | 52% |
| Dunning | 52% | 34% | 35% | 21% | 31% | 40% | 55% | 26% | 50% | 58% |
| Hemenway | 59% | 36% | 31% | 28% | 34% | 29% | 67% | 45% | 83% | 60% |
| Barbieri | 23% | 7% | 6% | 2% | 7% | 10% | -- | 13% | -- | 46% |
| Potter Road | 47% | 29% | 27% | 11% | 28% | 14% | 75% | 35% | 55% | 48% |
| Stapleton | 35% | 13% | 14% | 8% | 10% | 27% | -- | 11% | -- | 41% |
| McCarthy | 29% | 16% | 17% | 5% | 17% | 18% | -- | 13% | 12% | 44% |
| Wilson | 19% | 18% | 15% | 4% | 19% | 28% | -- | 9% | -- | 21% |
| Cameron Middle | 42% | 29% | 28% | 13% | 23% | 21% | 80% | 19% | 45% | 48% |
| Fuller Middle | 19% | 8% | 8% | 6% | 7% | 2% | 83% | 6% | 25% | 30% |
| Walsh Middle | 49% | 23% | 21% | 10% | 23% | 21% | 67% | 28% | 63% | 61% |
| District | 37% | 20% | 17% | 9% | 19% | 19% | 63% | 18% | 42% | 46% |
| State | 48% | 28% | 27% | 14% | 30% | 26% | 74% | 27% | 49% | 55% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 20: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2015–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **ELA** | | | | | **Math** | | | | |
| **School/Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** |
| Framingham High | 96% | 93% | 91% | 89% | -7% | 86% | 84% | 85% | 81% | -5% |
| African American/Black | 91% | 84% | 97% | 90% | -1% | 68% | 60% | 84% | 70% | 2% |
| Asian | 97% | 97% | 97% | 100% | 3% | 94% | 97% | 94% | 88% | -6% |
| Hispanic | 92% | 78% | 78% | 77% | -15% | 64% | 61% | 66% | 59% | -5% |
| Multi-race | -- | -- | 100% | 87% | -- | -- | -- | 95% | 87% | -- |
| White | 97% | 97% | 94% | 93% | -4% | 94% | 90% | 90% | 89% | -5% |
| High Needs | 89% | 81% | 79% | 76% | -13% | 68% | 62% | 66% | 60% | -8% |
| Econ. Dis. | 93% | 81% | 81% | 74% | -19% | 75% | 63% | 70% | 59% | -16% |
| SWD | 86% | 82% | 76% | 77% | -9% | 57% | 54% | 60% | 53% | -4% |
| EL | 71% | 50% | 49% | 49% | -22% | 40% | 25% | 36% | 39% | -1% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 21: Framingham Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Science by School and Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **School** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** |
| Juniper Hill | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| King | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Brophy | 83 | 35% | 36% | 32% | 31% | -4% |
| African American/Black | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 40 | 21% | 13% | 10% | 13% | -8% |
| Multi-race | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 34 | 71% | 86% | 64% | 53% | -18% |
| High Needs | 56 | 31% | 22% | 20% | 18% | -13% |
| Econ. Dis. | 39 | 28% | 18% | 16% | 13% | -15% |
| SWD | 17 | 21% | 15% | 10% | 12% | -9% |
| EL | 37 | 19% | 17% | 8% | 16% | -3% |
| Dunning | 84 | 53% | 46% | 55% | 40% | -13% |
| African American/Black | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 14 | 50% | 40% | -- | 29% | -21% |
| Hispanic | 13 | 18% | -- | -- | 23% | 5% |
| Multi-race | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 48 | 69% | 51% | 60% | 44% | -25% |
| High Needs | 38 | 29% | 10% | 37% | 13% | -16% |
| Econ. Dis. | 20 | 26% | 17% | 39% | 15% | -11% |
| SWD | 20 | 31% | 5% | 35% | 10% | -21% |
| EL | 22 | 0% | -- | -- | 9% | 9% |
| Hemenway | 95 | 79% | 78% | 70% | 63% | -16% |
| African American/Black | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 5 | 90% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 73 | 78% | 76% | 68% | 66% | -12% |
| High Needs | 37 | 56% | 53% | 39% | 51% | -5% |
| Econ. Dis. | 21 | -- | 55% | 38% | 57% | -- |
| SWD | 20 | 48% | 45% | 36% | 30% | -18% |
| EL | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Barbieri | 110 | 27% | 22% | 22% | 26% | -1% |
| African American/Black | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 63 | 17% | 13% | 17% | 13% | -4% |
| Multi-race | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 40 | 41% | 45% | 36% | 48% | 7% |
| High Needs | 68 | 8% | 3% | 10% | 10% | 2% |
| Econ. Dis. | 50 | 6% | 4% | 10% | 6% | 0% |
| SWD | 40 | 4% | 0% | 3% | 5% | 1% |
| EL | 41 | 10% | 0% | 10% | 7% | -3% |
| Potter Road | 83 | 48% | 53% | 49% | 51% | 3% |
| African American/Black | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 63 | 49% | 55% | 47% | 52% | 3% |
| High Needs | 49 | 21% | 19% | 23% | 29% | 8% |
| Econ. Dis. | 28 | 25% | 25% | 32% | 29% | 4% |
| SWD | 16 | 17% | 10% | 12% | 19% | 2% |
| EL | 33 | -- | 10% | 14% | 27% | -- |
| Stapleton | 77 | 22% | 45% | 38% | 47% | 25% |
| African American/Black | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 13 | -- | -- | 7% | 15% | -- |
| Multi-race | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 52 | 28% | 51% | 43% | 54% | 26% |
| High Needs | 43 | 3% | 31% | 20% | 23% | 20% |
| Econ. Dis. | 27 | 0% | 32% | 19% | 15% | 15% |
| SWD | 27 | 5% | 15% | 9% | 19% | 14% |
| EL | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| McCarthy | 93 | 30% | 21% | 22% | 26% | -4% |
| African American/Black | 13 | 17% | 7% | 0% | 23% | 6% |
| Asian | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 26 | 4% | 5% | 8% | 12% | 8% |
| Multi-race | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 46 | 40% | 29% | 28% | 33% | -7% |
| High Needs | 69 | 17% | 15% | 8% | 17% | 0% |
| Econ. Dis. | 53 | 21% | 9% | 5% | 17% | -4% |
| SWD | 47 | 5% | 14% | 6% | 15% | 10% |
| EL | 14 | 0% | 0% | -- | 0% | 0% |
| Wilson | 97 | 19% | 16% | 11% | 14% | -5% |
| African American/Black | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 9% | -- |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 18 | 0% | 9% | 18% | 22% | 22% |
| Multi-race | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 67 | 24% | 20% | 12% | 13% | -11% |
| High Needs | 85 | 13% | 14% | 11% | 13% | 0% |
| Econ. Dis. | 57 | 17% | 12% | 13% | 12% | -5% |
| SWD | 16 | 4% | 6% | 7% | 6% | 2% |
| EL | 63 | 5% | 10% | 5% | 11% | 6% |
| Cameron Middle | 179 | 29% | 31% | 16% | 18% | -11% |
| African American/Black | 16 | 20% | -- | 6% | 6% | -14% |
| Asian | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 36 | 17% | 13% | 11% | 11% | -6% |
| Multi-race | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 116 | 32% | 35% | 18% | 21% | -11% |
| High Needs | 113 | 11% | 16% | 10% | 8% | -3% |
| Econ. Dis. | 74 | 12% | 16% | 11% | 11% | -1% |
| SWD | 52 | 4% | 11% | 4% | 2% | -2% |
| EL | 41 | -- | -- | -- | 5% | -- |
| Fuller Middle | 150 | 24% | 30% | 17% | 10% | -14% |
| African American/Black | 9 | 23% | -- | 7% | -- | -- |
| Asian | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 59 | 6% | 8% | 9% | 2% | -4% |
| Multi-race | 1 | -- | 30% | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 75 | 36% | 45% | 22% | 17% | -19% |
| High Needs | 102 | 12% | 8% | 9% | 6% | -6% |
| Econ. Dis. | 70 | 13% | 8% | 12% | 4% | -9% |
| SWD | 35 | 9% | 3% | 5% | 9% | 0% |
| EL | 53 | 6% | 5% | 6% | 0% | -6% |
| Walsh Middle | 248 | 46% | 37% | 44% | 27% | -19% |
| African American/Black | 12 | 13% | -- | -- | 0% | -13% |
| Asian | 20 | 74% | 65% | 50% | 40% | -34% |
| Hispanic | 78 | 18% | 13% | 25% | 5% | -13% |
| Multi-race | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 129 | 60% | 50% | 52% | 40% | -20% |
| High Needs | 118 | 21% | 17% | 20% | 9% | -12% |
| Econ. Dis. | 78 | 17% | 19% | 22% | 8% | -9% |
| SWD | 58 | 19% | 7% | 4% | 7% | -12% |
| EL | 53 | 0% | 9% | 21% | 6% | 6% |
| Framingham High | 445 | 86% | 87% | 83% | 83% | -3% |
| African American/Black | 19 | 70% | 65% | 86% | 89% | 19% |
| Asian | 24 | 97% | 93% | 94% | 96% | -1% |
| Hispanic | 93 | 63% | 73% | 67% | 63% | 0% |
| Multi-race | 15 | -- | -- | 95% | 87% | -- |
| White | 293 | 93% | 90% | 87% | 88% | -5% |
| High Needs | 176 | 69% | 72% | 66% | 64% | -5% |
| Econ. Dis. | 110 | 72% | 76% | 69% | 64% | -8% |
| SWD | 74 | 58% | 57% | 63% | 58% | 0% |
| EL | 49 | 52% | 59% | 35% | 49% | -3% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 22: Framingham Public Schools**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 37 | 80.0 | 67.4 | 74.5 | 70.3 | -9.7 | 80.1 |
| Asian | 34 | 94.7 | 86.8 | 89.5 | 94.1 | -0.6 | 94.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 118 | 67.6 | 66.7 | 68.0 | 63.6 | -4.0 | 73.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 12 | -- | -- | 50.0 | 66.7 | -- | 86.5 |
| White | 361 | 88.5 | 90.9 | 88.7 | 88.4 | -0.1 | 92.2 |
| High needs | 297 | 73.6 | 74.6 | 73.4 | 71.0 | -2.6 | 78.0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 211 | 74.6 | 74.0 | 75.1 | 73.0 | -1.6 | 77.4 |
| SWD | 121 | 63.1 | 62.4 | 65.9 | 64.5 | 1.4 | 72.4 |
| EL | 85 | 58.3 | 56.9 | 45.6 | 55.3 | -3.0 | 64.1 |
| All | 563 | 83.9 | 84.8 | 82.6 | 81.9 | -2.0 | 87.9 |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2015 rates. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 23: Framingham Public Schools**  **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates by Student Group, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| African American/Black | 47 | 95.2 | 85.7 | 72.1 | 85.1 | -10.1 | 84.2 |
| Asian | 38 | 93.3 | 94.7 | 92.1 | 92.1 | -1.2 | 95.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 128 | 68.5 | 81.5 | 73.6 | 75.8 | 7.3 | 77.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 6 | 66.7 | -- | -- | 66.7 | 0.0 | 87.7 |
| White | 355 | 91.7 | 89.4 | 92.6 | 91.0 | -0.7 | 93.9 |
| High needs | 342 | 78.7 | 80.3 | 79.8 | 79.8 | 1.1 | 83.0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 265 | 79.4 | 82.3 | 79.3 | 82.3 | 2.9 | 82.0 |
| SWD | 132 | 67.7 | 73.0 | 67.5 | 75.8 | 8.1 | 76.8 |
| EL | 68 | 73.1 | 70.8 | 66.7 | 54.4 | -18.7 | 69.0 |
| All | 574 | 87.3 | 87.7 | 87.8 | 86.9 | -0.4 | 90.1 |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 24: Framingham Public Schools**  **In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 4.6 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 3.1 | -1.5 | 3.4 |
| Asian | 1.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | -1.4 | 2.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.7 | -0.1 | 2.3 |
| White | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| High Needs | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | -0.6 | 2.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.7 | -0.1 | 2.9 |
| SWD | 6.2 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.8 | -1.4 | 3.3 |
| EL | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 1.8 |
| All | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.2 | -0.3 | 1.8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 25: Framingham Public Schools**  **Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 5.8 | 4.7 | 6.4 | 8.3 | 2.5 | 6.0 |
| Asian | 1.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5.1 | 5.0 | 5.7 | 7.3 | 2.2 | 5.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 4.3 | 1.1 | 3.3 |
| White | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 1 | 1.9 |
| High Needs | 4.4 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 6.5 | 2.1 | 4.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 4.5 | 4.7 | 5.7 | 7.4 | 2.9 | 5.4 |
| SWD | 7.1 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 9.8 | 2.7 | 5.8 |
| EL | 2.5 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 2.9 | 3.7 |
| All | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 1.5 | 2.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 26: Framingham Public Schools**  **Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 5.2 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 3.1 | -2.1 | 2.9 |
| Asian | 0.0 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 5.9 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 5.2 | -0.7 | 4.5 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 5.9 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 2.9 | -3.0 | 1.9 |
| White | 1.6 | 1.1 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 1.0 |
| High Needs | 4.2 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 3.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.7 | -0.8 | 3.6 |
| SWD | 5.6 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 4.5 | -1.1 | 3.4 |
| EL | 3.7 | 5.0 | 10.3 | 3.2 | -0.5 | 7.6 |
| All | 2.5 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 1.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 27: Framingham Public Schools**  **Advanced Coursework Completion by Student Group, 2017–2018** | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| African American/Black | 81 | 60.8 | 63.0 | 2.2 | 69.2 |
| Asian | 68 | 82.6 | 92.6 | 10.0 | 89.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 216 | 53.4 | 59.7 | 6.3 | 62.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 31 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 648 | 81.4 | 79.3 | -2.1 | 86.5 |
| High Needs | 424 | 43.4 | 53.1 | 9.7 | 50.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 262 | 51.8 | 50.8 | -1.0 | 60.9 |
| SWD | 144 | 37.7 | 53.5 | 15.8 | 43.2 |
| EL | 173 | 34.4 | 38.7 | 4.3 | 40.0 |
| All | 1,045 | 74.0 | 75.1 | 1.1 | 78.6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 28: Framingham Public Schools**  **Progress toward Attaining English Language Proficiency, 2017–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Non-high school** | | | | | **High school** | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| EL | 1,176 | 56.6 | 56.7 | 0.1 | 57.1 | 183 | 38.7 | 37.2 | -1.5 | 43.1 |
| All | 1,176 | 56.6 | 56.7 | 0.1 | 57.1 | 183 | 38.7 | 37.2 | -1.5 | 43.1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 29: Framingham Public Schools**  **Chronic Absence Rates by Student Group,\* 2017–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Non-high school** | | | | | **High school** | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| African American/Black | 425 | 10.6 | 8.9 | -1.7 | 7.7 | 184 | 27.1 | 21.7 | -5.4 | 24.2 |
| Asian | 272 | 5.9 | 6.6 | 0.7 | 4.0 | 137 | 9.6 | 4.4 | -5.2 | 7.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1,727 | 14.2 | 14.7 | 0.5 | 11.4 | 555 | 37.9 | 34.6 | -3.3 | 35.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 225 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 75 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 3,290 | 7.8 | 7.6 | -0.2 | 6.8 | 1,422 | 15.2 | 15.3 | 0.1 | 14.2 |
| High needs | 3,797 | 13.2 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 1,200 | 34.4 | 29.3 | -5.1 | 32.5 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 2,146 | 16.7 | 16.5 | -0.2 | 14.1 | 625 | 36.9 | 33.9 | -3.0 | 34.3 |
| SWD | 1,529 | 14.8 | 15.1 | 0.3 | 12.4 | 449 | 35.0 | 31.2 | -3.8 | 32.6 |
| EL | 2,110 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 0.5 | 7.9 | 511 | 38.9 | 33.9 | -5.0 | 35.5 |
| All | 5,948 | 9.8 | 9.7 | -0.1 | 8.7 | 2,376 | 21.1 | 19.9 | -1.2 | 20.0 |
| \* Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. | | | | | | | | | | |

