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Executive Summary

The public schools of Northborough, Southborough, and Northborough-Southborough are located in central Massachusetts and are composed of 3 districts and 10 schools. The three districts consist of four elementary schools and one middle school in Northborough, three elementary schools and one middle school in Southborough, and the Algonquin Regional High School, which serves students from both towns. Enrollment has remained stable at the regional high school but has decreased in both Northborough and Southborough.

The districts have a complex organizational structure. Each of the three districts (Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro) has its own school committee. The fourth school committee, Superintendency Union #3, has the primary responsibility for hiring and evaluating the superintendent, who oversees and manages the three districts. In addition, three teachers’ associations represent the interests of the teachers in the three districts. Despite the complex organizational structure of the three districts, a collaborative leadership model has thrived and has contributed to staff stability, some student achievement improvement, and a positive relationship with town leaders, school committees, and the teachers’ associations.

The three districts are well resourced; the towns have consistently funded the districts above required net school spending (NSS) in recent years. In 2018, Northborough was 67.4 percent above required NSS, Southborough was 85.5 percent above required NSS, and the Algonquin Regional High School district was 33 percent above required NSS.

School and central office leadership has been mostly stable and consistent for the five years before the onsite in January 2019, with many district and school leaders having served in their positions for several years. At the time of the onsite, the superintendent was scheduled to retire on June 30, 2019. The Superintendency Union #3 school committee selected the assistant superintendent to replace the retiring superintendent.

According to the district’s 2018 state accountability determinations, assistance or intervention is not required for the regional high school district, which is partially meeting its improvement goal targets related to achievement, growth and high school graduation. Assistance or intervention is not required for the Northborough district, which is partially meeting improvement goal targets related to achievement and growth. The Southborough district is meeting its improvement targets and does not require assistance or intervention.

The districts are not without challenges, however. While the district survived a $383,602.05 embezzlement scandal in 2016 and subsequent audits have not identified additional material findings in business office procedures, a business office structure that includes stable full-time leadership was not in place at the time of the onsite. In addition, the organization of the districts presents a challenge in trying to provide as consistent an educational experience as possible for all students as students from both communities join upon entering the regional high school. For example, Southborough has full-day kindergarten; Northborough does not. The towns also have different grade configurations and class sizes, and both have declining enrollment at the elementary levels. Balancing these variables with resources will be a key to providing equitable services to all students in the two communities.

**Instruction**

The team observed 57 classes throughout the districts: 18 at the regional high school (grades 9–12), 13 at the 2 middle schools (grades 6–8), and 26 at the 7 elementary schools (K–5). The team observed 24 ELA classes, 16 mathematics classes, 10 science classes, and 7 other classes. Among the classes observed were 2 special education classes, 2 inclusion classes, 1 career, vocational, technical education, and 1 EL class. 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.

Throughout the district, classroom climate was characterized by respectful behaviors, routines, tone, and discourse. Districtwide, observed lessons were not designed to support and challenge all students.

In observed classes, the team found that the least well-developed characteristics of effective instruction included teachers using a variety of instructional strategies, promoting meaningful student discourse about content and their ideas, and ensuring that students were engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs.

**Strengths**

* The superintendent, school committee members, municipal officials, school leaders, and teachers develop and maintain a collaborative culture focused on improving students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes.
* Throughout the districts, instruction benefits from a positive culture and climate that supports teaching and learning, with multiple regular opportunities for collaboration between teachers and district leaders for instructional support.
* The human resources department maintains an infrastructure that supports the three districts.
* The districts have a comprehensive professional development program that supports all teachers and is aligned with the Massachusetts standards for professional development, district curricular initiatives, and staff’s interests/needs.
* In the aftermath of a 2016 incident in which a business office employee embezzled funds, the districts restructured the business office and implemented procedures and protocols to ensure the segregation of duties dictated by best practice and statute, and the security of cash and checks.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

* The districts’ planning documents do not include an annual action plan, disaggregated data, timelines, responsible personnel, measurable student outcomes, and consistent procedures for monitoring the progress of, reporting on, and refining plans.
* The districts’ business office had significant turnover in the two years before the onsite review in January 2019 and was not fully staffed at the time of the onsite review. The district does not have a manual of business office practices and protocols.
* In observed classrooms across the districts, the review team found that the least well-developed characteristics of effective instruction included teachers using a variety of instructional approaches; promoting meaningful student discourse about content and students’ ideas and thinking; and ensuring that students were engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs.

The district’s educator evaluation system has not prioritized opportunities for educators to receive high-quality feedback[[1]](#footnote-1) that helps them improve their practice.

The districts’ budget documents do not include all district income and expenditures and are not transparent.

The districts do not have a signed written agreement with the towns of Southborough and Northborough documenting services provided by the towns and clarifying town costs charged to the districts. The districts’ capital plans do not include a narrative about each project and its priority.

**Recommendations**

* The districts should ensure that their planning documents have clear goals that are based on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated data.
  + - The districts should consider re-allocating resources to ensure that the business office is staffed to serve the needs of three districts. The districts should develop a manual of procedures and protocols for the business office.

The districts should improve instruction by building teachers’ capacity, especially in the areas of students communicating their ideas and thinking with one another; student engagement in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs; and employing a variety of instructional strategies.

* The district should promote educators’ growth by fully implementing all components of the educator evaluator system, with a particular emphasis on ensuring that all educators receive high-quality feedback.
* The district should create budget documents that are clear, comprehensive, and detail how the budgets support district and school goals, how much schools and programs cost, and how outside funds are used.
* The districts and the towns should develop a written agreement to accurately reflect the services provided, and the allocation of expenditures, by the towns for the districts, in compliance with 603 CMR 10.04 (1).

Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro Districts Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted 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 three district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). Targeted reviews address one of the following sets of three standards: **Governance and Administrative Systems** (Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management standards) or **Student-Centered Systems** (Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support standards). All targeted reviews include finding(s) about instruction based on classroom observations. A targeted review identifies systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. The targeted district review is designed to promote district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps. 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.

This targeted review by the Office of District Reviews and Monitoring focused on the following standards: Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management.

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the three district standards identified as the focus of the targeted review. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a three-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. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE. 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 Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro districts was conducted from January 7–9, 2019. The site visit included approximately 26 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 75 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, students’ families, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 6 elementary and middle-school teachers from the Southborough district teachers, 10 elementary and middle-school teachers from the Northborough district, and 4 teachers from the Northboro-Southboro district.

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 57 classrooms in 10 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 Profiles**

Northborough and Southborough have town manager forms of government and the chairs of the four school committees are elected.[[2]](#footnote-2) At the time of the onsite review in January 2019, 18 members of the 4 school committees filled 26 school committee positions. The three district school committees meet monthly during the school year and the Superintendency Union #3 committee meets quarterly.

The superintendent of the districts has been in the position since July 1, 2014. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the director of student support services, the interim business manager, the English language education director, the human resource director, and the director of instructional technology and digital learning. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the five years before the onsite review, except for the business manager position. The district has 10 principals leading 10 schools. There are 5 other school administrators, including assistant principals. In the 2017–2018 school year, there were 114 teachers in Northborough, 93 teachers in Southborough, and 116 teachers in the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District.

In the 2017–2018 school year, 1,471 students were enrolled in the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District, which consists of Algonquin Regional High School; 1,648 students were enrolled in 5 Northborough schools; and 1,320 students were enrolled in 4 Southborough schools.

**Table 1a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment,\* 2017–2018**

| **School** | **Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fannie E. Proctor | ES | K–5 | 249 |
| [Lincoln Street](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=02130003&orgtypecode=6) | ES | K–5 | 255 |
| [Marguerite E. Peaslee](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=02130014&orgtypecode=6) | ES | K–5 | 275 |
| [Marion E. Zeh](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=02130020&orgtypecode=6) | ES | K–5 | 243 |
| [Robert E. Melican Middle School](http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/student.aspx?orgcode=02130305&orgtypecode=6) | MS | 6–8 | 626 |
| **Totals** | **5 schools** | **K–8** | **1,648** |
| \*As of October 1, 2017 | | | |

**Table 1b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment,\* 2017–2018**

| **School** | **Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial School | ES | 2–3 | 266 |
| Margaret A. Neary | ES | 4-–5 | 258 |
| Mary E. Finn School | ES | Pre-K–1 | 336 |
| P. Brent Trottier | MS | 6–8 | 460 |
| **Totals** | **4 schools** | **Pre-K–8** | **1,320** |
| \*As of October 1, 2017 | | | |

Between 2014 and 2018, overall student enrollment remained the same at Algonquin Regional High School, decreased by 8.9 percent in Northborough, and decreased by 4 percent in Southborough. 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, B1b, and B1c in Appendix B.

***Northborough***

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was about the same as the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for 9 elementary districts of similar size (1,000 + students) in fiscal year 2017:  $15,431 as compared with $15,401 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/) ). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table 5a in Appendix B.

***Southborough***

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was higher than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for 9 elementary districts of similar size (1,000 + students) in fiscal year 2017:  $17,773 as compared with $15,401 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/) ). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table Bb in Appendix B.