Leadership and Governance

***Contextual Background***

The Framingham Public Schools are changing, growing, and improving as they carry out a series of equity-focused, strategically planned, and aligned activities that benefit students, staff, and families.During the two years before the onsite in February 2019, district leaders and staff put into action multiple processes for transforming the district’s structures, systems, strategies, and culture.

Enrollment increased by 8.2 percent in Framingham during the five-year interval from 2015 to 2019, from 8,153 in 2015 to 8,822 in 2019. A recently completed demographic study forecasts continuing enrollment growth, particularly at the high-school level.

The seven-member school committee that hired the superintendent in April 2017 was succeeded by a nine-member committee elected in November 2017 under the terms of the new charter. Since all members serve a two-year term, the November 2019 election could change the composition of the committee for the third time in fewer than three years.

School committee members set policies, develop and monitor the budget, and evaluate the superintendent. Members also serve on subcommittees for policy, finance and operations, accountability and student achievement, communications, racial equity, and digital infrastructure.

In order to improve communications and support the implementation of the strategic plan, the superintendent reorganized the central office from 12 positions to 9 positions. The nine positions are four assistant superintendents (elementary education; secondary education; human resources; and equity, diversity, and community development); two assistant directors (elementary education and secondary education); an executive director of finance and operations; a director of safety and security; and a media and communications manager. The superintendent promoted internal staff members to fill several of these central office positions. In addition, the superintendent has hired new principals at 5 of the districts’ 14 schools.

The superintendent told the review team that the district was “building everything on an equity model.” He explained his equity-minded leadership orientation by stating that a district was only as good as its lowest performing students and that paying attention to who students were as human beings was as important as paying attention to how well they were progressing academically.

**Strength Findings**

**1. During the two years before the onsite review, the superintendent and school committee worked collaboratively and strategically to implement organizational structures, systems, and policies that increase equity throughout the school district.**

* 1. The new city charter has resulted in a school committee that is more representative of Framingham’s families and students.
     1. On January 1, 2018, Framingham began the transition from a town to a city form of government under the terms of a new city charter. One of the many structural changes was the institution of a nine-member school committee elected by district to concurrent two-year terms. Previous school committees were composed of seven members elected at–large. The mayor serves as an *ex-officio* member of the committee, votes only to break a tie vote, and cannot be the chair, vice chair, or clerk.
     2. A school committee member described the charter as opening the door for residents to run for office and allowing more voices at the table.
  2. The Framingham school committee has established a subcommittee for racial equity.
     1. According to agendas reviewed by the team, the active racial equity subcommittee held nine meetings during the interval from March 15, 2018, to February 11, 2019, during which members and participants addressed the following topics: academic achievement data for students of color; school discipline polices; hiring diversity; indigenous people’s day; and the district’s racial equity audit.
     2. On November 5, 2018, the district issued a request for proposals seeking a consultant to conduct a comprehensive audit to assess “student access to high quality programs, high quality teaching, just discipline procedures, equitable resources and root cause analysis of persistent achievement gaps for students of color.” The racial equity audit will also review the district’s policies and practices, disaggregated student data, efforts to recruit and retain staff of color, and the cultural responsiveness of curricula.
  3. When reorganizing the central office, the superintendent created a new central leadership position of assistant superintendent for equity, diversity, and communityengagementwith responsibility for “guiding efforts and guiding opportunities to define, assess, and promote diversity, equity and inclusion, educational and employment opportunities and cultural fluency.”
  4. The district’s 2017–2020 Annotated Strategic Plan is equity-focused. The fiscal year 2019 budget is closely aligned to the plan.
     1. The plan includes goals to develop students into “value-centered citizens who are able to navigate a complex and inequitable world” and to “create an environment in which every child can succeed by addressing inequities, including racism, socio-economic status, and language barriers.”[[6]](#footnote-6)
     2. The strategic plan also contains a goal to “nurture equitable and inclusive learning environments” by implementing 24 high-leverage goals categorized under the following four key standards: curriculum and planning, teaching all students, family and community engagement, and professional culture. A review of the fiscal year 2019 budget narrative indicated that the district budget was built upon on “an equity-based model that restructures how monies have been allocated to the schools in the past.”
     3. The following examples demonstrate the equity focus of the fiscal year 2019 budget:
        1. increased support for bilingual education;
        2. implementation of a new Portuguese dual-language program at Potter Road Elementary School;
        3. development and application of a student-based formula for allocating instructional materials to schools;

d. elimination of athletic fees in order to increase students’ access to and participation in athletic programs;[[7]](#footnote-7) and

e. addressing achievement gaps by adding instructional coaches at all elementary schools and core-content department heads at the secondary level.

1. The district has identified persistently low-performing or struggling schools for intervention and improvement planning with responsibility shared between district and school leaders for making measurable and sustained improvements.
   * 1. The district has categorized its schools into tiers based on student performance data. Schools receive equitable supports and assistance based on data that identifies students’ academic and social-emotional needs. Schools with higher levels of student needs (Tiers 2 and 3) receive more technical assistance and supports.
        1. District staff monitor the progress of the district’s Tier 1 schools (Dunning Elementary School, Hemenway Elementary School, Juniper Hill Elementary School, King Elementary School, Potter Road Elementary School, Stapleton Elementary School, Walsh Middle School, Cameron Middle School, and Framingham High School) every 60 days. Tier 1 schools are expected to focus on the implementation of their 2017–2020 School Improvement Plans (SIPs).
        2. District staff monitor Tier 2 schools (Barbieri Elementary School and Fuller Elementary School) every 30 days. These schools receive additional funding from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). School staff are expected to strengthen their collaborative learning culture and monitor their instructional practices. The SIPs for Tier 2 schools have a two-year rather than a three-year cycle (2017–2019) or use the individualized Turnaround Plan as the School Improvement Plan.
        3. Tier 3 schools (Brophy Elementary School, McCarthy Elementary School, and Wilson Elementary School) continue to collaborate closely with DESE’s Statewide System of Support (SSoS). These schools have developed and are implementing an annual Collective Turnaround Plan (CTAP) with direct coaching and co-planning support from SSoS staff.
        4. The CTAP addresses DESE’s four turnaround practices: leadership, shared responsibility and professional collaboration; intentional practices for improving instruction; student-specific supports; and school culture and climate.

**Impact**: The convergence of the district’s vision with compatible budgetary actions and differentiated support for schools has mobilized new resources that provide students with more equitable educational opportunities.

**2. The superintendent promotes a culture of collaboration and communication among school committee members, district staff members, families, students, and other stakeholders.**

**A.**  School committee members, the superintendent, and the district leadership team have a collaborative working relationship.

1. The school committee’s 2018 evaluation of the superintendent noted that the superintendent had “an open-door policy so we can email, phone and he gets back to us immediately.”

2. In its self-assessment submitted in advance of the onsite, district leaders stated, “There exists a strong collaborative working relationship between the school committee and the superintendent and the school committee and the district leadership team.”

3. In a letter to all staff, the superintendent explained why he reorganized central office positions: “Through a significant overhaul of Central Office, I have been able to right-size the leadership team and provide a more precise, coordinated, and collaborative model of district leadership with high expectations for equity of opportunity for students, expert teaching and improved outcomes for students across the district.”

a. In his 2018 evaluation, school committee members spoke positively about how the superintendent effectively used the skills and talents of central office administrators.

**B**. In order to engage stakeholders to work together to improve student outcomes, the superintendent has completed several outreach activities with various groups—including school personnel, families, and students—in an open and transparent manner.

1. In his central office reorganization, the superintendent added the position of a manager of media and communications who is responsible for informing the community about “school department policies, practices and commitment to improve teaching and learning for all students.”

2. As part of the process for developing the strategic plan, the superintendent invited and obtained stakeholder participation by holding educational visioning community forums in three different city locations. In addition, he emailed a draft of the strategic plan to all families and staff and invited them to comment.

3. The superintendent meets monthly with the presidents of the schools’ parent teacher organizations.

**C.** The superintendent consistently interacts with school personnel.

1. During the first six months of his term of service, the superintendent completed a one-week residency in each of the district’s 14 schools to learn about the school’s programs, strengths, and challenges from staff, students and families.

2. The superintendent completed a Framingham Teachers Association (FTA) listening tour during which association members shared their ideas and concerns with him. After completing the listening tours, the superintendent issued a nine-page document to all staff in question-and-answer format addressing the following seven topics: the human resources department; i-Ready purposes and implementation; addressing students’ behaviors; multi-tiered system of support model; special education inclusion; new DESE online courses on inclusive practices; and central office reorganization.

3. The superintendent conducts daily school visits with central office staff. During three-hour school improvement visits, he observes each school’s activities and needs, reviews current student achievement and performance data, and conducts classroom walkthroughs.

**D.** The superintendent encourages students to provide direct feedback on their educational experiences, which helps him and the school committee be informed and proactive.

* + - 1. A district leader who participated in the school improvement visits said that the superintendent often fell behind the rest of the group because he stopped to talk with students.
      2. The superintendent organized an action civics commission composed of students from all of the schools to represent student voices in the district. One of their first charges is to discuss, research, debate, and develop a petition on homework as a matter of school policy. Students will present their draft of a homework policy to the school committee.

**Impact:** When district leaders demonstrate collaboration and open communication for staff, families, students, and community members, they model the relationships and behaviors that can contribute to a positive cultural shift in the district.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**3. The district has not developed and implemented comprehensive and consistent procedures for analyzing and using disaggregated data in its strategic and School Improvement Plans.**

**A.** Missing some baseline data, the district did not use historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated data to plan improvement strategies and student goals.

* 1. District staff developed the strategic plan and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) in 2018 based on one year of Next Generation MCAS assessment results and not on current state accountability data. At that time, the district had not implemented i-Ready formative assessments in all its elementary and middle and schools.

**B.** The district’s 2017–2020 Annotated Strategic Plan is missing empirical, disaggregated data and measurable goals for groups of students.

1. In developing the district’s strategic plan, the superintendent reported that he relied more on anecdotal data from surveys and stakeholder input than on student performance data.

a. Few of the plan’s goals are stated in measurable terms. The team found that the expected outcomes were often expressed as increases in staffing, resources, and opportunities. For example, expected outcomes included “adding the curriculum coordinator of English learners and bilingual programs position,” “purchasing tiered math intervention materials for the elementary schools,” and “increasing staff capacity to be responsive to students affected by trauma and other adversities.”

b. The team found that few of the sections for listing goals and reporting progress in the strategic plan contained disaggregated data.

3. The team found that most of the SIPs for Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools were missing disaggregated data.

One exception was the high school’s SIP which, based on available 2017 data, cited the increasing dropout rate for English learners, which changed from 5.0 percent in 2015–2016 to 10.3 percent in 2016–2017. However, the SIP did not address the increased dropout rate for Hispanic/Latino students (from 4.0 percent in 2015–2016 to 8.0 percent) in 2016–2017 and was missing measurable goals for decreasing these high dropout rates.

4. Most SIPs did not meet the criteria listed in a school committee policy which states that “the school improvement plan should “specify expected student outcomes and measurable/observable results.”

Only one SIP contained outcomes written in the SMART goal[[8]](#footnote-8) format.

**C.** Administrators and staff reported that the district was aware of the need to improve the management and use of many metrics in order to effectively measure learning outcomes for groups of students in the district’s planning documents.

1. Interviews and a review of the minutes of school committee meetings and other documents indicated that the districts’ planning documents needed to include more measurable outcomes for student achievement and performance, including SMART goals.

2. In the district’s 2017–2020 Annotated Strategic Plan, strategy 2.1.1 cites the need to develop appropriate planning metrics and to use data sources “systematically for both academic and non-academic needs.”

3. The school committee has begun a process for identifying metrics that measure plan-based strategies and initiatives. At the March 19, 2018 school committee meeting, members of the subcommittee on accountability and student achievement, four school committee members and other participants initiated a process for answering the following questions: “How do we know if the Framingham Public Schools are successful? How do we measure that success? Are the Framingham Public Schools providing equity, access, and opportunity for all students so that they may succeed and thrive?”

The subcommittee members and participants brainstormed a comprehensive list of 38 metrics and 7 methods for measuring success for various groups of students.

1. A district leader said that the district had all the data it needed but needed to “figure out the focus.” The superintendent described data analysis as solving “an amazing puzzle, the convergence of so many variables.” He added that with the availability of more baseline data, future planning could include specific measurable benchmarks.

**Impact:** Without the analysis of disaggregated data, educators, students, families, and other stakeholders cannot determine whether planned initiatives are closing the gaps in the performance of student groups. Planning that is missing specific measurable outcomes and clear and effective data analysis procedures cannot effectively drive the development, implementation, and modification of educational programs and practices.

**Recommendation**

**In order to increase the effectiveness of all district plans, including strengthening the plans’ focus on equity, the district should improve processes for selecting, analyzing, and managing disaggregated data.**

* 1. The superintendent, school committee members, the district leadership team, and principals should review and discuss the list of metrics and methods of measurement that the school committee’s accountability subcommittee developed in March 2018. They should consider developing a set of common metrics that district staff should use when developing planning documents and monitoring progress.
     + 1. District leaders should select a manageable combination of research-based metrics which address student achievement data, such as MCAS item analysis data and formative assessment results; student outcome data such as chronic absence, suspension, and dropout rates; and student experience data, such as DESE’s VOCAL survey results.
       2. Using the identified metrics, the superintendent should lead a collaborative process to revise the expected outcomes of the strategic plan.
  2. In order to assist school staff and school council members when they are developing their School Improvement Plans (SIPs), district staff should provide more comprehensive and useable data for school staff to access and use.

1. For each school, central office staff should develop a report or dashboard that identifies the achievement and performance gaps among the school’s groups of students, as well as overall averages. The report should also provide benchmarking data that compares the achievement and performance of the school’s students with statewide data.

2. The district should develop protocols for analyzing, using, and monitoring achievement and performance data in all planning documents, especially the strategic plan and the aligned SIPs.

**C**. The district should provide professional development and coaching to build the planning capacity and skills of directors, assistant directors, and principals.

**Benefits:** By prioritizing a manageable, research-based set of metrics and providing support for improved planning processes, school committee members, school staff, families, and other stakeholders will be able to assess the degree to which the district is improving overall and gaps in the performance of groups of students are decreasing. District leaders will be able to use planning documents to monitor progress and make adjustments in a timely way. District and school staff will increase their capacity to use data to develop SMART goals with action steps and measurable outcomes and will better understand if their efforts are impacting student outcomes.

**Recommended resources:**

* *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs.
* DESE’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.
  + In particular, the district should consider using the following *Planning for Success* resources: SWOT Analysis; Analyzing Data for Root Causes; and Selecting Outcome Measures and Setting Targets.

Curriculum and Instruction

**Curriculum and Instruction**

**Contextual Background**

At the time of the review in February 2019, there was considerable impetus for curricular and instructional improvement in the district. Shortly after arriving in April 2017, the superintendent reorganized the office of teaching and learning to better focus leaders’ expertise and support at the school level. This office now consists of assistant superintendents for elementary and secondary education, and assistant directors for elementary and secondary education. The team of four develops and clarifies improvement strategies and helps build staff capacity to implement the goals in the strategic plan and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) for curriculum, instruction, assessment, and teaching all students.

Curricula for core content areas follow the *Understanding by Design* (UbD) format and teachers post curriculum units in Canvas, the district’s learning management platform. Designing UbD units is an emerging practice for some teachers, especially at the high school. Many UbD units reviewed by team members were rich in detail and required students to show a depth of knowledge and understanding, if well taught. However, some were not fully aligned with the current Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. After years without a system to review and renew curricula, in 2018 the district developed a curriculum review cycle to align all curricula with current state standards.

The elementary schools have adopted Lucy Calkin’s *Readers* and *Writers Workshop* to teach reading and writing, *Fundations* for K–3 phonics, and *Words Their Way* to strengthen spelling skills for students in grades 4–6. *Eureka Math/EngageNY* and *Math in Practice* guide elementary math lessons where teachers are now beginning to adapt the Workshop Model*.* Students use *National Geographic* materials in kindergarten through grade 2 and *Discovery Education* and inquiry-based *FOSS Kits* in grades 3–5 to study science. The social studies program relies on teacher-developed units. Elementary-school students study science and social studies for 90 minutes weekly in each subject.

In the secondary schools, curriculum is based on units of study, often in UbD format, and a variety of texts. Teachers reported that a number of secondary math and science texts were 10 or more years old. Leaders and teachers have encouraged the selection of secondary school literature to expand the curriculum beyond the typical western canon. In English and history/social studies courses, students now have opportunities to read a range of fiction and non-fiction representing multiple world cultures that reflect the diversity of the student population and the community.

Nevertheless, an enriched curriculum does not alone ensure consistently strong instructional practices. Observed elementary lessons demonstrated the benefits of the Workshop Model in meeting students’ learning needs through targeted small-group instruction in ELA and often in mathematics. At the middle-school level, observers often found evidence of students actively engaged in learning. At the high school, however, observers noted an over-dependence on teacher-directed lessons in which students rarely interacted with each other to discuss thoughtful or complex content and probe concepts. At all school levels, instruction did not often maximize students’ higher-order thinking skills. Although the rigor embedded in UbD units has the potential to challenge students intellectually, stretch their thinking, and help them apply complex knowledge and ideas, only a few observed high-school lessons realized that potential as delivered.

The district’s strategy for instructional improvement is still early in its implementation. In 2018–2019, the approach includes new structures such as an instructional leadership team in all schools to support pedagogical improvement through collaborative professional learning communities and other teacher teams. Starting in 2018–2019, all elementary schools have full-time ELA and math coaches to work with teachers in grade-level teams. Tier 3 schools have two ELA coaches. Middle- and high-school department heads reported that they engaged more in supervisory activities, such as walkthroughs, rather than in direct coaching to help teachers improve their practice. Some noted that they offered to model lessons and provide resources to guide improvement, but most did not have the time. Newly appointed middle-school department heads for social studies and science have full-time teaching loads and struggle to find time to support their colleagues.

There is a recent unified focus on data-based instructional decision-making linked to the use of common formative assessments now in progress at the elementary and middle schools and just beginning at the high school. Various walkthrough formats are starting to take hold at different levels to monitor instructional strengths and challenges and provide useful feedback to teachers; however, these are inconsistently implemented across schools. “Look-fors” are not clearly defined and walkthrough tools are not always used systematically and are missing uniform expectations for effective teaching.

The district is initiating a K–12 social-emotional learning curriculum based on Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) at all school levels to ensure that students are more ready and able to learn.

Under DESE’s 2018 Official Accountability Report for Framingham, 2 of Framingham’s 14 schools have insufficient data to be included in the accountability system. Of the 12 schools in the accountability system, 3 schools are classified as requiring assistance or intervention, 9 schools partially met improvement targets, and 3 schools met improvement targets. The three schools classified as requiring assistance or intervention were “in need of focused/targeted support” and were working with staff from DESE’s State System of Support (SSoS) to achieve the goals established in their Collective Turnaround Plan (CTAP).

**Strength Findings**

**1. The district created a curriculum review and renewal cycle to align curricula with the current Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and make curricula more challenging and engaging for students and accessible to all teachers.**

**A.** District leaders stated that the district did not have a formal process for curriculum review and revision in the past. Eighteen months before the onsite in February 2019, the district created a seven-year, five-phase curriculum review cycle to ensure that all curricula were aligned with current Massachusetts frameworks. This process is prioritized by district needs and is inclusive and transparent.

1. The district plans to review all content areas over the seven-year period. A timeline, which is shared districtwide, focuses the initial reviews on core subjects and grade levels without documented curricula, or with unaligned curricula, and content areas identified as high need based on data analysis.

* 1. The five phases of the process are as follows: Phases I, II, III/Year 1: evaluation and research, develop scope and sequence, and write/revise curriculum units; Phase IV/Year 2: implement and monitor new curriculum; Phase V/Years 3 and 4: monitor, evaluate and identify next steps. For each phase, the district intends to use achievement data and other information to inform discussions and decision-making.
     1. In 2017–2018, the district focused on grades 6–8 science and K–3 phonics.
     2. In 2018–2019, the focus is on grades 6–8 mathematics, grades 6–8 technology education, and grades 6–12 world languages. The district is also conducting a major review of grades 6–12 history and social studies, coinciding with the recent issuance of the Massachusetts History and Social Studies Framework.
     3. By the 2023–2024 school year, the district will have completed a curriculum review and renewal for all core academic areas as well as library media services, health and physical education, and the fine and performing arts.

**B.** Interviews with district leaders and a document review indicated that curriculum review teams consisted of both internal stakeholders such as teachers, coaches, administrators and families and external stakeholders, such as community members with expertise in specific content areas and representatives from higher education.

The district recruits teachers to ensure representation from each school and grade level. After selecting the initial group, the district identifies additional participants who can support the work and address the content area’s strengths and challenges.

Beginning in the 2017–2018 school year, the district provided professional development to help teachers implement new curriculum.

For each of the seven years in the curriculum review plan, the district has also determined where to allocate funds to provide stipends for staff reviewers and to purchase new materials.

1. To ensure accessibility, the district requires teachers to upload all curriculum materials to Canvas, the district’s learning management platform.
   * 1. District leaders reported that the district has trained all teachers to use Canvas, including new teachers. Experienced teachers provide ongoing training after school for those needing support. While there is still some inconsistency in using Canvas, the district has made it clear that teachers are required to use it.
     2. In addition to curriculum documentation, teachers use Canvas to create and share lessons and assignments. Students use Canvas to view content and complete and submit assignments, and families can use it to review lessons and assignments. There is a link on most school websites to help families access Canvas.
   1. Unit design mainly follows the *Understanding by Design* (UbD) framework and many units reviewed by the team are aligned with the content and rigor of the curriculum frameworks.
      1. Most reviewed units include components that promote effective teaching and learning such as objectives and unit overviews and essential questions that can help guide lesson planning.[[9]](#footnote-9)
      2. The most effective reviewed units at all school levels also incorporate knowledge and skill-based vocabulary to support language development for all students, especially English learners (ELs). Some K–5 units identify additional vocabulary to use with students in Tier 2 and 3 schools.
      3. In addition to the curriculum units, Canvas contains multi-subject curriculum matrices for kindergarten and grades 1–5 and several grades 6–12 scope and sequence maps to guide unit and lesson development for the academic year.
      4. However, some posted units are not fully aligned with the current Massachusetts frameworks, such as grades 9–12 science, grades 6–12 English (scheduled for review in 2019–2020), and K–5 science (scheduled for review in 2020–2021).
   2. The district is taking steps to ensure that selected curricula reflect diversity.
      1. Several reviewed secondary English units included works by authors representing a range of racial and ethnic groups. Readings include works by authors such as Toni Morrison, Maya Angelou, and Zora Neale Hurston. A unit on folktales included Native American and Chinese folktales. In addition, students in an observed ESL/ELA lesson engaged in an animated discussion of *The House on Mango Street*.[[10]](#footnote-10)
      2. A district leader reported that middle- and high-school curriculum in ELA and social studies addresses a variety of cultural identities, perspectives, and experiences.

a. Grade 6 social studies students read *A Long Walk to Water* in geography class about the Sudanese civil war. Students have the opportunity to understand the culture of an African region they are studying and the origins of the lost boys of Sudan.

b. The high school history/social studies department offers electives in African American history, gender studies, civics, and sociology.

c. Some core curriculum content reflects the multi-cultural identity of Framingham’s students. For example, given the number of Brazilian and Haitian students, grade 9 world history addresses the history of Brazil and Haiti in some detail.

* + 1. The district has posted a request for proposal to conduct a districtwide racial equity audit. Its scope includes a curriculum review to analyze and recommend how to increase representation of Framingham’s diverse community in the curriculum and recommendations to ensure a diverse enrollment in advanced classes and programs.

**Impact**: By reviewing and renewing the curriculum to align it with current state frameworks and by providing support for teachers to learn more skillful teaching strategies of newly developed curriculum, the district has taken steps to ensure that all students have access to high-level learning experiences. By setting high expectations for curriculum materials to challenge students and by beginning to incorporate diversity into curriculum, the district is on the path to providing students with high-quality learning experiences.

1. **The district has created distributed leadership roles and established inclusive structures to systematically oversee and manage improvements to teaching, learning, and the curriculum. Many of these are in the developing stage.**

**A.** Interviews with the superintendent and school committee members and a document review indicated that the district created the office of teaching and learning as a collaborative leadership team focused on supporting all schools in their improvement efforts.

1. This office consists of the assistant superintendent for elementary education, the assistant superintendent for secondary education, the assistant director for elementary education, and the assistant director for secondary education. The two assistant superintendents have overarching responsibility to help their schools meet high-leverage strategic goals for “curriculum, instruction and assessment” and “teaching all students.” The assistant superintendents support principals and teachers by planning, organizing, and directing instructional programs and curriculum review and renewal efforts.

a. The assistant directors also support school-based leaders and teachers under the direction of the assistant superintendents.

b. Each assistant superintendent holds regular weekly or monthly meetings with school leaders and teacher groups to support and monitor progress on the accomplishment of district and school improvement goals.

c. Office of teaching and learning team members reported that they spent the 18 months before the onsite review in February 2019 communicating clear expectations for classroom instruction, establishing instructional leadership teams at all schools, and developing a seven-year curriculum review cycle.

1. District and school leaders and teachers stated that instructional leadership teams were now operational in all schools. The teams focused on meeting goals related to data-driven instructional and curricular improvements in the schools, especially using the new i-Ready formative assessments in kindergarten through grade 8. Their mandate also includes understanding and responding to teachers’ needs and acting as the liaison between district leaders and schools.

These teams are composed of school administrators, general education, special education, and English language development teachers, instructional coaches or department heads, and in some schools, guidance counselors.

The teams also function as data teams in most schools. They track and monitor data for students to guide decision-making for instruction and interventions and work with teachers in professional learning communities or other grade-level or content-based teams. Interviews and a document review indicated that the work of the instructional leadership teams was a developing practice at some schools.

The teams meet regularly, although frequency varies among schools, depending on grade level and school tier.

1. Instructional coaches for ELA and mathematics and English language development at the elementary schools provide direct assistance to classroom teachers through consultation and collaboration. Their goal is to provide mentoring, modeling, feedback, data analysis, and other support to improve teaching and learning.