***Northboro-Southboro Regional***

The total in-district per-pupil expenditure was lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for a 9–12 high school of similar size in fiscal year 2017:  the total in-district per-pupil expenditure was $16,359 as compared with $16,804 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/)). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6c 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 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: Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro Districts**  **Accountability Percentile, Criterion Reference Target (CRT) Percentage, Reason for Classification** | | | | |
| **School** | **Accountability Percentile** | **CRT Percentage** | **Overall Classification** | **Reason For Classification** |
| Lincoln Street | 97 | 100% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Marguerite E. Peaslee | 93 | 88% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 89 | 94% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Zeh | 84 | 91% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | 66 | 37% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Northborough (District) | -- | 69% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | Insufficient data | Insufficient data |
| Neary | 92 | 90% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | -- | 100% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| P. Brent Trottier | 78 | 52% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| Southborough (District) | -- | 82% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Meeting targets |
| Algonquin Regional High | 83 | 46% | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |
| District | -- | 45 | Not requiring assistance or intervention | Partially meeting targets |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3a: Northborough 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 | 25 | 496.7 | 505.0 | 8.3 | 490.3 | 14.7 |
| Asian | 137 | 515.5 | 518.6 | 3.1 | 511.6 | 7.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 87 | 501.9 | 503.2 | 1.3 | 489.7 | 13.5 |
| Multi-Race | 44 | 507.6 | 507.9 | 0.3 | 502.8 | 5.1 |
| White | 840 | 503.6 | 506.3 | 2.7 | 504.2 | 2.1 |
| High Needs | 389 | 491.4 | 495.2 | 3.8 | 490.1 | 5.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 155 | 493.2 | 498.2 | 5.0 | 490.2 | 8.0 |
| SWD | 237 | 486.2 | 488.7 | 2.5 | 480.8 | 7.9 |
| EL | 100 | 495.2 | 499.1 | 3.9 | 488.4 | 10.7 |
| All | 1,145 | 504.7 | 507.4 | 2.7 | 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 3b: Southborough 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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 490.3 | -- |
| Asian | 145 | 513.4 | 515.3 | 1.9 | 511.6 | 3.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 47 | 507.5 | 506.9 | -0.6 | 489.7 | 17.2 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 517.1 | 517.2 | 0.1 | 502.8 | 14.4 |
| White | 603 | 510.9 | 513.1 | 2.2 | 504.2 | 8.9 |
| High Needs | 218 | 499.3 | 500.8 | 1.5 | 490.1 | 10.7 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | 501.8 | 501.4 | -0.4 | 490.2 | 11.2 |
| SWD | 122 | 494.1 | 494.0 | -0.1 | 480.8 | 13.2 |
| EL | 90 | 502.7 | 507.3 | 4.6 | 488.4 | 18.9 |
| All | 843 | 511.3 | 513.2 | 1.9 | 500.5 | 12.7 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4a: Northborough 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 | 25 | 496.5 | 496.0 | -0.5 | 486.9 | 9.1 |
| Asian | 136 | 525.5 | 523.9 | -1.6 | 514.3 | 9.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 87 | 496.2 | 497.8 | 1.6 | 487.4 | 10.4 |
| Multi-Race | 45 | 509.0 | 507.4 | -1.6 | 499.7 | 7.7 |
| White | 844 | 505.3 | 504.9 | -0.4 | 501.8 | 3.1 |
| High Needs | 390 | 492.7 | 493.7 | 1.0 | 488.2 | 5.5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 158 | 493.9 | 493.6 | -0.3 | 487.7 | 5.9 |
| SWD | 239 | 487.4 | 487.9 | 0.5 | 479.2 | 8.7 |
| EL | 98 | 498.4 | 499.8 | 1.4 | 488.5 | 11.3 |
| All | 1,149 | 506.8 | 506.3 | -0.5 | 498.4 | 7.9 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4b: Southborough 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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 486.9 | -- |
| Asian | 145 | 525.7 | 526.0 | 0.3 | 514.3 | 11.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 47 | 512.0 | 501.5 | -10.5 | 487.4 | 14.1 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 528.3 | 524.3 | -4.0 | 499.7 | 24.6 |
| White | 603 | 515.3 | 515.8 | 0.5 | 501.8 | 14.0 |
| High Needs | 219 | 503.8 | 504.3 | 0.5 | 488.2 | 16.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | 503.1 | 498.5 | -4.6 | 487.7 | 10.8 |
| SWD | 122 | 497.2 | 496.6 | -0.6 | 479.2 | 17.4 |
| EL | 91 | 512.1 | 513.6 | 1.5 | 488.5 | 25.1 |
| All | 843 | 517.3 | 517.0 | -0.3 | 498.4 | 18.6 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5a: Northborough 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 | 25 | 46% | 56% | 10 | 31% | 25 |
| Asian | 137 | 80% | 82% | 2 | 71% | 11 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 87 | 54% | 57% | 3 | 31% | 26 |
| Multi-Race | 44 | 71% | 68% | -3 | 54% | 14 |
| White | 840 | 59% | 63% | 4 | 58% | 5 |
| High Needs | 389 | 30% | 40% | 10 | 31% | 9 |
| Econ. Dis. | 155 | 36% | 47% | 11 | 32% | 15 |
| SWD | 237 | 19% | 28% | 9 | 14% | 14 |
| EL | 100 | 36% | 49% | 13 | 30% | 19 |
| All | 1,145 | 61% | 65% | 4 | 51% | 14 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5b: Southborough 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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 31% | -- |
| Asian | 145 | 79% | 83% | 4 | 71% | 12 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 47 | 64% | 64% | 0 | 31% | 33 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 80% | 86% | 6 | 54% | 32 |
| White | 603 | 76% | 73% | -3 | 58% | 15 |
| High Needs | 218 | 46% | 48% | 2 | 31% | 17 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | 49% | 49% | 0 | 32% | 17 |
| SWD | 122 | 34% | 32% | -2 | 14% | 18 |
| EL | 90 | 56% | 63% | 7 | 30% | 33 |
| All | 843 | 76% | 75% | -1 | 51% | 24 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6a: Northborough 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 | 25 | 42% | 36% | -6 | 26% | 10 |
| Asian | 136 | 87% | 84% | -3 | 74% | 10 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 87 | 41% | 53% | 12 | 27% | 26 |
| Multi-Race | 45 | 67% | 69% | 2 | 49% | 20 |
| White | 844 | 61% | 60% | -1 | 55% | 5 |
| High Needs | 390 | 32% | 35% | 3 | 28% | 7 |
| Econ. Dis. | 158 | 32% | 34% | 2 | 27% | 7 |
| SWD | 239 | 22% | 24% | 2 | 14% | 10 |
| EL | 98 | 43% | 51% | 8 | 30% | 21 |
| All | 1,149 | 62% | 62% | 0 | 48% | 14 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 6b: Southborough 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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 26% | -- |
| Asian | 145 | 93% | 89% | -4 | 74% | 15 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 47 | 74% | 55% | -19 | 27% | 28 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 97% | 86% | -11 | 49% | 37 |
| White | 603 | 79% | 81% | 2 | 55% | 26 |
| High Needs | 219 | 58% | 56% | -2 | 28% | 28 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | 58% | 44% | -14 | 27% | 17 |
| SWD | 122 | 41% | 40% | -1 | 14% | 26 |
| EL | 91 | 77% | 74% | -3 | 30% | 44 |
| All | 843 | 82% | 81% | -1 | 48% | 33 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 85% | -- |
| Asian | 35 | 95% | 97% | 2 | 95% | 2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 24 | 94% | 92% | -2 | 78% | 14 |
| Multi-Race | 11 | 100% | 100% | 0 | 93% | 7 |
| White | 264 | 98% | 97% | -1 | 94% | 3 |
| High Needs | 76 | 88% | 87% | -1 | 79% | 8 |
| Econ. Dis. | 25 | 97% | 92% | -5 | 81% | 11 |
| SWD | 48 | 80% | 81% | 1 | 69% | 12 |
| EL | 19 | 91% | 89% | -2 | 64% | 25 |
| All | 342 | 97% | 97% | 0 | 91% | 6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **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 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 60% | -- |
| Asian | 36 | 95% | 94% | -1 | 91% | 3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 24 | 87% | 75% | -12 | 56% | 19 |
| Multi-Race | 10 | 100% | 90% | -10 | 79% | 11 |
| White | 265 | 94% | 91% | -3 | 85% | 6 |
| High Needs | 77 | 73% | 60% | -13 | 57% | 3 |
| Econ. Dis. | 25 | 83% | 80% | -3 | 59% | 21 |
| SWD | 49 | 61% | 43% | -18 | 40% | 3 |
| EL | 19 | 90% | 63% | -27 | 44% | 19 |
| All | 343 | 93% | 90% | -3 | 78% | 12 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9a: Northborough 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 | 5 | -- | -- | 36% | -- | -- | 30% |
| Asian | 51 | 83% | 77% | 87% | 78% | -5 | 68% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 22 | 58% | 54% | 48% | 45% | -13 | 30% |
| Multi-Race | 14 | 75% | 33% | 57% | 86% | 11 | 54% |
| White | 307 | 68% | 63% | 63% | 64% | -4 | 60% |
| High Needs | 110 | 42% | 33% | 34% | 37% | -5 | 31% |
| Econ. Dis. | 47 | 62% | 35% | 38% | 45% | -17 | 32% |
| SWD | 59 | 20% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 2 | 21% |
| EL | 27 | 46% | 30% | 39% | 48% | 2 | 20% |
| All | 403 | 69% | 62% | 63% | 65% | -4 | 53% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9b: Southborough 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 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 30% |
| Asian | 36 | 80% | 82% | 82% | 67% | -13 | 68% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 17 | 69% | 67% | 28% | 53% | -16 | 30% |
| Multi-Race | 15 | 83% | -- | 100% | 80% | -3 | 54% |
| White | 218 | 63% | 70% | 60% | 62% | -1 | 60% |
| High Needs | 60 | 40% | 34% | 36% | 23% | -17 | 31% |
| Econ. Dis. | 12 | 20% | 47% | 25% | 17% | -3 | 32% |
| SWD | 33 | 33% | 18% | 28% | 15% | -18 | 21% |
| EL | 24 | 61% | 47% | 48% | 33% | -28 | 20% |
| All | 288 | 66% | 71% | 63% | 63% | -3 | 53% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10a: Northborough 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 | 180 | 59% | 64% | 5 | 52% | 12 |
| 4 | 155 | 74% | 77% | 3 | 53% | 24 |
| 5 | 184 | 53% | 78% | 25 | 54% | 24 |
| 6 | 200 | 52% | 66% | 14 | 51% | 15 |
| 7 | 205 | 66% | 47% | -19 | 46% | 1 |
| 8 | 221 | 61% | 61% | 0 | 51% | 10 |
| 3–8 | 1,145 | 61% | 65% | 4 | 51% | 14 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10b: Southborough 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 | 130 | 79% | 83% | 4 | 52% | 31 |
| 4 | 123 | 81% | 80% | -1 | 53% | 27 |
| 5 | 137 | 67% | 82% | 15 | 54% | 28 |
| 6 | 157 | 78% | 68% | -10 | 51% | 17 |
| 7 | 145 | 85% | 66% | -19 | 46% | 20 |
| 8 | 151 | 66% | 72% | 6 | 51% | 21 |
| 3--8 | 843 | 76% | 75% | -1 | 51% | 24 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11a: Northborough 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 | 181 | 58% | 59% | 1 | 50% | 9 |
| 4 | 156 | 68% | 70% | 2 | 48% | 22 |
| 5 | 183 | 55% | 66% | 11 | 46% | 20 |
| 6 | 200 | 61% | 54% | -7 | 47% | 7 |
| 7 | 206 | 60% | 54% | -6 | 46% | 8 |
| 8 | 223 | 69% | 69% | 0 | 50% | 19 |
| 3--8 | 1,149 | 62% | 62% | 0 | 48% | 14 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11b: Southborough 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 | 130 | 93% | 85% | -8 | 50% | 35 |
| 4 | 123 | 87% | 79% | -8 | 48% | 31 |
| 5 | 137 | 77% | 84% | 7 | 46% | 38 |
| 6 | 158 | 80% | 77% | -3 | 47% | 30 |
| 7 | 144 | 81% | 76% | -5 | 46% | 30 |
| 8 | 151 | 77% | 85% | 8 | 50% | 35 |
| 3--8 | 843 | 82% | 81% | -1 | 48% | 33 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12a: Northborough 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 (2018)** |
| 5 | 180 | 68% | 62% | 60% | 68% | 0 | 47% |
| 8 | 223 | 70% | 62% | 67% | 62% | -8 | 35% |
| 10 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 74% |
| All | 403 | 69% | 62% | 63% | 65% | -4 | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12b: Southborough 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 (2018)** |
| 5 | 137 | 72% | 76% | 65% | 69% | -3 | 47% |
| 8 | 151 | 61% | 68% | 63% | 57% | -4 | 35% |
| 10 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 74% |
| All | 288 | 66% | 71% | 63% | 63% | -3 | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **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 (2018)** |
| 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 35% |
| 10 | 331 | 92% | 94% | 94% | 91% | -1 | 74% |
| All | 331 | 92% | 94% | 94% | 91% | -1 | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13a: Northborough 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 | 140 | 66.5 | 50.0 | 141 | 66.2 | 50.1 |
| 5 | 174 | 63.9 | 50.1 | 174 | 58.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 189 | 51.0 | 50.1 | 188 | 51.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 200 | 48.9 | 50.0 | 201 | 49.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 210 | 44.3 | 50.0 | 212 | 52.6 | 50.0 |
| 10 | -- | -- | 49.9 | -- | -- | 49.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13b: Southborough 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 | 115 | 47.6 | 50.0 | 115 | 47.1 | 50.1 |
| 5 | 131 | 53.8 | 50.1 | 131 | 59.2 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 145 | 50.5 | 50.1 | 148 | 53.5 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 140 | 50.9 | 50.0 | 140 | 56.1 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 148 | 40.5 | 50.0 | 147 | 49.2 | 50.0 |
| 10 | -- | -- | 49.9 | -- | -- | 49.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **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 | -- | -- | 50.0 | -- | -- | 50.1 |
| 5 | -- | -- | 50.1 | -- | -- | 50.0 |
| 6 | -- | -- | 50.1 | -- | -- | 50.0 |
| 7 | -- | -- | 50.0 | -- | -- | 50.0 |
| 8 | -- | -- | 50.0 | -- | -- | 50.0 |
| 10 | 312 | 62.5 | 49.9 | 312 | 58.7 | 49.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14a: Northborough Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2018** | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Lincoln Street | 65% | 68% | 90% | -- | -- | -- | 75% |
| Marguerite E.Peaslee | 64% | 82% | 80% | -- | -- | -- | 75% |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 57% | 72% | 73% | -- | -- | -- | 67% |
| Marion E. Zeh | 78% | 84% | 69% | -- | -- | -- | 77% |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | -- | -- | -- | 67% | 48% | 62% | 59% |
| Northborough (District) | 64% | 77% | 78% | 66% | 47% | 61% | 65% |
| State | 52% | 53% | 54% | 51% | 46% | 51% | 51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14b: Southborough Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2018** | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | -- | 80% | 82% | -- | -- | -- | 81% |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | 84% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 84% |
| P. Brent Trottier | -- | -- | -- | 68% | 67% | 73% | 69% |
| District | 83% | 80% | 82% | 68% | 66% | 72% | 75% |
| State | 52% | 53% | 54% | 51% | 46% | 51% | 51% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15a: Northborough Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2018** | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Lincoln Street | 77% | 71% | 82% | -- | -- | -- | 77% |
| Marguerite E.Peaslee | 60% | 79% | 66% | -- | -- | -- | 68% |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 49% | 75% | 65% | -- | -- | -- | 61% |
| Marion E. Zeh | 56% | 60% | 50% | -- | -- | -- | 56% |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | -- | -- | -- | 54% | 55% | 70% | 60% |
| District | 59% | 70% | 66% | 54% | 54% | 69% | 62% |
| State | 50% | 48% | 46% | 47% | 46% | 50% | 48% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15b: Southborough 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** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | -- | 78% | 84% | -- | -- | -- | 82% |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | 86% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 86% |
| Trottier | -- | -- | -- | 76% | 77% | 85% | 80% |
| District | 85% | 79% | 84% | 77% | 76% | 85% | 81% |
| State | 50% | 48% | 46% | 47% | 46% | 50% | 48% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 16: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10, 2018** | | |
| **School** | **ELA** | **Math** |
| Algonquin Regional High | 97% | 90% |
| State | 91% | 78% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17a: Northborough Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Lincoln Street | -- | -- | 81% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 81% |
| Marguerite E. Peaslee | -- | -- | 65% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 65% |
| Fannie E. Proctor | -- | -- | 69% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 69% |
| Marion E. Zeh | -- | -- | 55% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 55% |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63% | -- | 63% |
| District | -- | -- | 68% | -- | -- | 62% | -- | 65% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 35% | 74% | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17b: Southborough Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | -- | -- | 70% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70% |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P. Brent Trottier | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 57% | -- | 57% |
| District | -- | -- | 69% | -- | -- | 57% | -- | 63% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 35% | 74% | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2018** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Algonquin Regional High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 91% | 91% |
| District | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 91% | 91% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 35% | 74% | 52% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18a: Northborough 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** |
| Lincoln Street | 75% | 50% | 63% | 48% | 50% | -- | 93% | -- | -- | 76% |
| Marguerite E. Peaslee | 75% | 51% | 50% | 41% | 63% | -- | 71% | 50% | -- | 80% |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 67% | 41% | 50% | 20% | 44% | -- | 80% | 56% | -- | 69% |
| Marion E. Zeh | 77% | 57% | 82% | 54% | -- | -- | 90% | 82% | -- | 73% |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | 59% | 35% | 41% | 19% | 51% | 62% | 84% | 63% | 69% | 55% |
| District | 65% | 40% | 47% | 28% | 49% | 56% | 82% | 57% | 68% | 63% |
| State | 51% | 31% | 32% | 14% | 30% | 31% | 71% | 31% | 54% | 58% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18b: Southborough 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** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | 81% | 57% | 38% | 37% | 79% | -- | 85% | 84% | 86% | 80% |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | 84% | 62% | -- | 48% | 69% | -- | 92% | -- | -- | 84% |
| P. Brent Trottier | 69% | 40% | 53% | 26% | 53% | -- | 79% | 48% | 89% | 67% |
| District | 75% | 48% | 49% | 32% | 63% | -- | 83% | 64% | 86% | 73% |
| State | 51% | 31% | 32% | 14% | 30% | 31% | 71% | 31% | 54% | 58% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19a: Northborough 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** |
| Lincoln Street | 77% | 55% | 56% | 52% | 58% | -- | 93% | -- | -- | 77% |
| Marguerite E. Peaslee | 68% | 42% | 33% | 36% | 53% | -- | 86% | 50% | -- | 65% |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 61% | 41% | 32% | 27% | 56% | -- | 75% | 56% | -- | 63% |
| Marion E. Zeh | 56% | 32% | 36% | 29% | -- | -- | 74% | 55% | -- | 52% |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | 60% | 30% | 31% | 17% | 48% | 46% | 88% | 60% | 67% | 57% |
| District | 62% | 35% | 34% | 24% | 51% | 36% | 84% | 53% | 69% | 60% |
| State | 48% | 28% | 27% | 14% | 30% | 26% | 74% | 27% | 49% | 55% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19b: Southborough 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** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | 82% | 60% | 38% | 50% | 79% | -- | 88% | 68% | 86% | 82% |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | 86% | 68% | -- | 61% | 69% | -- | 92% | -- | -- | 87% |
| P. Brent Trottier | 80% | 51% | 47% | 31% | 73% | -- | 90% | 48% | 94% | 79% |
| District | 81% | 56% | 44% | 40% | 74% | -- | 89% | 55% | 86% | 81% |
| State | 48% | 28% | 27% | 14% | 30% | 26% | 74% | 27% | 49% | 55% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 20: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **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** |
| Algonquin Regional High | 99% | 97% | 97% | 97% | -2 | 94% | 93% | 93% | 90% | -4 |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 100% | 95% | 95% | 97% | -3 | 97% | 95% | 95% | 94% | -3 |
| Hispanic | 100% | 90% | 94% | 92% | -8 | 71% | 80% | 87% | 75% | 4 |
| Multi-race | -- | 100% | 100% | 100% | -- | -- | 100% | 100% | 90% | -- |
| White | 99% | 98% | 98% | 97% | -2 | 96% | 93% | 94% | 91% | -5 |
| High Needs | 94% | 85% | 88% | 87% | -7 | 70% | 63% | 73% | 60% | -10 |
| Econ. Dis. | 94% | 100% | 97% | 92% | -2 | 78% | 83% | 83% | 80% | 2 |
| SWD | 88% | 75% | 80% | 81% | -7 | 42% | 44% | 61% | 43% | 1 |
| EL | -- | 100% | 91% | 89% | -- | -- | 85% | 90% | 63% | -- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 21a: Northborough 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** |
| Lincoln Street | 47 | 69% | 64% | 66% | 81% | 12 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 36 | 70% | 66% | 67% | 81% | 11 |
| High Needs | 9 | 25% | 61% | 40% | -- | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 3 | -- | -- | 33% | -- | -- |
| EL | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Marguerite E, Peaslee | 43 | 79% | 75% | 63% | 65% | -14 |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 29 | 74% | 72% | 62% | 59% | -15 |
| High Needs | 12 | -- | 47% | 46% | 33% | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 4 | -- | 36% | -- | -- | -- |
| EL | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Fannie E. Proctor | 49 | 71% | 55% | 63% | 69% | -2 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 82% | -- |
| Hispanic | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 31 | 73% | 55% | 61% | 71% | -2 |
| High Needs | 18 | 69% | 13% | 44% | 44% | -25 |
| Econ. Dis. | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| EL | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Marion E. Zeh | 38 | 60% | 54% | 50% | 55% | -5 |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hispanic | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 28 | 60% | 55% | 49% | 54% | -6 |
| High Needs | 13 | 42% | 35% | 33% | 46% | 4 |
| Econ. Dis. | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 7 | -- | 27% | -- | -- | -- |
| EL | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Robert E. Melican Middle | 220 | 70% | 63% | 68% | 63% | -7 |
| African American/Black | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 23 | 89% | 79% | 96% | 78% | -11 |
| Hispanic | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 179 | 68% | 66% | 67% | 61% | -7 |
| High Needs | 53 | 43% | 27% | 29% | 32% | -11 |
| Econ. Dis. | 22 | 76% | 43% | 29% | 36% | -40 |
| SWD | 32 | 10% | 19% | 20% | 19% | 9 |
| EL | 9 | -- | 9% | 30% | -- | -- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 21b: Southborough 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** |
| Mary E. Finn School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Albert S. Woodward Memorial | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Margaret A. Neary | 135 | 72% | 77% | 64% | 70% | -2 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 17 | 86% | 73% | 91% | 65% | -21 |
| Hispanic | 8 | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 101 | 67% | 79% | 58% | 69% | 2 |
| High Needs | 28 | 48% | 50% | 41% | 43% | -5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 14 | 26% | 44% | 27% | 36% | 10 |
| EL | 13 | 75% | 45% | 55% | 46% | -29 |
| Trottier | 150 | 61% | 69% | 63% | 57% | -4 |
| African American/Black | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 19 | 74% | 94% | 72% | 68% | -6 |
| Hispanic | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-race | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 115 | 60% | 66% | 62% | 57% | -3 |
| High Needs | 30 | 33% | 23% | 29% | 7% | -26 |
| Econ. Dis. | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 18 | 41% | 0% | 27% | 0% | -41 |
| EL | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 18% | -- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 21c: Southborough 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** |
| Algonquin Regional High | 331 | 92% | 94% | 94% | 91% | -1 |
| African American/Black | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 35 | 94% | 94% | 97% | 97% | 3 |
| Hispanic | 19 | 83% | 100% | 92% | 74% | -9 |
| Multi-race | 11 | -- | -- | 91% | 91% | -- |
| White | 259 | 92% | 95% | 94% | 92% | 0 |
| High Needs | 71 | 69% | 72% | 74% | 61% | -8 |
| Econ. Dis. | 23 | 79% | 70% | 80% | 70% | -9 |
| SWD | 46 | 50% | 59% | 67% | 48% | -2 |
| EL | 15 | -- | 92% | -- | 67% | -- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 22: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 80.0 |
| Asian | 34 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 96.8 | 100.0 | 4.8 | 94.1 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 74.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 7 | 100.0 | -- | 71.4 | 85.7 | -14.3 | 85.2 |
| White | 298 | 96.7 | 98.7 | 95.9 | 98.0 | 1.3 | 92.6 |
| High needs | 75 | 87.9 | 93.8 | 86.2 | 94.7 | 6.8 | 80.0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 50 | 92.9 | 96.3 | 84.3 | 94.0 | 1.1 | 79.0 |
| SWD | 35 | 82.2 | 90.2 | 82.0 | 88.6 | 6.4 | 72.8 |
| EL | 6 | -- | -- | 81.8 | 100.0 | -- | 63.4 |
| All | 361 | 96.9 | 98.9 | 95.7 | 98.1 | 1.2 | 88.3 |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2014 and 2015 rates. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 23: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2013–2016** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2016)** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 83.4 |
| Asian | 31 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 96.8 | -3.2 | 94.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 76.8 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 7 | -- | 100.0 | -- | 71.4 | -- | 87.4 |
| White | 319 | 98.4 | 97.0 | 98.7 | 96.2 | -2.2 | 93.5 |
| High needs | 94 | 93.4 | 89.4 | 93.8 | 86.2 | -7.2 | 82.9 |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 51 | 93.1 | 92.9 | 96.3 | 84.3 | -8.8 | 82.1 |
| SWD | 50 | 92.7 | 84.4 | 90.2 | 82.0 | -10.7 | 76.5 |
| EL | 11 | -- | -- | -- | 81.8 | -- | 70.9 |
| All | 376 | 98.6 | 97.4 | 98.9 | 96.0 | -2.6 | 89.8 |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low-income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 24a: Northborough Public Schools**  **In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.4 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.3 |
| White | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | -- | -- | 1.4 |
| High Needs | 0.2 | 0.7 | -- | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| SWD | 0.3 | 0.9 | -- | -- | -- | 3.3 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.8 |
| All | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | -- | -- | 1.8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 24b: Southborough Public Schools**  **In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.4 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.3 |
| White | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.4 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.3 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.8 |
| All | 0.3 | -- | -- | 0.1 | -0.2 | 1.8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 24c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **In-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.4 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.4 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.3 |
| White | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| High Needs | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 0.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2.9 |
| SWD | -- | 0.7 | 0.0 | 3.3 | -- | 3.3 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.8 |
| All | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.8 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 25a: Northborough 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 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.0 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.3 |
| White | 0.9 | 1.5 | 0.4 | -- | -- | 1.9 |
| High Needs | 2.2 | 1.8 | -- | -- | -- | 4.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.4 |
| SWD | 3.1 | 2.4 | -- | -- | -- | 5.8 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.7 |
| All | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.3 | -- | -- | 2.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 25b: Southborough 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 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.0 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.3 |
| White | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.9 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.4 |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.8 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.7 |
| All | 0.3 | -- | -- | 0.4 | 0.1 | 2.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 25c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Student Group, 2015–2018** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.0 |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | 12.0 | -- | -- | -- | 5.1 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.3 |
| White | 1.2 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | -0.1 | 1.9 |
| High Needs | 2.6 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.4 | 4.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 4.9 | 5.9 | -- | -- | -- | 5.4 |
| SWD | -- | 5.9 | 4.2 | 3.8 | -- | 5.8 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.7 |
| All | 1.2 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 1.0 | -0.2 | 2.9 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 26: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Dropout Rates by Student Group, 2014–2017** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| African American/Black | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 5.9 | 5.9 | 2.9 |
| Asian | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -2.3 | 4.2 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 1.7 |
| White | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.3 | -0.5 | 1.1 |
| High Needs | 1.8 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.3 | -0.5 | 3.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | -0.7 | 3.6 |
| SWD | 2.4 | 0.8 | 4.2 | 1.3 | -1.1 | 3.3 |
| EL | 0.0 | 10.5 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 |
| All | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | -0.2 | 1.8 |
| \*Dropout rates for students from low-income families used for 2014 rates. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 27: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Advanced Coursework Completion, 2017–2018** | | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| African American/Black | 7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 74 | 81.4 | 83.8 | 2.4 | 87.1 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 36 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 19 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | 585 | 67.5 | 65.0 | -2.5 | 70.5 |
| High Needs | 135 | 22.9 | 18.5 | -4.4 | 30.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 50 | 53.1 | 22.0 | -31.1 | 61.6 |
| SWD | 89 | 6.7 | 13.5 | 6.8 | 14.2 |
| EL | 31 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| All | 724 | 67.4 | 66.2 | -1.2 | 70.6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 28a: Northborough and Southborough Public Schools**  **Progress toward Attaining English Language Proficiency, 2017–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Northborough** | | | | | **Southborough** | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| EL | 63 | 81.8 | 65.1 | -16.7 | 80.6 | 56 | 84.7 | 85.7 | 1.0 | 80.6 |
| All | 63 | 81.8 | 65.1 | -16.7 | 80.6 | 56 | 84.7 | 85.7 | 1.0 | 80.6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 28b: Northborough and Southborough Public Schools and the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District,**  **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 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| All | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 29a: Northborough and Southborough Public Schools**  **Chronic Absence Rates,\* 2017–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Northborough** | | | | | **Southborough** | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| African American/Black | 34 | 3.1 | 5.9 | -2.8 | 0.2 | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | 187 | 4.8 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 195 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 116 | 3.5 | 7.8 | -4.3 | 0.7 | 62 | 1.5 | 8.1 | -6.6 | 0.0 |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 59 | 0.0 | 1.7 | -1.7 | 0.0 | 59 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| White | 1,126 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 0.5 | 5.4 | 799 | 2.7 | 3.5 | -0.8 | 1.7 |
| High needs | 513 | 10.1 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 8.2 | 273 | 4.0 | 6.6 | -2.6 | 2.1 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 168 | 10.1 | 12.5 | -2.4 | 7.5 | 41 | 4.5 | 7.3 | -2.8 | 1.9 |
| SWD | 314 | 12.2 | 9.6 | 2.6 | 9.8 | 152 | 3.9 | 5.9 | -2.0 | 1.5 |
| EL | 146 | 2.8 | 4.8 | -2.0 | 0.0 | 125 | 3.2 | 6.4 | -3.2 | 0.0 |
| All | 1,538 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 4.6 | 1,127 | 2.9 | 3.5 | -0.6 | 1.8 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of days of membership in a school | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 29b: Northborough and Southborough Public Schools and the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**  **Chronic Absence Rates,\* 2017–2018** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Non-high school** | | | | | **High school** | | | | |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** | **N (2018)** | **2017** | **2018** | **Change** | **Target** |
| African American/Black | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 158 | 5.4 | 6.3 | -0.9 | 3.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 89 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 42 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| White | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,167 | 10.7 | 11.4 | -0.7 | 9.4 |
| High needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 322 | 23.3 | 23.9 | -0.6 | 20.6 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 86 | 38.6 | 27.9 | 10.7 | 34.8 |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 196 | 22.7 | 28.6 | -5.9 | 18.8 |
| EL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 89 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| All | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1,483 | 10.9 | 11.5 | -0.6 | 9.9 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of days of membership in a school | | | | | | | | | | |