The district has taken an equitable approach for allocating coaches in order to provide sufficient coaching support to the schools most in need. As a result, each Tier 3 school has two literacy coaches, while Tier 1 and 2 schools have one. All K–5 schools have one mathematics coach and an English language development coach.

The assistant superintendents and directors meet regularly with coaches to ensure shared communication and information and adequate preparation and training for coaching.

Principals stated that coaching needs varied across elementary schools based on their school improvement goals. Walkthroughs also identify coaching needs for individual teachers and grade levels.

* + - 1. For example, coaches support teachers learning to use data to justify and make better evidence-based decisions for instruction and interventions, and help teachers develop more effective lesson plans. Some coaches work with new teachers, helping them to set goals.

Coaches meet with K–5 teachers in grade-level teams at least weekly. At Tier 3 schools, grade-level teachers meet with the ELA and mathematics coaches every week for 90 minutes in each subject area.

English language development coaches at all schools help teachers create and use more effective strategies with English learners.

1. The district has multiple structures for teachers to collaborate, although the time for teacher collaboration at the high school is limited.

Professional learning communities, co-planning time, common planning time, and collaborative time were the many descriptors used by teachers for planned opportunities to work with their peers.

The frequency varies by school. For example, collaboration time occurs almost daily at the Tier 3 schools and only one hour monthly at the high school.

**Impact:** By instituting a distributed leadership model with leadership delegated at the district and school levels to support multiple decision-making groups at the school level, the district has created an interdependent and collaborative approach to improve teaching, learning, and the curriculum.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**3. In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent across school levels, with overall stronger practices observed K–­­8. In fewer than half of observed elementary and high-school classrooms, team members saw sufficient and compelling evidence of student engagement and rigor/higher-order thinking, both of which are district instructional priorities.**

1. **Focus Area #1: Lesson Objectives and Expectations** The quality of instruction in elementary and middle-school classes was stronger than in grades 9–12 for characteristics related to how teachers establish, communicate, and assess progress toward lesson objectives. Elementary and middle-school teachers often explained lesson content fluently, provided students with clear lesson objectives that students understood and often could explain to observers, and engaged students in appropriate activities linked to those objectives. Middle-school students, in particular, benefitted from frequent checks for understanding, although feedback and adjustments to teaching were infrequent.
2. In observed classrooms, the review team saw sufficient and compelling evidence that teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter by explaining lesson content and responding to students’ questions or misconceptions (characteristic #1) in 83 percent of middle-school classes, in 76 percent of elementary classes, and in 58 percent of high-school classes.
   1. An effective example was an elementary ELA lesson on historical fiction where the teacher was reading and discussing selections from Lois Lowry’s book about the Holocaust and WW II, *Number the Stars*. The teacher helped students understand how the historical context could help them understand characters’ actions, thoughts, words, and feelings.
   2. In a middle-school science lesson on acceleration, the teacher gave a detailed explanation of a lesson to find the average speed of a bicycle trip.
   3. In contrast, in a grade 2 math lesson, the teacher explained the content with limited fluency.
3. Observers saw sufficient and compelling evidence that students understood what they should be learning and why (characteristic #2) in 89 percent of middle-school classrooms, in 66 percent of elementary classrooms and in 46 percent of high-school classrooms.
   1. In an elementary ELA lesson on primary and secondary sources, students sat in a circle and the teacher engaged them in an effective question and answer session about sources.
   2. In contrast, at the beginning of a high-school English lesson, there was no explanation of the focus or objective of a vocabulary lesson. The teacher began an interactive whiteboard and worksheet exercise and the teacher or a student offered an answer, while the other students copied the answers on their worksheets.
4. There was sufficient and compelling evidence that classroom activities were well matched to learning objectives in both content and cognitive demand (characteristic #3) in 74 percent of observed elementary classes, in 73 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 34 percent of high-school classes.
   1. In a positive example, using guiding questions, students in a grade 12 English class were developing drafts of research papers on topics of their choice on their Chromebooks. The teacher circulated among the students, discussing and checking their work and posing questions.
   2. In a missed opportunity, in another high-school English class, the lesson was overly teacher centered. The teacher used a question and answer format and one student answered almost all the questions while others copied the teacher’s notes from the interactive whiteboard.
5. Review team members observed sufficient and compelling evidence that teachers frequently checked for understanding, provided feedback, and adjusted instruction (characteristic #4) in 55 percent of elementary-school classrooms, in 78 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 58 percent of high-school classrooms.
   1. In elementary lessons, teachers used a variety of formative assessment strategies during lessons. In one lesson, the teacher asked students to express their degree of understanding by positioning their thumbs up or down. In another observed lesson, the teacher circulated to each working group and provided individualized support. In a third observed lesson, the teacher asked students to turn-and-talk to share their ideas and to demonstrate their understanding of a lesson on fractions by displaying their work on individual mini-whiteboards.
   2. In a middle-school algebra lesson, a teacher and an aide continually monitored students completing a task in their seats. At the end of the lesson, an exit ticket exercise required students to demonstrate understanding.
   3. In contrast, in a grade 9 math class, they did not ask questions or ask the class to express their degree of understanding in any way.
6. **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement and Higher-Order Thinking** This focus area emphasizes two district priorities: rigor or depth of knowledge (higher-order thinking) and active student engagement in lessons. The quality of instruction in elementary and middle-school classes was stronger than in grades 9–12 in this area.

In observed lessons, review team members found sufficient and compelling evidence that students engaged with the content and lesson objectives and had opportunities to do the thinking in the classroom (characteristic #5) in 68 percent of elementary classrooms, in 84 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in just 38 percent of high-school classrooms.

In a middle-school mathematics lesson on rational numbers, students worked in teams of three and four to solve problems collaboratively.

In another positive example, small groups of students in a high-school English class were engaged in character analysis, sharing thoughtful observations or findings. At the end of the task, one student from each group shared the group’s analysis with the entire class.

In many high-school classrooms, teachers’ voices were dominant and students sat staring straight ahead with their heads in their hands; in some instances, they appeared to be completely disengaged from the lesson.

The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students were engaged in higher-order thinking such as analysis, synthesis, problem solving, evaluation, or the application of new knowledge (characteristic # 6) in 43 percent of elementary-school classrooms, in 45 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 38 percent of high-school classrooms.

a. In a grade 3 poetry lesson, the teacher asked higher-order thinking questions that required students to explain their thinking about a poem read in class. The assignment required students to analyze and interpret the poem and provide evidence of their thinking.

b. In a middle-school ESL lesson on learning to identify and express main ideas in scaffolded texts, students analyzed texts and identified what they thought were the main ideas. As the teacher worked with each group, she asked them to explain why their choices were main ideas or why they were not.

c. In a middle-school social studies lesson in which students were not engaged in higher-order thinking, the content of the lesson was not deep, and students listened to the teacher talk throughout the observation.

Observers found sufficient and compelling evidence that students meaningfully and in a sustained way communicated their ideas with each other (characteristic #7) in 47 percent of elementary-school classes, in 50 percent of middle-school lessons, and in only 27 percent of high-school lessons.

a. In a grade 2 ELA lesson where students were writing chapters for their non-fiction books on topics of their choice, the teacher had them share one page of their newly written chapter with their small group and get feedback from the other group members.

b. In contrast, in a high-school science lesson, the teacher did all the talking, problem-solving, and explaining while students watched, listened, and took notes.

Observers found sufficient and compelling evidence that students had opportunities to engage meaningfully with tasks connected to their lives or with the larger world (characteristic #8) in 41 percent of elementary classes, in 61 percent of middle-school classes, and in 27 percent of high-school classes.

a. In a middle-school science lesson on acceleration, pairs of students worked together to figure out how to bike to Gillette Stadium with a minimum of 12 turns.

b. In a high-school social studies lesson about India, the teacher probed by asking students to explain why specific societal issues such as population growth, economic issues and women’s health issues took place.

c. In contrast, in an elementary math lesson, students did basic adding and subtracting and were not given the opportunity to engage meaningfully with tasks connected to their lives or the larger world.

**C.** **Focus Area #3: Inclusive Practice and Classroom Culture** In observed classrooms at all levels, classroom routines and teachers’ responses to limit disruptions to learning were generally effective, although there were notable exceptions. In addition, overall, students and teachers had respectful and positive relationships that promoted a classroom climate conducive to learning. However, in the majority of all observed lessons districtwide, tasks were not designed to support and challenge students by considering their diverse learning needs, including linguistic, background, disability, and academic gifts. Observers found stronger practices in elementary and middle-school classrooms in the variety of instructional strategies teachers used in lessons.

Observers found sufficient and compelling evidence that lessons were designed to provide support and challenge for all students, regardless of learning needs (characteristic #9) in 46 percent of elementary classrooms, in 39 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 35 percent of high-school classrooms.

1. A number of observed elementary writers’ and readers’ workshop lessons effectively addressed students’ learning needs, strengths, challenges, and talents since students could read and write at a challenging level and benefit from the support of teachers and modeling of other students.
2. In a middle-school science lesson on constellations, all students appeared to be sufficiently challenged by the lesson and all students offered observations and comments.
3. In a high-school science lesson that was not challenging, instruction was teacher centered and all students were taking notes using a work packet.

The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that teachers used a variety of instructional strategies (characteristic #10) in 73 percent of elementary and middle-school classes, and in only 19 percent of high-school classes.

In a grade 4 ELA lesson, the teacher designed the lesson to include direct instruction, sharing thorough turn-and-talk, note-taking, and individual practice.

In a high-school geometry class, students cooperated in small groups to solve problems.

One of every five high-school lessons relied on a single teaching format, often teacher-directed instruction with limited opportunities for students’ voice other than brief responses to questions during the lesson.

Observers noted sufficient and compelling evidence that classroom routines and positive supports were consistently and effectively in place (characteristic #11) in 79 percent of elementary classrooms, in 61 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 69 percent of high-school classrooms. Similarly, observers found sufficient and compelling evidence of a classroom climate conductive to teaching and learning (characteristic #12) in 69 percent of elementary classes, in 67 percent of middle-school classes, and in 62 percent of high-school classes.

Classroom management skills that helped focus students on learning were evident in many K–5 lessons. Teachers used techniques such as counting down from three or clapping their hands to signal that it was time to resume the lesson task and effectively redirected distracted students.

In many lessons, classroom management skills were not adequately demonstrated. In some lessons, teachers were ineffective in providing or restoring a learning climate and students did not focus on learning during the lesson observation.

**Impact**: Without supportive learning environments and lessons that challenge students while meeting their diverse learning needs as individuals and groups at all grade levels, students face obstacles in developing the habits of mind and discipline of productive work that produce successful learners. Effective teaching requires teachers and other supportive adults in the classroom to understand students’ strengths and challenges and provide the specific and varied strategies, techniques, content, and engaging tasks to maximize students’ intellectual and social-emotional growth and development. When these conditions and others are met, students can leave secondary education prepared for college, career, work, and civic engagement.

**Recommendation**

**1. The district should ensure that all teachers provide effective instruction that challenges and supports all students.**

* + 1. The district should convene a representative group of teachers and instructional leaders to identify the district’s instructional strengths and challenges.

1. The district’s educator evaluation rubric, classroom walkthrough data, and this report’s Instructional Inventory data (Appendix C) can support this work.

2. Areas of focus should include engaging students in higher-order thinking, and promoting meaningful discourse about content and students’ thinking, and supporting and challenging students regardless of their learning needs.

3. The district should consider revising its planning documents to address the identified instructional challenges and should require teachers to consider these areas when they develop student learning or professional practice goals.

4. Professional development should focus on instructional areas that need strengthening as applied to the specific curricula that students and teachers work with every day.

**B.** The district is encouraged to provide opportunities for educators to discuss ideas and strategies for improvement of instruction.

These opportunities might include grade-level, department meetings, common planning time, faculty meetings and professional days.

District leaders and principals should continue to meet regularly with coaches to share their perspectives gleaned from walkthroughs and to continually improve support for coaching as an integrated and targeted improvement strategy.

1. Based on lesson observations, the high school should focus on helping teachers maximize the richness in the curriculum by using more active learning, student-centered techniques such as collaborative projects, performances, and research that reflects the intellectual depth of the analytical and critical thinking of the curriculum and its Understanding by Design (UbD) framework.
2. Coaches and department heads should continue to support teachers at all levels in using disaggregated assessment data to develop instructional strategies and define teaching groups and the activities that will support all students to make progress, regardless of learning needs.

**E.** High-school teachers do not necessarily need to be clustered by department each week to work on instructional improvement. Rich discussions and improved practices can develop when interdisciplinary teacher teams collaborate during concurrent free periods.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will mean a deeper understanding of instructional strengths and challenges across the district, a stronger culture of professional growth and improvement, and instruction that is more clearly aligned with district priorities. By using disaggregated data to match learning activities with learning needs, instruction can be more inclusive and address students’ specific strengths and challenges. Overall, stronger instructional practices can help ensure improved learning outcomes for all students.

**Recommended resources:**

* DESE’s *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* (Updated August 2017) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.
* DESE’s *Online Calibration Training Platform* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/>) uses videos of classroom instruction to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as a district leadership team, watch a video together and then individually assess the educator’s practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric and provide the educator with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare to each other, as well educators throughout the state.
* DESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/title-iia/ImplementationGuide2016.docx> ) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

Assessment

***Contextual Background***

The district’s office of teaching and learning oversees the collection, analysis, and sharing of student assessment data for the district. Additional support is provided to the schools by instructional coaches who join collaborative team meetings, offer professional development, and hold individual data chats with teachers to review assessment results.

Beginning in 2018–2019, all elementary schools administer formative assessments three times annually. The i-Ready diagnostic assessment for reading and mathematics and the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (BAS) for reading comprise the core battery for English speaking students. To accommodate English learners (ELs), elementary schools use the Imagine Learning Language and Literacy assessment and district-developed English as a second language (ESL) writing assessments, as well as the state-mandated Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) for ELs to measure proficiency in reading, writing, listening, and speaking English.

The district is devoting time and resources to support educators in accessing and reviewing data more effectively and has set up structures, predominately K–5, to make ongoing progress in this area. Elementary schools have adopted the ATLAS Looking at Data protocol for structuring their conversations around effective data inquiry.

Data review and analysis practices vary considerably among school levels, with the most robust and consistent practices at the elementary level. All elementary and middle-school teachers use the i-Ready diagnostic assessments to measure student progress in reading and mathematics and Imagine Learning assessments for English learners (ELs). The high school does not make extensive use of common formative assessment tools. Instead, curriculum-based lesson and unit exams provide formative feedback, while standardized assessments such as the MCAS tests, SAT, and AP exams provide summative data.

District administrators acknowledged that essential areas of growth remained and recognized that much further advancement was necessary for the overall school culture around data literacy and methods for using student assessment data to strengthen instructional practices.

**Strength Finding**

**The district has made great strides in compiling, organizing, and making available to all educators a wide range of student engagement and academic performance data.**

* 1. The district collects and makes readily available to all principals and their leadership teams a wide range of information, including social-emotional learning (SEL), school attendance, formative assessments, MCAS tests scores and item analysis, and responses from a school climate survey, that provides a profile of the students in their schools.
     1. Data is made available through the district’s shared Google Drive folders.
     2. Several sources of data are aligned with the current DESE accountability system. As a result, schools have at their disposal a considerable amount of information to analyze student achievement results and compare these with anticipated and targeted gains.
     3. The district is supporting calibration in data literacy (from the district level to the schools; from the schools to their instructional leadership teams; and from the instructional leadership teams to individual teachers) by making these data accessible in a shared, familiar, and well-organized platform.
  2. The district is in the process of developing a centralized data dashboard.
     1. The district’s vision is to make data and analysis tools available to schools on a timelier basis, and to provide a central repository of data so users will be able to access these in one place.
     2. School leaders expressed enthusiasm that this data dashboard would be a more efficient way of diving deeper into the data.
  3. District and school leaders have begun the process of analyzing data to guide decision-making and provided several recent examples.
     1. During the 2017–2018 school year, the district's curriculum review process identified concerns about the phonics skills of students in grades 4 and 5. As a result, the district decided to add *Fundations* at grade 3 and added additional training in phonics for K–3 teachers.
     2. One elementary school recently looked at i-Ready data and identified concerns about students’ facility with vocabulary. As a result, school leaders scheduled a half-day of professional development on vocabulary instruction.
     3. Teachers noted inconsistent approaches and access to social-emotional learning (SEL) at the elementary schools. After reviewing the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) data, they realized a need for SEL at all elementary schools and the district decided to purchase Second Step for K–5, beginning in 2019–2020.
     4. After an analysis of classroom instruction and other relevant data, the district concluded that many students were not performing at high levels. After determining the need to enhance rigor in classroom objectives and tasks, the district engaged consultants to work with coaches to review instructional standards and the level of rigor in lesson planning.

**Impact:** A shared and consistent system for data collection, data sharing, and informed decision-making can lead to higher interest, more confidence, and positive momentum in using data to help move the district forward.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. The district has not fully established a culture that uses data to improve teaching, learning, and classroom-level decision making.**

* 1. The district is at the preliminary stage in the development and implementation of its system for using student assessment results to support all students in making progress toward achieving state and local standards.
     1. According to interviewees, while educators often use discussions about student performance and assessment data for classroom grouping and identification of individual students needing interventions, moving these conversations into actionable changes in instructional practice at the classroom level does not usually take place.
     2. Evidence that teachers use formative assessment data to drive and adjust daily instructional practice varies considerably by school level and class.
        1. The team saw sufficient and compelling evidence of teachers using a variety of instructional strategies in 73 percent of observed elementary and middle-school classes, but in just 19 percent of observed high-school classes.
        2. The team observed sufficient and compelling evidence of teachers ensuring that students were engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs in 46 percent of elementary classes, in 39 percent of middle-school classes, and in 35 percent of high-school classes.
     3. The middle schools and the high school have not established consistent or standard practices for collection, review, and analysis of district and school assessment and outcome data. District and school leaders and teachers told the team that while i-Ready and Imagine Learning assessments were available at the middle schools, these assessments were used sporadically, and structures for discussing data were not happening consistently. When discussions about data do take place, data discussion protocols are not typically followed. Further, the roll-out of i-Ready at the middle-school level was reportedly hampered by what some perceived as flawed timing and limited training offered to educators.
     4. The use of common formative assessments at the high school is not widespread and consistent across departments. Most teachers rely mainly on their mid-year and final exams and standardized assessments such as the MCAS assessment, tests, the PSAT, and AP exams.
     5. Some school leaders and educators identified the need for more training on data analysis and use. Some secondary school teachers expressed the view that data analysis led to questions that they could not always answer, and that they sometimes did not get the full picture because the data did not always “come together” for them.
        1. During classroom observations, review team members observed inconsistencies in the administration of assessments. Students were sometimes distracted by their peers and some seemed unable to stay focused for the full length of the assessment.

**Impact**: Without adequate development and implementation of a system for using student assessment results, the school community is missing a critical opportunity for teachers to act on timely information, which they can use to revise their instructional practices to ensure that all students are achieving maximum academic growth. In addition, stakeholders have limited knowledge of the extent to which progress is being made, and the district’s ability to make appropriate and timely adjustments to its programs, instruction and professional development offerings is hindered.

**Recommendation**

**The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the efficient collection, use, and sharing of a range of assessments at the middle schools and the high school.**

**A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data in grades 6–12.

1. The district should ensure that educators in grades 6–12 use data strategically to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.

**B.** Ongoing targeted training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided to all 6–12 staff.

1. The district should encourage its grade-level and content-level teams to take advantage of the full range of materials available for effective ways of turning data analysis findings into action plans, including online resources, conferences, and journals.
2. A piece of this work involves using standard protocols for reviewing data. The elementary schools’ use of the ATLAS Looking at Data protocol is a familiar process that should be considered for use across the secondary schools. A variety of other excellent and popular data protocols are also available.
3. Once educators are better trained and comfortable with using formative assessment and student achievement data, the district should encourage greater use of qualitative data such as social emotional data and school culture and climate surveys.

**Benefits:** Through implementing this recommendation, secondary school educators will likely be better informed about students’ progress as well as educators’ instructional strengths, challenges, and needs for additional training and support to adjust their practice. Further, the district stands to benefit from greater K–12 coordination among curriculum, assessment, and instructional practices, which will help maximize the impact of their efforts to improve the academic achievement of all students.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - DESE’s *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
    - DESE’s *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/toolkit/district-data-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.

Human Resources and Professional Development

***Contextual Background***

It was clear to the review team that the administration has prioritized improvements to the district’s professional development (PD) program. PD programming and services are directly aligned with district priorities; the district’s PD plan is closely aligned with the goals articulated in the strategic plan, and interviews and a review of documents confirmed that every school improvement plan (SIP) was aligned with the district’s strategic plan and the goals articulated in the PD plan. District and school leaders said that student data from multiple sources informed decisions about PD needs and programs. They identified i-Ready, ACCESS, Panorama, EWIS, SAT, and a variety of other benchmark, common assessments, and writing assignments, as well as student attendance and disciplinary records and demographics, to be among the key data points that they systematically analyze for the purposes of PD planning. In addition to in-service and early-release days and regular, structured collaborative time during the school day, the district offers extension courses taught by district staff and courses taught by external providers. However, the district’s PD program is missing some essential elements, including measurable goals and collaborative leadership.

The district’s educator evaluation system, products, and supervisory practices are missing the overall quality, focus, and consistency needed to make meaningful and lasting improvements to classroom instruction that also addresses student learning needs.

The district’s commitment to increasing the diversity of its faculty is worthy of note. Embedded in the district’s strategic plan is the goal of diversifying school and district staff to better reflect the student population. A number of highly promising strategies and action steps have been and are being developed to improve and expand recruitment, hiring, and retention policies and practices in order to achieve this important and worthy goal.

**Strength Finding**

**1. The district demonstrates a genuine commitment to building a racially diverse faculty.**

**A.** One of the goals articulated in the district’s 2017–2020 Annotated Strategic Plan is the establishment of hiring practices that diversify district and school staff. The specific strategies developed to achieve this goal are as follows: establish and support a homegrown teacher program, develop more aggressive and effective recruitment strategies, and revise and improve the teacher induction and mentoring programs to enhance staff retention.

1. Interviewees reported that plans have been developed to establish a homegrown teacher program for district students, paraprofessionals, and other non-teaching staff through which to enter the teaching profession. They said that these included the creation of a mentoring program for high-school students in order to develop a cadre of “students in teacher training” and mentoring programs for paraprofessionals interested in becoming teachers.

District and school leaders expressed the belief that these programs would be implemented and fully operational during the 2019–2020 school year.

2. District and school leaders described a number of action steps underway, or planned, whose purpose was to improve and expand district recruitment and hiring policies and practices. These include substantially increased attendance at diversity in hiring job fairs; enhanced Framingham Public Schools recruitment literature designed to highlight the district’s commitment to staff diversity; and expanded partnerships with local colleges and universities—including Wellesley College, Simmons College, Clark University, Boston University, Framingham State University, and UMass Boston—in order to recruit a more diverse pool of student teachers.

3. District and school leaders stated that comprehensive improvements to the new teacher mentoring program, including changes to the mentor training course, new teacher orientation, and new teacher seminar, have been implemented in 2018–2019 and/or would be introduced in 2019–2020. They said that these include a revised mentor handbook and mentor training course, and significant enhancements to the new teacher orientation program to incorporate more Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) support and training in the use of data.

**B.**  The district’s recent decision to conduct a comprehensive racial equity audit was based in part on the goal of reviewing current efforts to recruit and retain staff of color and to provide recommendations on how to further improve staff recruitment and support for a diverse professional staff through the creation of a welcoming, bias-free work environment.

**Impact**: The district’s commitment to building a diverse workforce is both genuine and well defined. It reflects the understanding that increasing the number of staff of color, and creating an inclusive environment for staff, will benefit students in many ways.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. The district’s educator evaluation system does not prioritize opportunities for educators to receive high-quality feedback[[11]](#footnote-11) that helps them improve their practice.**

**A.** The team reviewed the evaluative documentation of 42 randomly selected teachers from across the district for the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 school years. Most teachers’ formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations were missing instructive feedback to meaningfully improve professional competencies or classroom practice.

1. Fewer than half of all evaluations could be described as evidence based. Of those, the evidence cited was not concrete or clearly teacher or lesson specific. Instead, it was typically vague, generic, and/or merely a paraphrased or verbatim restatement of DESE performance indicators.

2. Almost 80 percent of teacher evaluations contained little constructive feedback, clear pedagogical suggestions, or specific and actionable recommendations of any kind for improved classroom practice or enhanced lesson design.

**B.** State educator evaluation regulations require that the evaluation of principals mirror the same five-step annual cycle that is the basis of the teacher evaluation system.

1.Reviewers noted significant challenges in the district’s implementation of its principal evaluation system. For example, in the case of the district’s five new principals, no formal mid-cycle goals review or formative assessments had been completed at the time of this review (late February 2019). In addition, for the 2017–2018 and 2018–2019 school years, none of the nine other principals had received a formative assessment and only two had received a summative performance evaluation throughout that period.

**C.** The district’s supervisory policies and practices do not appear adequate to properly inform and fully support a high-quality and truly effective educator evaluation system.

Although the district’s educator evaluation system is generally aligned with the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework, reviewers noted some significant differences. For example, while state regulations require that teachers in their first year of practice receive at least four unannounced classroom observations during the school year, the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement (CBA) requires only two. Further, for teachers in their second and third years of practice, the state framework requires that teachers receive at least three unannounced observations, while the teachers’ CBA stipulates just two.

Although some of the teachers from schools across the district spoke favorably about the frequency of unannounced observations and quality of feedback that they received, the majority of teachers described a perfunctory, ineffective, “check the box” evaluative system in which supervisors did not regularly visit classrooms and typically provided them with little feedback of value or substance.

Administrators acknowledged that because of the many demands that compete for their time and attention and the number of teachers assigned to evaluators, they found it difficult to meet even the minimum number of classroom observations specified in the CBA and to provide teachers with the ongoing, individualized instructional support required to improve instruction.

Principals told the team that formal, comprehensive training for all administrators focusing on such topics as supervisory practices, evidence gathering and analysis, calibration, and document writing have not been regularly or systematically provided to all district evaluators.

**D.** As of the 2015–2016 school year, state educator evaluation regulations (603 CMR 35.07) call for districts to collect and use student feedback as evidence in the teacher evaluation process and staff feedback as evidence in the administrator evaluation process. This feedback may also be used to inform an educator’s self-assessment, goal-setting, or as evidence to demonstrate growth over time.

1. School leaders told reviewers that the district has not initiated any action or developed any plan to use feedback in the educator evaluation process.

**E.** The district has not formalized collection and use of multiple measures of student learning as part of its educator evaluation system.

1. Student learning is embedded as an indicator within one of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework’s four standards, and evaluators are required to take into account evidence of impact from multiple measures of student learning when determining performance ratings.

2. District and school leaders stated they were not aware of any district plans to use multiple measures of student learning as part of its educator evaluation system.

**Impact**: Without high-quality (specific, timely, and actionable) feedback, the district cannot effectively improve educators’ ability to meet the needs of all learners and advance all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes.

**3. The district’s professional development (PD) program is missing a designated and coordinated leadership structure, measurable goals and objectives, and formal teacher collaboration in PD planning and leadership.**

1. District PD structures are not properly aligned with several key elements of the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development. Of particular note are those guiding principles that require coordinated and collaborative leadership and stress the need for a district’s PD plan to be developed and monitored according to the SMART goal format.[[12]](#footnote-12)
2. District and school leaders said that the district did not have a formal PD committee or designated leadership group at the district or school levels. Instead, the district’s PD Plan is jointly developed by the assistant superintendent for elementary education and the assistant superintendent for secondary education who, through the office of teaching learning, oversee and coordinate districtwide PD programs and services. Principals are responsible for planning and implementing all PD activities in their schools during early-release sessions.
3. Both teachers and district leaders said that teachers were not involved in any formal way in PD leadership or collaborative planning at the district or school levels. In focus groups, many teachers expressed the view that they were essentially excluded from having a meaningful role in developing the programs and services that were supposed to support them and promote their professional growth.
   1. By the teachers’ collective bargaining agreement, one of the district’s four full PD days is assigned to the Framingham Teachers’ Association, which assumes responsibility for planning PD activities and programs for that specific day. Teachers spoke favorably of the association-designed program, but it was not clear to the review team that it was directly aligned with the district’s strategic priorities or consistent with the goals of the district PD plan.
4. Although the district’s PD plan is directly aligned with and supportive of the goals and objectives articulated in the strategic plan, its goals are not measurable or constructed in SMART goal format, as recommended by the state’s Standards for Professional Development.
5. District and school leaders stated that the district’s PD plan served as a blueprint for all PD programs and services and that all school-level PD activities must be aligned with the district plan and approved by the office for teaching and learning. They reported, however, that coordination among the individual schools was not well established and that PD planning, practices, and leadership structures varied significantly from school to school.