Leadership and Governance

***Contextual Background***

Ten Schools, Three Districts, One Community of Learners. This guiding principle of the Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro districts also describes its complex governance structure, which was formed through a regional agreement. The regional agreement, which was first approved in 1954, was revised in 2000.

The three districts—each having its own school committee—comprise 10 schools:

1. Northborough: four elementary (K–5) and one middle (grades 6–8);

2. Southborough: three elementary (Pre-K-–1; 2–3; 4–5) and one middle (grades 6–8);

3. Northboro-Southboro Regional: Algonquin Regional High School (grades 9–12).

The fourth school committee, Superintendency Union #3, focuses primarily on hiring and evaluating the superintendent. During 2018–2019, with some school committee members serving on multiple school committees, 18 individual members filled 26 seats on 4 school committees.[[3]](#footnote-3) The number of seats on school committees was as follows: Northborough: 5 seats; Southborough: 5 seats; Northboro-Southboro Regional: 10 seats; and Superintendency Union #3: 6 seats. The three district school committees (each meeting once a month) and the Superintendency Union #3 (meeting four times a year) have scheduled 34 public meetings.

School committee members focus on updating school districts’ policies, developing annual budgets, monitoring expenditures and, with the superintendent, building a strong sense of support for the schools.

Both towns’ support for the districts is evidenced by high net school spending (NSS)[[4]](#footnote-4) and steady, annual school district budget increases. In addition, active parent-teachers’ organizations (PTOs) and two local educational foundations have raised funds that bolster teachers’ initiatives and districts’ instructional priorities in math and technology.

The superintendent, school committee members, town administrators, and administrative staff handle the districts’ governance complexities collaboratively, strategically, and efficiently. Principals and school council members have aligned School Improvement Plans with the 2013–2020 strategic plan’s four focus areas: communications, curriculum, student support, and technology.

The superintendent and the central office staff provide the following administrative services to the staff and students in the districts’ 10 schools: strategic planning, human resources/personnel services, budgetary development, financial management, transportation services, data management, facilities management, technology support, student support services, food services, and curriculum and instruction development and support, from pre-school through high school. At the time of the onsite review in January 2019, approximately 60 percent of administrative team members had been in their jobs for less than five years, including two principals who were completing their first year of service.

At the time of the onsite review, the superintendent planned to retire in June 2019, and the school committees had already hired the districts’ assistant superintendent to become superintendent. Since 2007, the new superintendent is the fourth superintendent who has been promoted internally from a district administrative position.

Some of the districts’ challenges for continually improving both equitable services and outcomes for all students are: developing a new strategic plan; hiring administrative staff for a re-organized business office; funding tuition-free kindergarten for both towns; scheduling later school-start times; and maintaining the level of services as enrollments decline and budgets tighten.

***Strength Finding***

**1. The superintendent, school committee members, municipal officials, school leaders, and teachers develop and maintain a collaborative culture focused on improving students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes.**

* 1. The 18 members of the districts’ 4 school committees work collaboratively with one another and with the superintendent.
     + 1. School committee members stated that they collaborated well with one another, describing their relations as “cooperative and respectful.”

a. Review team observations of videos of several school committee meetings confirmed the committee members’ positive assessment of their collegial relationships.

* + 1. School committee members described their interactions with the superintendent as cooperative, productive, collaborative, and problem focused. The school committees’ 2017–2018 evaluation of the superintendent stated: “The superintendent is a strong, capable and collaborative leader” who “does not shy away from difficult conversations and readily accepts feedback.” The evaluation also stated that the superintendent “collaborates well with her administrators, teachers, students, parents, community members, taxpayers, town administrators, and state legislators.”

1. The superintendent and the municipal administrators of both towns have developed and sustained positive working relationships that have contributed to consistent funding for the towns’ schools.
2. Speaking about past conflicts between the districts’ leaders and town officials, a municipal leader stated his commitment to collaboration: “The last thing we can afford is to expend any energy on fighting among ourselves.”
   1. Town administrators expressed the view that they and the superintendent had “real proven collaboration” built on “extremely trusting relationships.
3. The superintendent described district–town relations as “productive, collaborative, and participatory, noting “We have mutual respect for the jobs that we have to do.”
   * + - 1. School committee members acknowledged that the districts now enjoyed positive relationships with the towns.
         2. In the self-assessment submitted in advance of the onsite review, district staff wrote that one of the districts’ strengths “lies in the collaboration of our two towns to create educationally sound and fiscally responsible practices.”
         3. District leaders and town officials stated that a tangible result of the “zero-friction” town-district relationships was that district projects and budgets now were passed at town meetings with unanimous support.
4. The superintendent, teachers’ associations, and school committees also have positive working relationships.
   * 1. Representatives of the associations told the team that trust and mutual respect were strong in the districts.
     2. The superintendent, school committees, and the teachers’ associations use interest-based bargaining (IBB), a negotiation strategy, for developing collective bargaining agreements. Through IBB, parties collaborate to find “win-win” strategies and mutually beneficial agreements based on the interests of involved parties.
5. The districts ensure that each school’s structures and practices support teacher leadership and a collaborative learning culture.
   * 1. In all schools in the districts, teachers participate in regularly scheduled meetings of professional learning communities (PLCs), where teachers analyze student performance data, discuss instructional resources, and plan curricula.
     2. During the 18 months before the onsite review in January 2019, 70 district staff members, representing different instructional roles and levels (e.g., teachers, principals, instructional support staff), participated in instructional rounds, another collaborative process. Instructional-rounds groups focus their classroom observations on specific questions about school-selected topics.

**Impact**: When district leaders and town officials commit to and sustain collaborative working relationships, they likely improve all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**2. The districts’ planning documents do not include an annual action plan, disaggregated data, timelines, responsible personnel, measurable student outcomes, and consistent procedures for monitoring the progress of, reporting on, and refining plans.**

The districts have developed three planning documents: in 2013, Vision 2020, the seven-year strategic plan; in 2015, the technology implementation plan, an addendum to Vision 2020; and between 2017 and 2018, 10 School Improvement Plans (SIPs).

The districts have not developed an annual action plan to support the implementation of the strategic plan and the SIPs.

Vision 2020 and the SIPs do not contain student performance data.

1. While school leaders have made annual presentations to school committees on the performance of students on several summative assessments (AP, ACT, AP, SAT, MCAS), presentations did not include performance data disaggregated by student groups.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that district staff have not consistently analyzed and used student data, disaggregated by groups such as male of female students, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students.

3. The superintendent said that increasing the use of disaggregated data was a growth area for the districts.

Districts’ planning documents do not consistently include timelines, responsible personnel, resources, and measurable student outcomes.

1. Vision 2020 and one of the 10 SIPs contain timelines.

2. Two SIPs include personnel responsible for carrying out action steps.

3**.** Vision 2020 contains approximately 109 measurement statements. None indicates specific increases in student performance outcomes. Rather, many measurement statements specify what staff are expected to do or produce.

a. The measurements describe improvements in opportunities, resources, and/or staff. For example, Vision 2020 contains the following statements about improvements: “Available resources and possible funding and/or post-secondary connections are identified”; “Staff participates in professional development activities involving the planning,” and “Staff are in place to support both educational and organizational needs of the District.”

4. Three of the ten SIPs indicate measurements for action steps. However, the measurement statements do not include specific student performance outcomes.

**E.** Interviews and a review of documents and videos of school committee meetings indicated that district procedures for monitoring, reporting on, and revising plans were inconsistent.

* + - 1. Since 2013, district staff have not reported on the implementation of Vision 2020’s goals and measurements or amended or updated Vision 2020’s content.

a. The superintendent told the review team that the district had begun planning to develop its new strategic plan. District staff have begun engaging in the state’s *Planning for Success (PfS)* strategic planning process.

1. Principals and school councils revise SIPs every two years. Six of ten SIPs include a section that lists the previous plan’s accomplishments. Annually, principals discuss SIP updates at school committees’ meetings.

3. During the school year, monitoring progress and reporting differ across schools. Only one SIP stated the school’s process for evaluating and reporting progress toward SIP goals.

**Impact:** Without planning documents with measurable goals based on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated student data, the districts cannot ensure that priorities are based on evidence and that its improvement plans drive the development, implementation, and modification of educational programs and practices. Without consistent procedures for progress-monitoring of, reporting on, and refining plans, the districts cannot seek significant and meaningful feedback to guide the plans’ ongoing refinement or make necessary changes to ensure progress toward goals.

**3. The districts’ business office had significant turnover in the three years before the onsite review in January 2019 and was not fully staffed at the time of the onsite review. The district does not have a manual of business office practices and protocols.**

1. In the three years before the onsite review in January 2019, the districts had a business director, a director of finance and operations, and a part-time director of business and finance, respectively. In addition, two of the three financial coordinators left the districts in the two years before the onsite review and the treasurer was a new hire in 2017–2018. Town officials expressed concern about the absence of a permanent business manager especially now that the superintendent planned to retire in June 2019. They also spoke about the difficulty of hiring qualified financial administrators.
2. In its 2017–2018 summative evaluation of the superintendent, school committee members expressed concern about the staffing level in the business office stating, “We cannot continue to service three districts with the resources of one.” School committee members also stated that they might consider advocating for more help for the superintendent.
3. In the focus group sessions in the towns preceding the hiring of a new superintendent, it was stated, “People understand the complexity of the [superintendent’s] job and are concerned over whether the current administrative structure is sufficient to support the superintendent.”

**Impact**: A fully staffed business office with stable leadership is essential for any district, but even more so when the office is administering three districts. When a well-staffed business office is not in place, the districts cannot ensure regular, accurate reports to the superintendent and school committees on spending from all funding sources, and forecasts of spending through the end of the year, with adequate school-level information provided to every principal.

***Recommendations***

**1. The districts should ensure that their planning documents have clear goals that are based on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated data.**

1. Principals and teachers should continue to complete the online Data Wise training program.
2. District leaders should continue to implement the Planning for Success (PfS) process for developing the districts’ new strategic plan and the annual districts’ action plan.

**C.** Under the leadership of the superintendent, and using the PfS process, the districts should convene a representative group of stakeholders to develop measurable goals (including progress benchmarks and final outcomes) for their planning documents.

1. The goals should be based on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated data related to student performance, opportunities, and outcomes.

2. The goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).

3. The districts should develop a process for using the most recent student data to continually monitor and update planning documents.

**D.** For all planning documents, the districts should include timelines and necessary resources and should designate staff with primary responsibility for achieving plan goals.

**E.** Principals, in collaboration with school councils, should ensure that each School Improvement Plan includes specific measures to determine the progress of school-based initiatives.

**F.** District and school leaders should provide frequent, timely, and thorough information to the school committee, staff, students, and families and the community on progress toward the achievement of plan goals.

**Benefits**. By developing, communicating, and using measurable goals based on an analysis of historical, longitudinal, and current disaggregated student data and other data sources, the districts will ensure that they are focused on the most important areas for improvement. By making a commitment to the yearly amount of change that it plans to achieve, the districts will be able to plan and regularly monitor the impact of key improvement strategies, instructional practices, and the use of resources on student performance, opportunities, and 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.
* ESE’s *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
  + *Selecting Outcome Measures and Setting Targets* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/setting-outcomes-targets.docx>) might be particularly helpful as the district analyzes data in order to establish measurable goals.
    - ESE’s *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/accountability/toolkit/>)) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
* ESE’s *District Analysis and Review Tool (DART)* ([www.mass.gov/ese/dart](http://www.mass.gov/ese/dart)) is organized by the District Standards and can help district leaders see where similar districts in the state are showing progress in specific areas to identify possible best practice.
  + - ESE’s *Statistical Reports* page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/infoservices/reports/>) provides links to downloadable district-level reports on graduation rates, grade retention, dropout rates, educator evaluation data, enrollment, mobility, and other data.
    - *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/level-4-guiding-principles-effective-benchmarks.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
    1. **The districts should consider re-allocating resources to ensure that the business office is staffed to serve the needs of three districts. The districts should develop a manual of procedures and protocols for the business office.**

1. The districts should consider contracting with the Massachusetts Association of Business Officials (MASBO) to determine the optimal staffing level for a business office serving three districts.

**B.** The districts should develop a business office manual that contains all school committee policies, all applicable state laws and regulations, job descriptions of all business office staff, and an outline of business procedures and protocols.

**Benefit:** A fully staffed business office will likely possess the capacity to address the complex financial needs of three school districts.

Instruction

The organization of the 3 districts with 10 schools presents a challenge in trying to maintain as consistent an educational experience for all students as possible as students from both communities join upon entering the regional high school. There are a few specific differences between the towns, including the age of the school buildings and capital projects to maintain the school buildings (see the Executive Summary above). A key to helping ensure a consistent educational experience for all students is the written K–12 curriculum. The curriculum is aligned across all core subject areas, well organized, accessible through ATLAS, and supported with resources that reflect current standards and approaches. The districts’ model of distributive leadership supports the implementation of the curriculum by offering teachers at all grade levels multiple opportunities for modeling, coaching, and sharing during common planning time and in Professional Learning Communities. This distributive model of leadership extends from administrators to districtwide math coordinators, reading specialists, department chairs, and grade-level team leaders. Currency in curriculum is also a priority; work is ongoing to maintain alignment. Through all these measures, the districts provide a curriculum that supports strong classroom instruction.

***Strength Finding***

**1. Throughout the districts, instruction benefits from a positive culture and climate that supports teaching and learning, with multiple regular opportunities for collaboration between teachers and district leaders for instructional support.**

* 1. The culture and climate in the districts’ classrooms (K–12) is conducive for learning.
     1. In observed classrooms overall, the team found sufficient and compelling evidence of a classroom culture conducive to teaching and learning (characteristic #11) in 85 percent of classrooms overall in the districts.

2. Observers also saw sufficient and compelling evidence that classrooms had routines and supports in place to ensure that students behaved appropriately (characteristic #12) in 84 percent of classrooms overall.

3. Observers described the classroom environment in observed classrooms as: “welcoming,” “calm and pleasant,” and respectful.”

4. Families and community members who participated in a survey about the search for a superintendent noted the collaboration and collegiality among faculty and staff and their professionalism.

5. Students reported that there were teachers who wanted them to learn, who were invested in them, and wanted them to do well.

6. Representatives of teachers’ associations’ noted that the district focused on climate and culture when orienting new teachers or those new to the district.

* 1. Teachers collaborate in common planning time (CPT) and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), which are scheduled regularly and incorporate communication with specialists and special educators.
     1. Teachers meet weekly for CPT with an opportunity to discuss curriculum and planning; team notes are shared with specialists; and classroom teachers meet with special educators and EL (English learner) teachers once a week.
     2. Best practices are shared during PLCs with teacher and specialist input. PLCs offer teachers opportunities to review student work and adjust instruction.
     3. High-school teachers meet every Monday after school for faculty, curriculum, or department meetings; ATLAS “master maps” provide curriculum guidance.[[5]](#footnote-5)
     4. Teachers expressed the view that because they were supported but not micromanaged they experienced a freedom to try new things.

**Impact**: The collegiality, collaboration, and caring of professional educators in these districts combine to create a supportive environment for instruction and an overall positive culture for learning.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**2. In observed classrooms across the districts, the review team found that the least well-developed characteristics of effective instruction included teachers using a variety of instructional approaches; promoting meaningful student discourse about content and students’ ideas and thinking; and ensuring that students were engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs.**

**A.** The team observed sufficient and compelling evidence of students communicating their ideas and thinking with each other (characteristic #7) in 50 percent of elementary classrooms, in only 39 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 56 percent of high-school classrooms.

1. In many observed classrooms, students communicated their ideas and thinking with each other. For example, in a grade 7 ELA class, students rated MCAS essays/anchor papers, and debated and provided a rationale for their scoring.

2. The review team noted some classrooms where students were working together and the level of analysis was high, but in other observed classrooms, teachers’ voice dominated lessons and there was little student-to-student discussion.

**B.**  The team saw sufficient and compelling evidence that the teacher ensured that students were engaged in challenging tasks regardless of their learning needs (characteristic #9) in 74 percent of elementary classrooms, in only 39 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in only 39 percent of high-school classrooms.

In many elementary classrooms, observers noted writing at different levels, group work that ensured participation of all students and provided multiple entry points, and a variety of approaches including use of manipulatives. For example, in a grade 1 ELA/reading class, the teacher used a variety of groupings/related tasks and led small groups for individual instruction.

In contrast, in many classrooms at the middle- and high-school levels, all students were doing the same task or completing the same worksheet, instruction was not challenging, and access points were limited.

1. The team observed sufficient and compelling evidence of teachers using multiple instructional strategies (characteristic #10) in 57 percent of elementary classrooms, in 62 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in only 11 percent of high-school classrooms.

1. At the elementary and middle-school levels, the range of instructional approaches included iPads; manipulatives; paired small-group instruction; and the use of video, pictures, songs, and hand motions (to introduce vocabulary). For example, in a grade 5 math class, observers noted a variety of tasks and instructional approaches.

2. In some high-school level classrooms, teachers relied on lecture mode with little student participation and interaction with each other throughout the observation.

1. The Workshop Model is used at the elementary level for organizing small-group instruction reading, writing, and math; teachers reported receiving professional development about small-group instruction.

**Impact**: When a district does not ensure that instruction challenges and supports all students, it does not optimize their learning opportunities to adequately prepare them for college, career, and civic engagement.

***Recommendation***

**The districts should improve instruction by building teachers’ capacity, especially in the areas of students communicating their ideas and thinking with one another; student engagement in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs; and employing a variety of instructional strategies.**

**A.** Drawing on work that administrators and teachers are already doing in each school to improve instruction, the districts should provide high-quality professional development (PD) to deepen teachers’ understanding of instructional practices and increase their repertoire and use of instructional strategies to promote student discourse.

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

2. The district should use multiple sources of data including needs assessments, teacher evaluations, instructional round data, student performance data, and other relevant sources to identify PD topics.

3. The districts should consider providing training for teachers on accountable talk to improve students’ ability to communicate their ideas and thinking with each other.

4. Administrators are encouraged to expand opportunities for teachers to observe peers who demonstrate expertise, especially in increasing student communication, ensuring that students are engaged in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs, and using a variety of instructional strategies.

5. Teachers should be encouraged to watch videos of effective instructional strategies and follow up with discussion during PD and/or department meetings. Shared professional readings and subsequent discussions may strengthen teachers’ understanding of key instructional strategies.

**B.** The districts should consider identifying areas for instructional improvement as goals in the strategic plan together with resources, implementation strategies, and monitoring responsibilities. Teachers are encouraged to include SMART goals[[6]](#footnote-6) related to instruction practices in their PD plans and educator evaluation documents.

**Benefits**: Implementing this recommendation will mean that students will experience more challenging instruction that further develops their ability to communicate their ideas and thinking with each other and is designed to accommodate their specific learning needs. Districts that prioritize high-quality instruction for all students create and sustain a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth for educators and increased student achievement.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/title-iia/ImplementationGuide2016.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (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.