The district now administers an annual PD interest survey to staff and conducts exit assessments following all districtwide workshops and programs to determine their effectiveness. Principals reported that these important teacher input practices were not consistently employed at the school level.

**Impact**: Although the district’s PD plan is aligned with and supportive of the strategic plan, its goals and objectives are not developed and presented according to the SMART goal format. Because they are not readily measurable, it is more difficult to accurately monitor progress, assess the overall effectiveness of implementation strategies, and make timely and targeted adjustments to those strategies, thus potentially compromising outcomes. In addition, the absence of formal opportunities for teachers to participate in a direct and meaningful way in PD leadership and planning prevents them from becoming fully invested as true and appropriate partners in school and district improvement initiatives, as well as in their own professional growth.

**Recommendations**

**1. The district should promote educators’ growth by fully implementing all components of the educator evaluation system, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that all educators receive high-quality feedback.**

* 1. The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of evaluators to ensure that the feedback that they provide is specific, timely, and actionable and relevant to instructional practice, professional growth, and student outcomes.

1. Evaluators should participate in ongoing calibration training and other activities to ensure quality, accuracy, and consistency in the evaluation process.

**B.** The district should consider widening the pool of evaluators to provide teachers with more frequent classroom observations, increased support, and higher quality feedback. Allocating evaluative responsibilities to additional qualified personnel is a model of distributed leadership than can reduce or equalize supervisory workloads and build the leadership skills of more educators.

**C.** The district should implement systems to ensure that all educators develop student learning and professional practice goals that are SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action-Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused; and Time and Tracked).

Performance ratings for all educators should be based in part on educators’ impact on student learning.

**D.** The district should take the necessary steps to meaningfully incorporate student and staff feedback into the educator evaluation system.

**Benefits**: By implementing an educator evaluation system that prioritizes high-quality feedback, the district will help educators improve instruction, likely leading to enriched learning experiences and increased outcomes for all students. The inclusion of student and staff feedback and student learning indicators as evidence in the educator evaluation process will enable teachers and principals to reflect more accurately and comprehensively on their professional efficacy and be better able to identify areas of strength and areas for growth.

**Recommended resources:**

* *Quick Reference Guide: Student and Staff Feedback* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf>) provides information about how to select feedback instruments and use feedback as part of the educator evaluation system, along with links to relevant resources.
* DESE’s calibration platform (<http://www.ma-calibration.com/>) includes tasks and activities to help educators calibrate their understanding of both content and pedagogy.
  + - * *A Protocol for developing S.M.A.R.T Goal Statements* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/>) is designed to support educators in developing S.M.A.R.T. goal statements using the appropriate evaluation rubric and a DESE-developed protocol. *The Evidence Collection Toolkit (*[*http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/rubrics/)*)* is designed to help districts establish clear and consistent expectations for evidence collection and promote a meaningful process for the collection, analysis, and sharing of high-quality artifacts. The toolkit Includes: brief guidance, examples of district strategies, a worksheet for district decision-making, and a handout of Evidence Collection Tips for Educators.
* *On Track with Evaluator Capacity* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/pln/OnTrack-EvaluatorCapacity.pdf>) is an interactive document that provides specific strategies, lessons learned, and links to district-created resources. It was produced by eight districts that were part of a Professional Learning Network for Supporting Evaluator Capacity.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Streamline.pdf>) is designed to help districts reflect on and continuously improve their evaluation systems:
  + What’s working? What are the bright spots?
  + How can we streamline the process to stay focused on professional growth and development?
  + What do we need to adjust to ensure our system is valuable to educators and students?
* DESE’s Educator Evaluation Training Workshops (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/teachers/default.html>) provide a general overview to the educator evaluation framework as well as opportunities to engage in activities associated with the first three steps of the 5-Step Cycle. This is a particularly helpful resource for educators new to the educator evaluation framework.

**2. The district’s PD program should be directed by a designated and collaborative joint committee or another representative group. This leadership team should be responsible for developing, implementing, and monitoring a comprehensive PD plan that includes well-defined and measurable goals, and ensuring that consistent PD policies, practices, and structures are in place in all schools across the district.**

1. The district’s improved PD model should systematically incorporate the elements and guidelines articulated in the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development, with particular attention given to the need for collaborative leadership.
   * 1. The district’s PD program should be directed by a joint committee/group composed of district and school administrators, curriculum leaders, and teacher representatives from the elementary, middle and high schools, thereby creating a designated, centralized, and genuinely collaborative leadership structure. Its role should be to develop, communicate, implement, and evaluate comprehensive PD plans, programs, and support services for the district.

2. The district PD committee should have the administrative capacity to provide strong and effective leadership. It should be empowered to make revisions and improvements, as needed, to PD programs, practices, and structures. This should include the coordination of all district PD programming to ensure that high-quality PD policies, procedures, and governance structures are established and maintained in each of the district’s schools.

Teachers should also be actively included in the PD planning and decision making of every school. For example, the instructional leadership team could assume responsibility for collaborating with the principal to develop and direct all school level PD programs and activities.

1. Among the guiding principles of the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development are that PD is intentional, is a deliberate and consistent process, and that it is evaluated for effectiveness. The district, therefore, is encouraged to incorporate the following recommendations into its PD program:
2. The annual goals of the PD plan should be measurable and informed by data on instruction (such as from walkthroughs or other processes) in addition to student achievement and outcome data. The PD goals and objectives of the district, as well as those of each school, should be developed and monitored according to the SMART goal format.
3. All PD programs and activities, at both the school and district levels, should be evaluated by staff and the results of those assessments used to plan and/or make improvements to future PD programming.
4. Efforts should be made to ensure that the Framingham Teachers Association’s full-day PD programs are aligned with and supportive of the district’s well-defined and overarching PD priorities and goals.

**Benefits**: The creation of a designated and collaborative PD leadership structure will provide a more appropriate mechanism for the district to annually develop a comprehensive and measurable PD Plan. The formal collaboration of teachers in the PD processes of both the district and individual schools is fully consistent with the principles clearly articulated in the state’s Standards for Professional Development. It contributes to the creation of an authentic professional community and promotes a model of shared leadership within the district. Involving staff directly in the design, implementation, and assessment of PD programming will increase their sense of ownership and enhance their support for and active participation in district and school improvement efforts, as well as their own professional growth.

**Recommended resources:**

* *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.html>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
* ESE’s *Professional Development Self-Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/dsac/professional-development-self-assessment-guide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings’ alignment with the Massachusetts High-Quality Professional Development Standards, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.
* *Identifying Meaningful Professional Development* (<https://youtu.be/zhuFioO8GbQ>) is a video in which educators from three Massachusetts districts discuss the importance of targeted, meaningful professional development and the ways districts can use the evaluation process to identify the most effective PD supports for all educators.
  + - The *2015 Guidelines for Induction & Mentoring Programs* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/guidelines.pdf>) provides updated information for how districts can develop, implement, and refine induction and mentoring programs for educators new to the profession, the district, and/or their roles.

Student Support

***Contextual Background***

Framingham is a high growth community. Student enrollment increased by 8.2 percent from 2015 to 2019, from 8,153 in 2015 to 8,822 in 2019. The district’s rising percentages of economically disadvantaged students, English learners, and students whose first language is not English exceeded the statewide averages for these student groups in 2018–2019. Between 2015 and 2019, the proportion of students with disabilities fluctuated with an overall decrease, from 23.6 percent in 2015 to 22.9 percent in 2019, compared with the 2019 state average of 18.1 percent. There are more than 400 homeless students enrolled in the district’s schools.

The district implements a multi-tiered system of support. Tiers 2 and 3 levels of support provide coaches to support teaching for mathematics, ELA, and ELD. In the district-defined Tier 2 and 3 schools, there are co-taught classes with general and special education teachers. However, at the high school, only the history and social studies department uses co-teaching as a strategy. The district has recently seen a decline in student referrals for special education at the elementary and middle-school levels that district leaders have attributed to the tiered support system for students.

In almost all key performance indicators, opportunity and achievement gaps between student groups are evident. To succeed in school, many students require more intensive academic, social-emotional, and behavioral support and interventions. These are priorities that the district continues to pursue with an evolving set of strategies. At the high school level, these include: identifying and supporting students who are old for their grade and therefore at high risk of dropping out; programs such as Step up to Excellence, which provides mentoring and support for economically disadvantaged students; an academic development center for tutoring during the school day; peer tutoring after school; and the Cornerstones Program, through which two teachers and a social worker support retained students.

Recently, educators have also addressed issues to improve school culture and climate to encourage student engagement in all aspects of school life and promote more positive attitudes toward learning. A new policy to eliminate all athletic fees helps provide access to sports for all students. Added late buses at the high school encourage participation in after-school activities. The district now provides its diverse student population at the secondary level with programs, activities, and electives that feature topics and texts that enhance students’ awareness and understanding of the district’s rich and varied ethnic and racial student groups and students’ gender identity. For example, the high school offers over 60 different clubs such as a Black student union, Jewish student union, and LGBTQ[[13]](#footnote-13) club. The high school also provides after-school peer mentoring programs through the academic development center and the Step Up to Excellence program.

In addition to the directors for special education and English language development (ELD), the district has recently created a new role of assistant superintendent for equity, diversity, and community development. The new assistant superintendent is responsible for creating opportunities to “define, assess and promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.” He teams with leaders in the office of teaching and learning on curriculum and with the office of human resources to address staff recruitment and diversity in hiring. In addition, he oversees and develops the district’s partnerships with local businesses and other community organizations.

**Strength Findings**

**1. The district has taken steps to create a school culture and climate characterized by safe, positive, inclusive, and welcoming learning environments in schools.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has put in place a number of positive approaches to establish a safe and supportive school culture and a school climate conducive to learning at all school levels.

1. The district has initiated a Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) model in each elementary and middle school.

a. A PBIS coordinator/coach provides technical assistance to school-based PBIS teams. The Fuller Middle School has a student success coach.

b. These coaches help students with behavior issues and help staff implement behavioral expectations and tiered interventions through proactive classroom management practices, such as consistent routines and positive reinforcement.

2. In addition, leaders and teachers in several elementary schools have had training to implement the Responsive Classroom and Second Step programs. Each program is intended to create safe and welcoming classrooms and to give students the tools to make progress in emotion management, situational awareness, and academic achievement. The district has planned ongoing training to include every K–5 school over the next few years.

a. District leaders and teachers are beginning to use qualitative and quantitative behavioral data from both programs to track and provide evidence of effectiveness and to plan next steps in order to ensure continued progress.

**B.** The district formed a social-emotional mental health team consisting of the district’s behavior coordinator and a clinical psychologist. This team helps leaders and teachers to support students and provides PD to staff to strengthen support systemwide for students needing mental health and behavioral interventions. The district has also formed student support intervention teams in partnership with the city health department.

**C.** The district has conducted or participated in surveys to gather data to help understand students’ well–being and to guide goalsetting focused on culture, social-emotional learning, and safety at the district and school levels.

1. The district has administered the Panorama Education Survey for students, staff, and families in grades 3–12 for the three years before the onsite in February 2019 to measure engagement in school, relationships, safety, and other indicators.

2. Secondary schools also participate in the Metro-West Adolescent Health Survey for grades 8–12 to assess issues related to students’ health and well-being. High-school teachers use the results to help plan the health curriculum. In addition, survey data is shared with administrators and then with the schools to help set SIP goals.

**Impact:** By instituting multi-faceted systems of social-emotional and behavioral supports, the district is better positioned to help develop students’ social-emotional self-awareness and well–being and to create safer, more welcoming and respectful learning environments. As a result, more students likely are motivated to stay in school, focus on learning, and graduate from high school prepared for college, career, and civic engagement.

**2. The district has taken steps to ensure that each school develops strong collaborative relationships with families, community partners, and other stakeholders.**

**A**. The district proactively ensures that students and their families have an opportunity to participate in decision-making processes within the district.

1. The district has given a voice and leadership development opportunities to students through a student advisory committee that meets monthly with the superintendent to examine and discuss school issues. At the time of the onsite in February 2019, students were researching the value of homework.

2. The superintendent also meets monthly with the schools’ leadership councils as well as the PTO leadership group. Parents stated that they were confident that district leaders listened to their views.

**B.** There are multiple online platforms through which families can monitor students’ work and progress. These include Canvas, the district’s learning management system, where teachers post lessons and assignments and student results and Aspen X2, which records student attendance data.

**C.** A number of partnerships and organizations within the community support families and students.

1. The district’s office of equity, diversity, and community development has relationships with over 60 community organizations in Framingham. Some of these organizations have donated funds to the district for family supports, such as freezers for the Wilson Elementary School and Framingham High School to equip the district to provide families in need with frozen meals.

2. The school partners with area colleges such as Boston University, Wellesley College, and Framingham State University to provide courses for both students and teachers. At no cost, Framingham State University will provide a summer program to help teachers conduct curriculum research. The university will also offer a tuition-free summer reading program for the district’s lowest performing readers.

3. In 2018–2019, the district collaborated extensively with the city health department on best practice supports to address students’ social-emotional and behavioral needs in order to create a more comprehensive Tier 2 and 3 system.

**Impact:** Strong community relationships and partnerships can enable the district to provide students with the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral supports that can promote well–being and higher academic achievement.

**Challenges and Areas of Growth**

**3. The district’s policies and practices are not improving graduation, dropout, and chronic absence rates, particularly for some groups of students.**

**A.** Data shows that despite the fact that the high school has implemented several strategies to provide students with academic, social-emotional and behavior support, there is much more to be done to improve key outcomes for many students.