* ESE’s *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/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.
  + - *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation and the MA Curriculum Frameworks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/qrg-curriculumframework.pdf#search=%22Quick Reference Educator Evaluation the MA Curriculum Frameworks%22>) provides an overview of how the Educator Evaluation System supports implementation of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, including ways to embed the Frameworks within the 5-Step Cycle for Educator Evaluation and to incorporate them into evidence collection.
* DESE’s calibration platform (<http://www.ma-calibration.com/>) includes tasks and activities to help educators calibrate their understanding of both content and pedagogy.

Human Resources and Professional Development

***Contextual Background***

The human resources department, which serves three districts, was created in 2016. The department is staffed with two full-time employees: the human resources administrator and the personnel coordinator. Central office administrative assistants provide additional support for the department in the areas of CORI[[7]](#footnote-7) checks, payroll, and benefits. The human resources administrator works with the districts’ principals and department heads to streamline the districts’ recruitment and hiring processes.

The district has systems in place to recruit, hire, and retain staff and has established partnerships with Assumption, Simmons, Framingham State, and Worcester State colleges to create a pipeline of educators. The district uses SchoolSpring web-based service and MASBO (Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials, Inc.), if applicable, to advertise positions and recruit candidates. Families and high-school students are involved in screening candidates.

The district has developed a comprehensive professional development (PD) program aligned with the Massachusetts standards for PD, and an induction and mentoring program aligned with DESE’s guidelines. The districts’ PD promotes continuous learning through ongoing and differentiated programming, effective communication, and professional collaboration.

The Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework is designed to provide educators and administrators with evidence-based quality feedback that will improve pedagogical practice and expand professional competencies. A review of teachers’ and administrators’ evaluation documents indicated limited high-quality feedback to help educators improve their practice. Before the 2018–2019 school year, the districts had not implemented any components of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework for administrators’ evaluations. In school year 2018–2019, administrators began implementing the Massachusetts Education Evaluation Framework by establishing SMART goals.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The human resources department maintains an infrastructure that supports the three districts.**

* 1. The human resources department is responsible for maintaining the districts’ human resources webpage for processing, communicating, and making available online all employee documents and information.
     1. The superintendent told the team that employees were “happy” to have a human resources department where they could access benefit information and view hiring policy and procedures. She said that in January 2019, the department would open a portal that would include W-2 forms, W-4 forms/withholding, and vacation requests.
     2. Administrators, school leaders, and teachers told review team members that the human resources director was helpful, the department did presentations for the staff, and the website was robust. Teachers said that they especially liked the SMART PD and licensure information found on the districts’ website.
     3. For new and veteran teachers, human resources developed a teacher licensure link that includes the details of sheltered English immersion (SEI) endorsement, ELAR information, re-certification guidelines, and professional development tracking documents.
     4. Principals said that they could request information and documentation from the human resources department. Routinely they receive attendance data, certification information, staff directories, paraprofessional assignments, and verification of SEI endorsements.

**Impact**: A human resources department strategically designed to facilitate employee processes and provide support for all educators contributes to a culture of high performance and accountability.

**2. The districts have a comprehensive professional development program that supports all teachers and is aligned with the Massachusetts standards for professional, district curricular initiatives, and staff’s interests/needs.**

* 1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the districts’ professional development (PD) program was well developed, planned, and supported.

The assistant superintendent is responsible for leading the districts’ PD program and facilitating the districts’ PD committee. The committee, which meets five or six times a year, consists of representative educators from the three districts, including teachers, principals, central office leaders, and teachers’ associations presidents.

District and school leaders and teachers said that a significant number of PD offerings were aligned with School Improvement Plans, the districts’ strategic plan, and curricular initiatives.

b. At the elementary level, some PD is based on analysis of student assessment data and student work. In addition, grade-level teams look at students’ progress in reading and writing to develop PD.

c. At the middle school level, examples of the deliberate alignment of PD offerings to district initiatives include Canvas training for teachers grades 6–12, data workshops K–12, and instructional rounds K–12.

d. At the high-school level, the district uses an analysis of MCAS assessment data and common assessments such as mid-terms and finals to plan PD.

The districts’ website publishes on the Smart PD portal a list of all PD opportunities available in the 2108–2019 school year. The schedule includes detailed information, including dates, target audiences, program titles and description, time, location, and cost. In addition, the 2018–2019 PD calendar is posted on the districts’ website.

Teachers told reviewers that the districts surveyed staff about their interests to plan and evaluate PD programming. Principals and the districts’ PD committee review survey results and/or staff requests, and decide what PD will be offered.

For school year 2018–2019, the district scheduled five full days of PD: two planned by each district school, two district-based, and one six-hour flex day that each teacher completes independently. Programming is appropriately differentiated and balanced to provide districtwide, school-level, and individual teacher options during designated PD time.

a. Information and a learning plan for the districts’ flex day is available online. All teachers must submit their plan for approval each school year.

b. The districts provide a range of PD opportunities, including in-district workshops/presentations, online classes, after-school programs, summer workshops, professional conferences, and teacher study groups.

5. The team was told that the districts surveyed educators to assess the impact of PD and used the feedback to determine “next steps.”

**Impact**: When a district provides a comprehensive and differentiated professional development plan aligned with the Massachusetts standards for professional development, educators will continue to improve their knowledge and skills to enrich learning opportunities and increase achievement for all students.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. The district’s educator evaluation system has not prioritized opportunities for educators to receive high-quality feedback[[8]](#footnote-8) that helps them improve their practice.**

1. The team reviewed the 2017–2018 evaluation documentation of 30 teachers randomly selected from all of the districts’ schools in TeachPoint, the district’s educator evaluation management system. In 28 of the formative assessments/evaluations and/or summative evaluations, evaluators described observed instruction but provided vague or little instructional feedback. In two evaluations, feedback was detailed and aligned with the educator’s goals.

1. Most evaluators suggested that teachers continue to collect evidence for a particular standard and encouraged teachers to continue with their effective practices as they worked to meet their goal(s).

2. Teachers and administrators told the review team that educator evaluation feedback could be deeper, it needed more attention, and effective teachers were not being pushed very hard. In addition, teachers and administrators said that no educator could receive an overall rating of exemplary. Teacher goal setting has helped improvement, but no one receives an overall) rating of exemplary. The plan is to begin to look at rubric(s) as applied to an exemplary rating.

3. Teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators stated that the 15 evaluators (principals and assistant principals) had too many staff to evaluate. Principals stated that because of time constraints and the large number of evaluations that needed to be done, it was difficult to give all teachers the feedback necessary “to inspire and motivate.”

**B.** The team also reviewed the 2017–2018 evaluative documentation of eight school and district administrators, including the evaluation of the superintendent by the school committee.

1. The administrators’ evaluative documentation included a summative evaluation. Only three folders included formative assessments/evaluations, and only one included feedback that would promote professional growth. The superintendent’s 2017–2018 evaluation did not include any specific feedback for continued growth. None of the administrators’ evaluative documentation included evidence.

2. Administrators stated that their evaluation process needed attention. When asked to describe the process, principals said that the process has been “fairly non-existent” since the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education developed the Educator Evaluation Framework in 2011.[[9]](#footnote-9)

3. Principals and school leaders stated that beginning in school year 2018–2019 administrators set SMART goals. Leaders said that it seemed as though district administrators were starting to follow a process for educator evaluation.

**C.** 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. The team did not find evidence that student feedback was used as evidence in the teacher evaluation process or that staff feedback was used in the administrator evaluation process.

**D.** The team did not find evidence of the use of educators’ impact on student learning in the educator evaluation process.

**Impact**: Without high-quality (specific, timely, and actionable) feedback designed to contribute to the professional growth of teachers and administrators, the district is missing opportunities to help educators build their skills and improve students’ learning experiences and outcomes.

***Recommendation***

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

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

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

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

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

**C.** The district leaders and evaluators should review and discuss the teacher rubric(s) for exemplary ratings and agree upon the observable and actionable measures for educators to attain this status.

**D.** The district should continue to survey educators about the quality of their evaluations, walkthroughs, and feedback, and provide these results to the evaluators.

**E.** The districts should consider widening the pool of evaluators to provide teachers with 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.

**Benefits:** By implementing an educator evaluation system that prioritizes high-quality feedback, the districts will help educators improve their practice, inform their professional growth, which will likely lead to increased student performance and outcomes. 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 practice and more accurately identify areas of strength and areas for growth.

**Recommended resources:**

* *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.
* Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf>) and Administrators (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf>) are designed to provide schools and districts with information about the status of their educator evaluation implementation. Information from these surveys can be used to target district resources and supports where most needed to strengthen implementation.
* *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?
* WGEE also offers an *Electronic Clearinghouse* (<http://wgee.org/electronic-clearinghouse-with-promising-practices/>), which includes exemplars for teachers, school administrators, district leaders and evaluators that clarify particular Indicators on the Classroom Teacher Rubric from the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation.
* *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.

Financial and Asset Management

***Contextual Background***

Central office administrators of the Northborough and Southborough Public Schools and the Algonquin Regional High School perform the financial and budgetary activities for three districts. The district has reorganized its business office in the wake of an embezzlement incident involving a business office employee in 2016. The business office has a part-time director of finance, a part-time independent accountant, and a part-time treasurer. Full-time staff include a financial coordinator for each district who handles accounts payable and payroll. The districts have a certified procurement officer. The districts have completed timely audits and no material deficiencies in district procedures have been found in recent years.

The size of the student population has been decreasing in the K–8 districts, with Northborough losing 262 students and Southborough losing 56 students since 2014. The regional high school student population is stable.

The two towns have supported the schools with the fiscal year 2018 budgets adopted without discussion at the town meetings. The towns have consistently funded the districts above required net school spending (NSS) in recent years. In 2018, Northborough was 67.4 percent above required NSS, Southborough was 85.5 percent above required NSS, and the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District was 33 percent above required NSS.

The districts operate 10 schools, seven elementary schools,[[10]](#footnote-10) two middle schools (grades 6–8), and the regional high school (grades 9–12). Each district has a maintenance director responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of the schools. Reviewers found the buildings generally clean and well maintained. Maintenance schedules are generated using SchoolDude software and each district has a six-year capital plan. In 2018, in-district per-pupil expenditures on operations and maintenance were below the state average in Northborough, but above the state average in Southborough and in the regional district.[[11]](#footnote-11) Interviews and a document review indicated that at the time of the onsite review the districts planned to submit a statement of interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority for major repairs such as windows, roofs, and boilers and Northborough planned to submit a statement of interest for a new elementary school in the coming years.

***Strength Finding***

**1. In the aftermath of a 2016 incident in which a business office employee embezzled $383,602.05,[[12]](#footnote-12) the districts restructured the business office and implemented procedures and protocols to ensure the segregation of duties dictated by best practice and statute, and the security of cash and checks.[[13]](#footnote-13)**

* 1. The districts hired an accounting company to conduct a forensic audit. Subsequent audits have revealed no material deficiencies in business office procedures.
     1. The independent audit of the Northboro-Southboro Regional School District for the 2016–2017 school year showed that the district complied with requirements for federal grants.
     2. The audit for 2016–2017 (called a “management letter”) did not identify any “deficiencies in internal control” that were considered material weaknesses.

**B.** The districts reviewed all job descriptions for business office positions to ensure segregation of duties.

**C.** The districts ensured the security of cash and checks through the purchase of a safe for the business office and the use of lock bags for the transport of cash and checks to the town offices.

**D**. After the incident, the districts hired a new director of business and finance and a new part-time treasurer. The new director of business and finance left at the end of fiscal year 2018 and the district hired a part-time director of finance.

* + 1. The districts hired an accountant from an independent accounting company who works two to four days in the district. He is responsible for financial reports and the end-of-year report.

**E.** The districts now review and report on revolving funds, something they did not do before the incident.

**Impact**: It is incumbent on districts that incur financial irregularities because of ineffective internal controls and policies to review the structure, policies, and protocols of their business office. Districts that do this and incorporate standards that reflect best practice and meet statutory requirements can likely avoid financial irregularities in the future.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**2. The districts’ budget documents do not include all district income and expenditures and are not transparent.**

* 1. Budget documents submitted by the districts and posted on the districts’ website do not include all district income and expenditures and are not transparent and easily understandable.

1. Budget documents do not include all district income and expenditures in the provision of academic and support services. Missing from the documents are revolving funds, food service funds, and grants.

2. The documents do not have a narrative to explain the changes in budget allocations from year to year.

* + - 1. The superintendent’s PowerPoint presentations to the school committees give a rationale for major changes in the budget but are not part of the budget documents posted on the districts’ website.

3. The budget documents contain only one year of budget history. They do not include multi-year data or trends.

4. The budget documents do not include staffing data including changes in staffing levels over time.

5. The budget documents do not contain clear links to the districts’ strategic plan and School Improvement Plans (SIPs).

**B.** The central administration has produced a budget book for each district. A budget book is a compilation of budget documents including the budget calendar, the PowerPoint presentations made by the superintendent, and other information related to the budget.

1. The budget book is a collection of 24 documents generated by the district as part of the budget process. The book does not have a unifying narrative and the documents are not linked to the budget priorities and the final budget. The only section with a narrative is the fund code section. The document explains what district expenditures are attached to each fund code but does not link them to district priorities or decisions.

2. The budget books include student data, including AP, ACT, SAT, and MCAS assessment data for the high school and MCAS assessment data for the K–8 schools. The data is presented as information without accompanying narrative. The budget book does not link instructional goals to budget priorities and decisions.

**Impact:** Without comprehensive and transparent budget documents, the districts cannot give the school committee and other stakeholders a clear picture of the districts’ priorities, initiatives, and achievements and how their resources are allocated.

**3. The districts do not have a signed written agreement with the towns of Southborough and Northborough documenting services provided by the towns and clarifying town costs charged to the districts. The districts’ capital plans do not include a narrative about each project and its priority.**

1. The districts do not have a signed agreement with the towns of Northborough and Southborough detailing what services the towns will provide the districts and how much those services will cost.
   * 1. The director of business and finance stated that central administration did not did not have letters of agreement with the towns of Northborough and Southborough. In an interview with district business staff, no one was aware of any written agreement between central administration and the towns.
     2. Town officials stated that there was no written agreement between the towns and central administration. They stated that the town accountants determine the costs for services that the towns provided to the districts.
     3. The 2018 Northborough end of year report schedule 19 lists some apportionment of town costs to the school district. This included 5 percent for the department of public works (DPW), 67 percent for liability insurance and other percentages for unemployment, health insurance, and workers’ compensation. District officials said that they were unaware of this and unable to comment as to whether these were real expenses or percentages for the calculation of net school spending.
2. The districts’ capital plans are Excel spreadsheets projecting capital costs over a six-year period. The plans do not contain narratives describing each project and its priority.

**Impact**: Not having a written agreement between the districts and the towns about what services the towns will provide the districts and how much those services will cost leaves these critical working relationship undefined, and prevents the parties from knowing whether municipal charges are calculated correctly on the end of year reports. Not having capital plans with narratives about each project and its priority prevents the districts from efficiently planning for and allocating resources to coordinate and finance capital improvement projects over a multi-year period and limits the districts’ ability to communicate capital planning with stakeholders.

***Recommendations***

**1.**  **The district should create budget documents that are clear, comprehensive, and detail how the budgets support district and school goals, how much schools and programs cost, and how outside funds are used.**

**A.** The district should produce budget documents that include all essential information about the financial operations of the districts.

Revolving funds, food service funds, and grants should be included.

**B**. The budget documents should include a narrative that explains the elements that make up the budget and that outlines changes from the previous year and trends over multiple previous years.

**C.** Budget documents should include information about how the budgets support the strategic plan. Both budget documents and district planning documents should reflect the connection.

**D.** The districts’ budget books should provide a concise overview of the budget process.

1. The district’s budget books should outline past, present and proposed budget allocations and should present this data by program, as well as by fund code.

2. A narrative should be included to explain the rationale for budget requests. The significance of any data presented should be explained. The narrative should be clear and explain the budget to an audience that includes non-educators.

3**.** The budget process should be linked to student data and district and school plans.

**Benefit:** By implementing these recommendations, the districts will have comprehensive budget documents that clearly delineate the districts’ current education efforts. The development of a concise informative budget book will enhance the districts commitment to transparency**.**

**Recommended resource:**

* *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

**2. The districts and the towns should develop a written agreement to accurately reflect the services provided, and the allocation of expenditures, by the towns for the districts, in compliance with 603 CMR 10.04 (1).**

**A.** Town and district representatives should meet to draft an agreement that accurately reflects the cost of actual or allocated services provided to the districts by the towns.

1. The agreement should include an accounting of the services that are typically provided by the towns, including buildings and grounds, health insurance, other insurance, and the DPW.

**B**. The agreement should include the specific calculations and methodologies used to determine the allocation of expenditures that are not included in the districts’ budgets but must be included on Schedule 19 of the end-of year reports.

**C.** The agreement should be reviewed and signed by the superintendent and the town managers annually.

**Benefits:** A written agreement prepared in accordance with state regulation 603 CMR 10.04 (1) will allow more precision in the calculation of net school spending and the annual end-of-year budget reporting requirements. In addition, the districts and the town will have a clear understanding of municipal expenditures that are assigned to the districts.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’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.
* *End-of-Year Financial Report* information can be found at http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/accounting/eoy/

**3. The districts should add to their capital plans narratives describing each project and its priority.**

**A.** The districts’ capital plans should include a description of each proposed project and its priority.

**Benefits:** Capital plans with narratives about each project and its priority will help the districts efficiently plan for and allocate resources to coordinate and finance improvement projects over a multi-year period. In addition, detailed capital plans will help the districts communicate with stakeholders and could help to build support for annual capital improvements that promote health and safety, which can improve all students’ performance, opportunities, and outcomes.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 7–9, 2019, by the following team of independent DESE consultants.

1. Dr. James Caradonio, Leadership and Governance
2. Dr. Linda Denault, Instruction
3. James L. Hearns, *review team coordinator*
4. Mary Jo Nawrocki, Human Resources and Professional Development
5. John Retchless, Financial and Asset Management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the interim business manager, the regional financial coordinator, the Southborough financial coordinator, and the Northborough financial coordinator.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chair of the Northborough school committee; chair of the Southborough school committee; chair of the Superintendency Union #3 school committee; chair of the Northboro-Southboro regional school committee; one member of the Southborough school committee; two members of the regional school committee; and one member of the Northborough school committee, who was a member of the regional school committee and of the Superintendency Union #3 school committee.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: the president of the Northborough teachers’ association, the president of the Southborough teachers’ association, and 1 of the co-presidents of the Algonquin Regional teachers’ association.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the interim business manager, the director of English language education, the director of student support services, and the human resources administrator.

The team visited the following schools: Algonquin Regional High School (grades 9–12); Fannie E. Proctor School (K–5); Lincoln Street School (K–5); Marguerite E. Peaslee School (K–5); Marion E. Zeh School (K–5); Robert F. Melican Middle School (grades 6–8); Albert S. Woodward Memorial School (grades 2–3); Margaret A. Neary School (grades 4–5); Mary E. Finn School (Pre-K–1); and P. Brent Trottier School (grades 6–8).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews/focus groups with students, students’ families, and 10 principals, and focus groups with 6 elementary and middle-school teachers from the Southborough district, 10 elementary and middle-school teachers from the Northborough district, and 4 teachers from the regional high school.

The team observed 57 classes throughout the district: 18 at the regional high school (grades 9–12), 13 at the 2 middle schools (grades 6–8), and 26 at the 7 elementary schools (K–5).

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**  01/07/2019 | **Tuesday**  01/08/2019 | **Wednesday**  01/09/2019 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; teacher focus groups; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to P. Brent Trottier Middle School, Albert S. Woodward Memorial School, and Algonquin Regional High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus group; students’ families focus group; town official interview, school committee interview; and visits to Robert E. Melican Middle School, Lincoln Street Elementary School, Marion E. Zeh Elementary School, Fannie E. Proctor Elementary School, Margaret A. Neary Elementary School, and Marguerite E. Peaslee Elementary School, for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; interview with students; and visits to Mary E. Finn Elementary School and Algonquin Regional High School for classroom observations. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 31 | 1.9% | 86,305 | 9.0% |
| Asian | 199 | 12.1% | 65,667 | 6.9% |
| Hispanic | 118 | 7.2% | 191,201 | 20.0% |
| Native American | 6 | 0.4% | 2,103 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,218 | 73.9% | 573,335 | 60.1% |
| Native Hawaiian | 11 | 0.7% | 818 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 65 | 3.9% | 34,605 | 3.6% |
| All | 1,648 | 100.0% | 954,034 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2017 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 10 | 0.8% | 86,305 | 9.0% |
| Asian | 236 | 17.9% | 65,667 | 6.9% |
| Hispanic | 70 | 5.3% | 191,201 | 20.0% |
| Native American | 2 | 0.2% | 2,103 | 0.2% |
| White | 931 | 70.5% | 573,335 | 60.1% |
| Native Hawaiian | 2 | 0.2% | 818 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 69 | 5.2% | 34,605 | 3.6% |
| All | 1,320 | 100.0% | 954,034 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2017 | | | | |

**Table B1c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 17 | 1.2% | 86,305 | 9.0% |
| Asian | 158 | 10.7% | 65,667 | 6.9% |
| Hispanic | 83 | 5.6% | 191,201 | 20.0% |
| Native American | 5 | 0.3% | 2,103 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,163 | 79.1% | 573,335 | 60.1% |
| Native Hawaiian | 3 | 0.2% | 818 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 42 | 2.9% | 34,605 | 3.6% |
| All | 1,471 | 100.0% | 954,034 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2017 | | | | |

**Table B2a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 308 | 60.9% | 18.5% | 171,061 | 38.0% | 17.7% |
| Econ. Dis. | 184 | 36.4% | 11.2% | 305,203 | 67.9% | 32.0% |
| EL and Former EL | 76 | 15.0% | 4.6% | 97,334 | 21.6% | 10.2% |
| All high needs students | 506 | 100.0% | 30.4% | 449,584 | 100.0% | 46.6% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2017. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,665; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,806. | | | | | | |

**Table B2b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 214 | 63.3% | 16.1% | 171,061 | 38.0% | 17.7% |
| Econ. Dis. | 70 | 20.7% | 5.3% | 305,203 | 67.9% | 32.0% |
| EL and Former EL | 69 | 20.4% | 5.2% | 97,334 | 21.6% | 10.2% |
| All high needs students | 338 | 100.0% | 25.4% | 449,584 | 100.0% | 46.6% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2017. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,333; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,806. | | | | | | |

**Table B2c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations, 2017–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 212 | 66.9% | 14.3% | 171,061 | 38.0% | 17.7% |
| Econ. Dis. | 106 | 33.4% | 7.2% | 305,203 | 67.9% | 32.0% |
| EL and Former EL | 21 | 6.6% | 1.4% | 97,334 | 21.6% | 10.2% |
| All high needs students | 317 | 100.0% | 21.4% | 449,584 | 100.0% | 46.6% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2017. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,478; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,806. | | | | | | |