1. Framingham has a lower four-year graduation rate and higher dropout and chronic absence rates than the state (see Tables 22, 26, and 29 in the District Overview section of this report).

2. The district’s overall four-year graduation rate decreased from 2016 to 2018, and in 2018 was 81.9 percent. The state rate in 2018 was 87.9 percent.

a. While the graduation rate has increased over time for some student groups, there are substantial gaps among students.

i. For example, the graduation rate in the district for English learners was 55.3 percent, compared to 64.1 percent of English learners statewide and compared to 94.1 percent of the district’s Asian students and 88.4 percent of the district’s White students.

3. The district’s overall dropout rate fluctuated with an overall increase from 2016 to 2018, and in 2018 was 2.7 percent. The state rate in 2018 was 1.9 percent.

a. Dropout rates for most student groups increased from 2016 to 2018. Gaps persist between student groups and in comparison with state rates.

i. The dropout rate for students in the high needs group was 4.6 percent. The statewide rate for high needs students was 3.6 percent. The dropout rate for White students in the district was 1.7 percent.

4. The district’s overall chronic absence rate[[14]](#footnote-14) fluctuated with an overall increase from 2016 to 2018, and in 2018 was 13.4 percent; the state rate was 13.2 percent.

a. Chronic absence rates for most student groups increased between 2016 and 2018. While rates were slightly lower than state rates in many cases, there was high chronic absence for several student groups.

i. For example, 20.8 percent of students with disabilities were chronically absent in 2018.

**B.** The team found limited evidence of high student engagement and deeper learning in observed high school classes.

1. Review team members found little evidence of students assuming responsibility for their learning, high student engagement, students engaged in higher-order thinking and students communicating with each other in observed high school classes.

2. The review team found limited evidence of teachers ensuring that students were engaged in challenging tasks regardless of their learning needs and teachers using a variety of strategies in observed high school lessons.

**C.** Interviewees and documents indicated that the Thayer Campus, the district’s alternative high school program, serves students who are at risk of dropping out and students who have already dropped out and returned. However, although the program currently enrolls 62 students, a third of them do not regularly participate in the program, which offers credit recovery.

**Impact:** When tiered interventions, support programs, and instructional strategies fail to address the needs of the district’s students, these students may lose interest in schooling and are likely to miss school. The most severe consequences include many students who drop out of school and fail to graduate with their entering high school class.

**4. Although most teachers, students, and families interviewed by the team said that they believed that the high school environment was safe, some expressed a need for clarification about the response procedures to follow if the school were to have a crisis.**

**A.** According to the results of a high-school survey in preparation for the NEASC[[15]](#footnote-15) review, 18.5 percent of students (about 400 students) and 12.4 percent of teachers (about 15 faculty members) said that they were not clear about what to do in a crisis. In addition, 40.6 percent of families reported they did not know what to do in a crisis.

1. Teachers and students stated that the district had not provided up-to-date information about emergency procedures, expressing a need to know more about what should be done in the case of an emergency or crisis.

2. Teachers said that there was a need for additional training opportunities to ensure that leaders and teachers were prepared to act in the event of an emergency.

**B.** The district has initiated safety audits at all schools, but the results were incomplete at the time of the onsite visit in February 2019.

**C.** In 2018–2019, there are two new school resource officers in the school buildings and a memorandum of understanding with the Framingham police department about safety, which has helped ease some of the concerns of students and staff.

**Impact:** Until security plans are clarified, some students and staff can be anxious and unsure about what to do in the event of an emergency.

**Recommendations**

**1. To better support its most at risk and vulnerable students, the district should conduct root cause analyses to examine and eliminate obstacles to attending and staying in school.**

**A.** The district should analyze attendance data and determine the root cause(s) of chronic absence.

1.The district should use disaggregated data to examine attendance rates and analyze the extent to which specific student groups have disproportionate rates of chronic absence.

2.The district shouldgather input from students and families through focus groups and surveys about the reasons for high absence rates and possible ways to address the challenge of students missing too much instruction.

3. The district should ensure that schools support two-way communication and access for all students’ families, including providing interpretation and translation services to families, as appropriate.

4.The district should determine the root causes of high and disproportionate absence rates and take steps to address them, including reviewing current initiatives to improve attendance and adjusting efforts as needed.

**B.** The district should make systematic and timely use of DESE’s early warning indicator system (EWIS) to systematically identify students that need additional support to stay on track to graduate.

**C.** The district should consider that addressing attendance and graduation/dropout may involve a range of wider initiatives such as improving instruction and its relevance to post-graduation goals; fostering a positive school climate; and building or strengthening relationships with students and their families.

1. The district might consider ways to increase students’ agency, personalize their learning, and increase their understanding of the connections and relevance of their current coursework to their future success.

2. The district should continue to explore ways to implement UDL in all of its schools and classrooms. This is a research-based, proven set of strategies to eliminate barriers to learning and to improve teaching to address the individual and group needs of students.

3. The district should prioritize improving instruction and its relevance to post-graduation goals to promote student engagement.

**Benefits:** The district can improve identification and understanding of students and provide more functional strategies to help them be successful in school. Baseline and actionable data will help the district better understand systemic weaknesses and lead to providing a more coherent school experience for the district’s most at risk and vulnerable students and groups. Finally, these and other already operational strategies can lead to fewer students missing school and more students graduating on time.

**Recommended resources:**

* My Career and Academic Plan (MyCAP) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/ccr/mycap/>) is a student-centered, multi-year planning tool designed to provide students with ongoing opportunities to plan for their academic, personal/social and career success.
* *Every Student, Every Day: A Community Toolkit to Address and Eliminate Chronic Absenteeism* (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/chronicabsenteeism/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of Action Guides that provide information and resources to help ensure that all young people are in school every day and benefitting from coordinated systems of support.
* The Attendance Works website (<https://www.attendanceworks.org/resources/>) provides several resources to help address chronic absenteeism, including district- and school-level self-assessments and planning tools, webinars, and toolkits.
* *Ninth Grade Counts* (<http://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/resources/ninth-grade-counts/>) is a resource to help high schools identify weaknesses in their ninth-grade programs, and then develop a purposeful, proactive plan to strengthen this critical educational transition. The guide is divided into three areas of focus:
  + Strengthening the Transition into High School
  + Strengthening the High School Transition for English Language Learners
  + Using Summer Bridge Programs to Strengthen the High School Transition
* DESE’s *High School Exit Intervention Model Protocol* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/ExitProtocol.docx>) is based on statutory language, and also incorporates promising examples of existing exit protocols used by some school districts in Massachusetts and nationally. Schools and districts may choose to use this format when creating or adapting their own exit interview protocol for conducting exit intervention interviews or develop an alternative format. The model protocol includes two main sections:
  + Foundation for Supporting Students: Setting up school and district structures to efficiently and effectively identify and intervene with individual students.
  + Support Process for Individual Students: Hosting an Exit Intervention Interview, creating or revising an Individual Learning Plan, and conducting an Exit Survey.
* *Dropout Prevention* (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/dp_pg_090308.pdf>) is a practice guide produced by the US Department of Education, the Institute of Education Sciences, and the What Works Clearinghouse. It provides specific and coherent evidence-based recommendations for use by educators addressing the challenge of reducing dropping out. Strategies presented include identifying and advocating for at-risk students, implementing programs to improve behavior and social skills, and keeping students engaged in the school environment.
  + The *Impact of Dropping Out Student Flyer* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/ImpactFlyer.docx>) is a brief resource that can be shared with students and their families as part of the exit intervention process to share the potential negative impacts of dropping out of high school.
  + The *Impact of Dropping Out Staff Resources Summary* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/ImpactSum.docx>) provides a summary of research findings on the impacts of dropping out, listed by the following categories: personal income and employment, economy, crime, literacy, health, and family formation. Following the summary of findings is a listing of references.
* DESE’s *Early Warning Indicator System* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccte/ccr/ewis/>) 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 *Wraparound Replication Cookbook* (<https://sites.google.com/site/masswazcookbook/>) is a practical guide focused on improving academic performance by systematically addressing students’ social emotional and non-academic needs. It is based on the experience of several Massachusetts districts, and is organized according to the following key strategy areas:
  + Addressing School Culture and the Social Emotional Aspects of Learning
  + Rethinking Systems for Identifying and Addressing Academic and Social Emotional Needs
  + Creating Focused Partnerships & Coalitions
* The Office for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mv/>) works to ensure the enrollment, attendance, and opportunity to succeed in school for homeless children and youth by providing technical assistance and guidance to school districts and families and collaborating with other state agencies and community providers to support homeless families and their students.

**2. The district should complete the schools’ safety audits and conduct periodic up-to-date safety drills at all schools. It also should consider providing additional training for faculty and clarify with staff, students, and families the procedures and protocols for responding to a crisis.**

**A.** The district should study the findings and recommendations from the schools’ safety audits, consider other best practices for school safety, and develop clear security policies and practices to promote school safety.

1. Once policies are in place, the district should develop with the city of Framingham police and fire chief a one- or two-page safety checklist of the actions to take when/if there is an emergency. The checklist should be translated into all of district families’ home languages.

a. The safety checklist should use the appropriate uniform language about responses throughout the district.

b. The review team recommends that the district not post safety procedures online, which might jeopardize public safety and cyber security.

2. The district should thoroughly test safety procedures through drills, and review and update them periodically to be effective and timely.

**B.** Each school should have an emergency management planning team so that each school is represented on the district’s planning team. Each school should also have a trained threat assessment team of administrators, teachers, and members of the city’s police and fire departments to conduct a “threat assessment” and evaluate threats as quickly as possible.

**C.** The district should consider conducting training in each school annually and each time a school is renovated, to ensure that responsible adults are prepared for emergencies.

**D.** The district should consider additional technology such as cameras, video, panic buttons for teachers, and other security-oriented hardware that it can use to ensure safer and more secure schools.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will ensure that all stakeholders will be better informed and trained for emergencies and the schools will be safer and more secure for all.

**Recommended resources:**

* DESE’s Emergency Management Planning for Schools web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/sfs/emergencyplan/resources.html?section=topic>) lists a number of considerations and resources that can expedite planning for safe and secure schools in Massachusetts school districts.

* The National School Boards Association (NSBA), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASSP) have prepared safety briefs with annotated resources to help ensure safe and secure schools: <https://www.nsba.org/services/school-board-leadership-services/school-safety-and-security> , <https://www.naesp.org/school-safety-resources> and <https://www.nasponline.org/resources-and-publications/resources/school-safety-and-crisis>

Financial and Asset Management

***Contextual Background***

Between 2008 and 2018, according to DESE data, the City of Framingham consistently funded the district above the required net school spending (NSS) level, by percentages ranging from 36 percent above required NSS in 2008 to 50 percent above required NSS in 2018. City officials said that the community understood the fundamental importance of providing a quality education for Framingham’s young people. They also stated that the community was aware of the role that quality education played in attracting and retaining residents and in supporting real estate values.

To achieve equity among schools, the superintendent instituted a new methodology for allocating school expenses for fiscal year 2019 that used a formula based on the number of classrooms, staff, special education teachers, and support staff in each school to determine an equitable dollar allotment for non-salary expenses. The same methodology was extended to an analysis of school staff for the fiscal year 2020 budget.

At the time of the onsite in February 2019, district administrators were undertaking the creation of a lengthier and more comprehensive fiscal year 2020 budget document with the support and encouragement of the school committee, which requested a transparent and user-friendly document that would be accessible to all constituents. The proposed fiscal year 2020 budget document would include the full detailed budget report from the district’s accounting software; two years of actual historical expenses; allocations from all sources of grant and revolving account revenue; narrative from each department on program priorities and initiatives; and more data on student performance and progress than in the past.

The district does not accept school choice students, but a number of Framingham students attend the Christa McAuliffe Charter School, a middle school, located in Framingham. The charter school serves grades 6–8 with mostly Framingham students who return to the City’s public high school for grades 9–12. The cost to the district for school choice-out and charter tuition was less than four percent of actual net school spending in 2017.

The district has offered intra-district choice for elementary and middle-school students for many years. When originally adopted, the intra-district choice program was meant to support the creation of mini-magnet schools within the district. Those schools did not develop but parents still chose schools located in any geographic area of the town for their children to attend. As a result, intra-district choice has created an additional and significant financial cost to the district for bus transportation that is provided to all students, no matter where they live or which school they attend.

At the time of the onsite in February 2019, the district was in the third year of a five-year contract with a company that provided bus services to the district. The company owns the buses and hires the drivers. However, it has had difficulty finding and hiring enough qualified drivers this school year (2018–2019). Without enough drivers and substitute drivers, buses have frequently arrived late for school start times. This has been a major issue for parents, school administrators, and the school committee since September 2018.

The district hired a new executive director of finance and operations on July 1, 2018. He followed a chief financial officer who had also served as interim superintendent for the period between September 2016 and April 2017. Other business office staff have been in their positions for many years, assuring a level of continuity and institutional knowledge.

Of the district’s 14 schools, 10 have not undergone a major renovation in the past 50 years, the lifespan expected by the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA). Some have been updated as recently as 2008; others have not been renovated or replaced. A document review indicated that 6 schools had roofs that were 20 or more years old,[[16]](#footnote-16) which is the typical term of a roof warranty.

District administrators said that roof repairs and replacements were a priority. They noted that many roofs leaked and, rather than replacing them, the district has made temporary repairs that will add approximately five years to their useful life.

Overcrowding is a particular issue at the high school. At the time of the review in February 2019, the high school had more students and staff than the building was designed to accommodate. The superintendent is exploring options such as adding modular classrooms, leasing an unused private school, or adopting distance learning to alleviate the space restrictions at the high school.

When asked to describe the condition of school buildings, district leaders said that “Antiquated but [with] well-maintained mechanical systems.” District leaders, school committee members, and city officials told the team that the district should make facilities and building maintenance priorities for spending.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**1. The district and the city do not have an up-to-date, written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of the schools.**

**A.** The district and the city do not have an up-to-date, written agreement on a method for determining the cost of municipal services that are provided to the district by the city, as required by state regulation CMR 10.05.

**B.** The document submitted by the district entitled “Allocation of Municipal Administration Costs” is dated January 9, 2007.

1. District leaders stated that the written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of the schools was “outdated,” noting that it was dated January 2007.

**Impact**: Without an up-to-date, signed written agreement between the district and the city on municipal expenditures in support of the schools, the district cannot effectively monitor and internally audit costs for education-related services and ensure the accuracy of these expenditures.

**Recommendation**

**1. In compliance with 603 CMR 10.05, district administrators and city officials should update the written agreement that details the calculation process and/or amounts to be used in calculating municipal expenditures that are provided to the district.**

**A**. District administrators and city officials should draft an up-to-date agreement that details the calculations process and/or amounts to be used in calculating indirect charges to the district from the city.

1. For services that require allocation, such as auditing, data processing or other administrative services, district administrators and city officials should agree on an allocation method.

2. For actual expenditure categories such as debt and employee benefits, district administrators and city officials should develop a method to determine the actual expenditures.

**B.** The mayor, the superintendent, and the chair of the school committee should review and sign the agreement.

**C.** District administrators and city officials should review and revise the agreement annually, as needed.

**Benefits:** By implementing this recommendation, the district will align its budget documents with state regulation 603 CMR 10.05; the district and the city will have a clear understanding of municipal expenditures that are provided to the district; and the district will be able to monitor and internally audit cots for education-related services and ensure the accuracy of these expenditures. Working together on reviewing the agreement regularly will also contribute to a collaborative working relationship between the district and the city.

**Recommended resources:**

* *End-of-Year Financial Report* information can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/accounting/eoy/>.
* DESE’s webpage on school finance laws and regulations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html?section=04>) provides a list of municipal payments commonly made on behalf of school districts.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from February 25–28, 2019, by the following team of independent DESE consultants.

1. James Caradonio, Ed. D., Leadership and Governance
2. Linda L. Greyser, Ed. D., Curriculum and Instruction and *review team coordinator*
3. Lonnie Kaufman, Assessment
4. Frank Sambuceti, Ph. D., Human Resources and Professional Development
5. Tom LaValley, Student Support
6. Marge Foster, Financial and Asset Management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews or focus groups with financial personnel, members of the school committee, representatives of the teachers’ association, central office administrators, students, students’ families, principals, and teachers.

The team visited the following schools: Barbieri Elementary School (K–5), Brophy Elementary School (K–5), Dunning Elementary School (K–5), Hemenway Elementary School (K–5), King Elementary School (K–5), McCarthy Elementary School (K–5), Potter Road Elementary School (K–5), Stapleton Elementary School (K–5), Wilson Elementary School (K–5), Cameron Middle School (grades 6–8), Fuller Middle School (grades 6–8), Walsh Middle School (grades 6-8), Framingham High School (grades–12), and the Thayer Campus[[17]](#footnote-17) (grades 9–12).

The team observed 91 classes throughout the district: 26 at the high schools (including the Thayer Campus), 18 at the 3 middle schools, and 47 at the 8 elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**  February 25, 2019 | **Tuesday**  February 26, 2019 | **Wednesday**  February 27, 2019 | **Thursday**  February 28, 2019 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Stapleton Elementary School and Cameron Middle School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff and principals; teacher focus groups; students and students’ families focus groups; and visits to Hemenway Elementary School, Woodrow Wilson Elementary School, and Framingham High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; follow-up interviews; visits to Barbieri Elementary School, Brophy Elementary School, McCarthy Elementary School, Fuller Middle School, Walsh Middle School, and the Thayer Campus, for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Dunning Elementary School, King Elementary School, Potter Road Elementary School, and Framingham High School for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent and assistant superintendents. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Framingham Public Schools**

**2018–2019 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 667 | 7.6% | 87,104 | 9.2% |
| Asian | 434 | 4.9% | 66,890 | 7.0% |
| Hispanic | 2,416 | 27.4% | 197,644 | 20.8% |
| Native American | 5 | 0.1% | 2,159 | 0.2% |
| White | 4,916 | 55.7% | 561,096 | 59.0% |
| Native Hawaiian | 9 | 0.1% | 802 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 375 | 4.3% | 35,936 | 3.8% |
| All | 8,822 | 100.0% | 951,631 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2018 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Framingham Public Schools**

**2018–2019 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 2,076 | 39.1% | 22.9% | 173,843 | 38.0% | 18.1% |
| Econ. Dis. | 2,911 | 54.9% | 33.0% | 297,120 | 64.9% | 31.2% |
| EL and Former EL | 1,976 | 37.2% | 22.4% | 99,866 | 21.8% | 10.5% |
| All high needs students | 5,305 | 100.0% | 58.6% | 458,044 | 100.0% | 47.6% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2018. 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 9,046; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 962,297. | | | | | | |

**Table B2a: Framingham Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 699 | 94.7 | 95.1 | 94.3 | 94.9 | 0.2 | 94.1 |
| Asian | 479 | 95.8 | 95.9 | 95.8 | 96.0 | 0.2 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,586 | 93.5 | 93.5 | 93.1 | 93.4 | -0.1 | 92.7 |
| Multi-Race | 352 | 95.2 | 95.6 | 94.8 | 95.0 | -0.2 | 94.4 |
| White | 5,281 | 95.6 | 95.5 | 95.0 | 95.1 | -0.5 | 95.1 |
| High Needs | 5,690 | 94.0 | 94.0 | 93.3 | 93.8 | -0.2 | 93.2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 3,762 | 93.8 | 93.7 | 93.1 | 93.4 | -0.4 | 92.5 |
| SWD | 2,263 | 93.5 | 93.4 | 92.8 | 93.4 | -0.1 | 92.9 |
| EL | 2,081 | 94.1 | 94.2 | 93.4 | 94.0 | -0.1 | 93.3 |
| All | 9,410 | 95.0 | 95.0 | 94.5 | 94.7 | -0.3 | 94.5 |
| 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 B2b: Framingham Public Schools**

**Chronic Absence Rates by Student Group\*, 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 699 | 16.9 | 15.8 | 17.3 | 14.0 | -2.9 | 16.4 |
| Asian | 479 | 10.9 | 11.2 | 10.2 | 9.4 | -1.5 | 7.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2,586 | 19.0 | 18.8 | 21.2 | 20.5 | 1.5 | 22.5 |
| Multi-Race | 352 | 9.8 | 9.1 | 13.3 | 12.2 | 2.4 | 14.2 |
| White | 5,281 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 10.6 | 10.3 | 1.5 | 10.0 |
| High Needs | 5,690 | 16.8 | 17.0 | 19.9 | 18.3 | 1.5 | 20.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 3,762 | 17.6 | 18.8 | 22.2 | 20.6 | 3.0 | 22.9 |
| SWD | 2,263 | 18.8 | 19.1 | 21.0 | 20.8 | 2.0 | 20.7 |
| EL | 2,081 | 15.4 | 15.7 | 18.5 | 16.4 | 1.0 | 20.4 |
| All | 9,410 | 12.1 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 13.4 | 1.3 | 13.2 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school | | | | | | | |

**Table B3: Framingham Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2016–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY16** | | | **FY17** | | | **FY18** | | |
|  | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | | **Estimated** | | **Actual** |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  | | | | | | | | |
| By school committee | $115,731,953 | $116,225,112 | | $122,550,690 | | $121,564,057 | | $128,065,471 | $127,399,766 |
| By municipality | $49,238,508 | $46,638,913 | | $53,867,609 | | $48,916,041 | | $55,916,941 | $50,619.940 |
| Total from local appropriations | $164,970,461 | $162,864,025 | | $176,418,299 | | $170,480,098 | | $183,982,412 | $178,019,706 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $17,591,754 | | -- | | $17,647,754 | | -- | $18,394,342 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $180,455,779 | | -- | | $188,127,852 | | -- | $196,414,048 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $37,729,858 | | -- | | $42,091,391 | | -- | $42,363,221 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $57,889,811 | | -- | | $56,417,775 | | -- | $59,331,897 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $95,619,669 | | -- | | $98,509,166 | | -- | $101,695,118 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $139,365,921 | | -- | | $145,011,177 | | -- | $152,578,944 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $43,746,252 | | -- | | $46,502,011 | | -- | $50,883,826 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 45.8% | | -- | | 47.2% | | -- | 50.0% |
| \*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: FY16, FY17, and FY18 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved 11/13/18 and 6/18/19 | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: Framingham Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Administration | $625 | $779 | $800 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,127 | $1,256 | $1,276 |
| Teachers | $6,455 | $6,600 | $6,746 |
| Other teaching services | $1,512 | $1,526 | $1,542 |
| Professional development | $112 | $121 | $122 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $215 | $229 | $243 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $504 | $489 | $507 |
| Pupil services | $1,663 | $1,659 | $1,738 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,002 | $1,103 | $1,064 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $3,103 | $3,109 | $3,194 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $16,317 | $16,870 | $17,232 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/ppx.html)  Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Expectations** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Avg Number of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter. | **ES** | 6% | 17% | 57% | 19% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 17% | 61% | 22% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 12% | 31% | 50% | 8% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 6 | 19 | 51 | 15 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 7% | 21% | 56% | 16% |  |
| 2. The teacher ensures that students understand what they should be learning in the lesson and why. | **ES** | 6% | 28% | 53% | 13% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 0% | 11% | 83% | 6% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 19% | 35% | 42% | 4% | 2.3 |
| **Total #** | 8 | 24 | 51 | 8 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 9% | 26% | 56% | 9% |  |
| 3. The teacher uses appropriate classroom activities well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 0% | 26% | 55% | 19% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 28% | 56% | 17% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 15% | 50% | 15% | 19% | 2.4 |
| **Total #** | 4 | 30 | 40 | 17 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 4% | 33% | 44% | 19% |  |
| 4. The teacher conducts frequent checks for student understanding, provides feedback, and adjusts instruction. | **ES** | 4% | 40% | 40% | 15% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 0% | 22% | 67% | 11% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 12% | 31% | 50% | 8% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 31 | 44 | 11 | 2.7 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 34% | 48% | 12% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **11.2** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **11.8** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **9.8** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **10.9** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Higher-Order Thinking** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Avg Number of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 5. Students assume responsibility to learn and are engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 2% | 30% | 40% | 28% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 17% | 67% | 17% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 8% | 54% | 23% | 15% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 3 | 31 | 37 | 20 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 3% | 34% | 41% | 22% |  |
| 6. Students engage in higher-order thinking. | **ES** | 19% | 38% | 34% | 9% | 2.3 |
| **MS** | 6% | 50% | 39% | 6% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 35% | 31% | 31% | 4% | 2.0 |
| **Total #** | 19 | 35 | 31 | 6 | 2.3 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 38% | 34% | 7% |  |
| 7. Students communicate their ideas and thinking with each other. | **ES** | 15% | 38% | 43% | 4% | 2.4 |
| **MS** | 17% | 33% | 50% | 0% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 42% | 31% | 23% | 4% | 1.9 |
| **Total #** | 21 | 32 | 35 | 3 | 2.2 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 35% | 38% | 3% |  |
| 8. Students engage with meaningful, real-world tasks. | **ES** | 23% | 36% | 28% | 13% | 2.3 |
| **MS** | 6% | 33% | 50% | 11% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 27% | 46% | 19% | 8% | 2.1 |
| **Total #** | 19 | 35 | 27 | 10 | 2.3 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 38% | 30% | 11% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **9.9** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **10.4** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **8.5** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **9.6** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focus Area #3: Inclusive Practice & Classroom Culture** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Avg Number of points |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 9. The teacher ensures that students are engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs. | **ES** | 9% | 45% | 40% | 6% | 2.4 |
| **MS** | 11% | 50% | 39% | 0% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 38% | 27% | 35% | 0% | 2.0 |
| **Total #** | 16 | 37 | 35 | 3 | 2.3 |
| **Total %** | 18% | 41% | 38% | 3% |  |
| 10. The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies. | **ES** | 9% | 19% | 60% | 13% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 6% | 22% | 67% | 6% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 15% | 65% | 15% | 4% | 2.1 |
| **Total #** | 9 | 30 | 44 | 8 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 10% | 33% | 48% | 9% |  |
| 11. Classroom routines and positive supports are in place to ensure that students behave appropriately. | **ES** | 6% | 15% | 47% | 32% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 39% | 49% | 22% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 8% | 23% | 50% | 19% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 20 | 42 | 24 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 22% | 46% | 26% |  |
| 12. The classroom climate is conducive to teaching and learning. | **ES** | 9% | 23% | 43% | 26% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 33% | 50% | 17% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 4% | 35% | 35% | 27% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 26 | 38 | 22 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 29% | 42% | 24% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **11.1** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **10.7** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **9.7** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **10.6** |

1. Students in the high needs group are in one or more of the following student groups: economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English learners (ELs) or former ELs. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In 2014–2015, “economically disadvantaged,” based on direct certification by Health and Human services, replaced “low-income,” based on family income self-reporting for the federal lunch program. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Framingham’s elementary and middle schools ranged from the 9th percentile to the 79th percentile of elementary and middle schools in the Commonwealth and its high school was in the 40th percentile. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. All K-8 schools have at least one ELA coach, a math coach and an ELD coach. Some have SEL coaches to support PBIS programs and to help build strong school culture and climate. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. High-quality feedback is specific, timely, and actionable. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The 2017–2020 Annotated Strategic Plan replaced an earlier and shorter version of the Strategic Plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. On March 12, 2018, the school committee approved a new policy on inclusive sports participation, which ensures that “students can participate in athletics and co-curricular activities in a manner consistent with their gender identity.” [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. SMART goals are Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Units contain overviews, clear objectives, timelines, resources, essential questions, learning outcomes often expressed as knowledge, skills and understandings, usually an array of formative and summative assessments, tasks and projects. Many units also showed connections to prior and future knowledge, common misconceptions, and instructional strategies. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. *The House on Mango Street* is written from the perspective of teenage Latina, **Esperanza Cordero**, who struggles with her life in a Chicano and Puerto Rican neighborhood of Chicago. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. High-quality feedback is specific, timely, and actionable. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. SMART goals are Strategic and Specific; Measurable: Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. LGBTQ stands for lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender, and queer. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. NEASC stands for New England Association of Schools and Colleges. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The schools are Barbieri, Dunning, Hemenway, King, McCarthy, and Potter. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Thayer Campus is the district’s alternative high-school program. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)