**Table B3a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 34 | 93.5 | 94.8 | 97.3 | 97.6 | 4.1 | 94.1 |
| Asian | 203 | 96.0 | 96.3 | 96.7 | 96.4 | 0.4 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 124 | 96.1 | 96.4 | 96.1 | 95.7 | -0.4 | 92.7 |
| Multi-Race | 67 | 97.0 | 97.2 | 96.5 | 96.2 | -0.8 | 94.4 |
| White | 1,245 | 96.4 | 96.4 | 96.1 | 96.2 | -0.2 | 95.1 |
| High Needs | 565 | 95.3 | 95.7 | 95.2 | 95.6 | 0.3 | 93.2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 219 | 95.1 | 95.1 | 95.2 | 95.2 | 0.1 | 92.5 |
| SWD | 355 | 95.3 | 95.6 | 95.1 | 95.4 | 0.1 | 92.9 |
| EL | 77 | 95.7 | 96.7 | 96.1 | 96.3 | 0.6 | 93.3 |
| All | 1,690 | 96.3 | 96.4 | 96.2 | 96.2 | -0.1 | 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 B3b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 11 | 97.3 | 98.1 | 96.6 | 97.1 | -0.2 | 94.1 |
| Asian | 248 | 96.8 | 96.5 | 96.1 | 96.1 | -0.7 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 71 | 96.3 | 95.3 | 96.2 | 95.5 | -0.8 | 92.7 |
| Multi-Race | 70 | 96.2 | 96.8 | 96.5 | 96.3 | 0.1 | 94.4 |
| White | 971 | 96.4 | 96.6 | 96.6 | 96.0 | -0.4 | 95.1 |
| High Needs | 380 | 95.9 | 96.0 | 95.7 | 95.2 | -0.7 | 93.2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 92 | 95.7 | 94.8 | 95.9 | 92.6 | -3.1 | 92.5 |
| SWD | 234 | 95.3 | 95.8 | 95.6 | 95.3 | 0.0 | 92.9 |
| EL | 83 | 97.1 | 96.7 | 96.0 | 95.6 | -1.5 | 93.3 |
| All | 1,376 | 96.4 | 96.6 | 96.5 | 96.0 | -0.4 | 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 B3c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Attendance Rates, 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 19 | 94.9 | 90.1 | 92.8 | 94.8 | -0.1 | 94.1 |
| Asian | 158 | 96.7 | 96.5 | 96.7 | 96.7 | 0.0 | 96.2 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 89 | 94.3 | 92.8 | 93.6 | 93.4 | -0.9 | 92.7 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 94.2 | 95.5 | 96.2 | 94.2 | 0.0 | 94.4 |
| White | 1,167 | 95.6 | 95.6 | 95.0 | 94.7 | -0.9 | 95.1 |
| High Needs | 322 | 92.0 | 92.1 | 92.5 | 92.5 | 0.5 | 93.2 |
| Econ. Dis. | 125 | 90.4 | 89.3 | 90.9 | 91.3 | 0.9 | 92.5 |
| SWD | 196 | 91.2 | 91.3 | 91.7 | 91.7 | 0.5 | 92.9 |
| EL | 27 | 87.0 | 91.1 | 92.7 | 93.1 | 6.1 | 93.3 |
| All | 1,483 | 95.6 | 95.5 | 95.1 | 94.8 | -0.8 | 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 B4a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Chronic Absence Rates,\* 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 34 | 22.9 | 8.3 | 2.9 | 5.9 | -17.0 | 16.4 |
| Asian | 203 | 10.6 | 7.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 | -5.7 | 7.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 124 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 6.6 | 9.7 | 5.2 | 22.5 |
| Multi-Race | 67 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.2 | 14.2 |
| White | 1,245 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 6.6 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 10.0 |
| High Needs | 565 | 11.8 | 7.8 | 11.9 | 8.8 | -3.0 | 20.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 219 | 14.9 | 8.8 | 12.1 | 12.3 | -2.6 | 22.9 |
| SWD | 355 | 9.3 | 9.2 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 0.8 | 20.7 |
| EL | 77 | 12.4 | 5.3 | 5.2 | 6.5 | -5.9 | 20.4 |
| All | 1,690 | 5.7 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 5.6 | -0.1 | 13.2 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school | | | | | | | |

**Table B4b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Chronic Absence Rates,\* 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 11 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -9.1 | 16.4 |
| Asian | 248 | 3.7 | 6.6 | 6.3 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 7.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 71 | 8.6 | 14.1 | 5.5 | 9.9 | 1.3 | 22.5 |
| Multi-Race | 70 | 7.5 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 2.9 | -4.6 | 14.2 |
| White | 971 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 1.9 | 10.0 |
| High Needs | 380 | 7.4 | 9.3 | 7.4 | 11.1 | 3.7 | 20.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 92 | 9.1 | 18.2 | 14.5 | 18.5 | 9.4 | 22.9 |
| SWD | 234 | 7.8 | 10.1 | 7.1 | 10.3 | 2.5 | 20.7 |
| EL | 83 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 7.1 | 10.8 | 5.0 | 20.4 |
| All | 1,376 | 3.7 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 2.0 | 13.2 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school | | | | | | | |

**Table B4c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Chronic Absence Rates,\* 2015–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2018)** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2018)** |
| African American/Black | 19 | 17.6 | 37.5 | 22.2 | 21.1 | 3.5 | 16.4 |
| Asian | 158 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 5.4 | 6.3 | 1.3 | 7.6 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 89 | 19.1 | 24.0 | 19.7 | 20.2 | 1.1 | 22.5 |
| Multi-Race | 42 | 15.4 | 8.8 | 12.8 | 11.9 | -3.5 | 14.2 |
| White | 1,167 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 10.7 | 11.4 | 3.5 | 10.0 |
| High Needs | 322 | 22.6 | 23.0 | 23.2 | 23.9 | 1.3 | 20.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 125 | 34.4 | 38.4 | 38.6 | 25.6 | -8.8 | 22.9 |
| SWD | 196 | 20.2 | 22.2 | 22.7 | 28.6 | 8.4 | 20.7 |
| EL | 27 | 42.9 | 22.7 | 9.5 | 18.5 | -24.4 | 20.4 |
| All | 1,483 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 10.9 | 11.5 | 3.2 | 13.2 |
| \* The percentage of students absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school | | | | | | | |

**Table B5a: Northborough 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 | $21,951,539 | $22,034,508 | | $22,719,843 | | $22,774,496 | | $23,445,017 | $23,444,230 |
| By municipality | $16,934,963 | $24,248,804 | | $18,268,452 | | $20,797,584 | | $18,817,596 | $19,234,065 |
| Total from local appropriations | $38,886,502 | $46,283,313 | | $40,988,295 | | $43,572,080 | | $42,262,613 | $42,678,295 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $2,074,045 | | -- | | $1,954,238 | | -- | -- |
| Total expenditures | -- | $48,357,357 | | -- | | $45,526,318 | | -- | 44,453,257 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $3,756,435 | | -- | | $3,849,770 | | -- | $3,899,030 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $13,153,691 | | -- | | $12,701,763 | | -- | $12,501,814 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $16,910,126 | | -- | | $16,551,533 | | -- | $16,400,844 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $25,399,170 | | -- | | $26,395,650 | | -- | $27,460,063 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $8,489,044 | | -- | | $9,844,117 | | -- | $11,059,219 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 50.2% | | -- | | 59.5% | | -- | 67.4% |
| \*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.  \*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.  Sources: FY16, FY17, and FY18 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on DESE website  Data retrieved 11/13/18 and 2/13/19 | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5b: Southborough 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 | $18,908,934 | $18,558,981 | | $19,401,863 | | $19,599,440 | | $19,781,258 | $20,090,157 |
| By municipality | $14,376,836 | $14,040,643 | | $14,520,950 | | $14,665,749 | | $15,002,282 | $15,069,656 |
| Total from local appropriations | $33,285,770 | $32,599,625 | | $33,922,813 | | $34,265,189 | | $34,783,540 | $36,582,513 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $1,618,166 | | -- | | $1,509,851 | | -- | -- |
| Total expenditures | -- | $34,217,790 | | -- | | $35,775,040 | | -- | -- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $2,809,611 | | -- | | $2,877,481 | | -- | $2,914,531 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $10,152,043 | | -- | | $9,485,040 | | -- | $9,486,965 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $12,961,654 | | -- | | $12,362,521 | | -- | $12,401,496 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $21,041,940 | | -- | | $22,677,133 | | -- | $23,005,500 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $8,080,286 | | -- | | $10,314,612 | | -- | $10,604,004 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 62.3% | | -- | | 83.4% | | -- | 85.5% |
| \*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 DESE website  Data retrieved 11/13/18 and 2/13/19 | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending**

**Fiscal Years 2016–2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY16** | | **FY17** | | **FY18** | |
|  | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** |
| Expenditures | | | | | |  |
| From school committee budget | $21,843,554 | $21,389,508 | $22,717,524 | $22,479,925 | $23,460,925 | $23,365,064 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $3,089,943 | -- | $3,171,461 | -- | $3,093,598 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $24,479,451 | -- | $25,651,387 | -- | $26,458,662 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | |  |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $2,951,914 | -- | $3,034,084 | -- | $3,078,274 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $12,932,868 | -- | $12,730,046 | -- | $12,690,623 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $15,884,782 | -- | $15,764,130 | -- | $15,768,897 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $18,847,625 | -- | $19,926,859 | -- | $20,971,119 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $2,962,843 | -- | $4,162,730 | -- | $5,202,222 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 18.7% | -- | 26.4% | -- | 33% |
| \*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, FY18 District End-of-Year Reports; Chapter 70 Program information on DESE website.  Data retrieved 11/13/18 and 2/13/19 | | | | | | |

**Table B6a: Northborough Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Administration | $446 | $484 | $520 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $758 | $770 | $784 |
| Teachers | $6,104 | $6,585 | $6,840 |
| Other teaching services | $1,735 | $1,759 | $1,812 |
| Professional development | $65 | $85 | $66 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $317 | $411 | $247 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $447 | $442 | $546 |
| Pupil services | $974 | $943 | $1,068 |
| Operations and maintenance | $966 | $989 | $938 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,271 | $2,423 | $2,609 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $14,082 | $14,891 | $15,431 |
| 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. | | | |

**Table B6b: Southborough Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Administration | $495 | $535 | $577 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $1,116 | $926 | $959 |
| Teachers | $6,685 | $7,110 | $7,471 |
| Other teaching services | $2,022 | $2,018 | $2,120 |
| Professional development | $62 | $101 | $99 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $442 | $541 | $436 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $509 | $560 | $520 |
| Pupil services | $1,014 | $1,103 | $1,099 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,270 | $1,292 | $1,500 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,396 | $2,504 | $2,952 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $16,012 | $16,689 | $17,733 |
| 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. | | | |

**Table B6c: Northboro-Southboro Regional School District**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| Administration | $397 | $447 | $447 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $864 | $782 | $915 |
| Teachers | $6,550 | $6,659 | $6,952 |
| Other teaching services | $725 | $1,072 | $1,109 |
| Professional development | $63 | $88 | $142 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $190 | $279 | $211 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $739 | $572 | $676 |
| Pupil services | $1,948 | $2,043 | $2,067 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,269 | $1,187 | $1,244 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,285 | $2,432 | $2,594 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $15,030 | $15,561 | $16,359 |
| 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** | 0% | 12% | 77% | 12% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 23% | 77% | 0% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 0% | 6% | 39% | 56% | 3.5 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 7 | 37 | 13 | 3.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 12% | 65% | 23% |  |
| 2. The teacher ensures that students understand what they should be learning in the lesson and why. | **ES** | 0% | 8% | 73% | 19% | 3.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 31% | 69% | 0% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 0% | 39% | 50% | 11% | 2.7 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 13 | 37 | 7 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 23% | 65% | 12% |  |
| 3. The teacher uses appropriate classroom activities well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 0% | 15% | 69% | 15% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 31% | 46% | 23% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 0% | 11% | 83% | 6% | 2.9 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 10 | 39 | 8 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 18% | 68% | 14% |  |
| 4. The teacher conducts frequent checks for student understanding, provides feedback, and adjusts instruction. | **ES** | 0% | 35% | 38% | 27% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 38% | 46% | 15% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 0% | 28% | 61% | 11% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 19 | 27 | 11 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 33% | 47% | 19% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** | 0% | 12% | 65% | 23% | 3.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 23% | 62% | 15% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 0% | 33% | 56% | 11% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 12 | 35 | 10 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 21% | 61% | 18% |  |
| 6. Students engage in higher-order thinking. | **ES** | 0% | 27% | 65% | 8% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 0% | 15% | 69% | 15% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 28% | 61% | 11% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 14 | 37 | 6 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 25% | 65% | 11% |  |
| 7. Students communicate their ideas and thinking with each other. | **ES** | 0% | 50% | 31% | 19% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 8% | 54% | 31% | 8% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 6% | 39% | 56% | 0% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 2 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 4% | 47% | 39% | 11% |  |
| 8. Students engage with meaningful, real-world tasks. | **ES** | 0% | 15% | 65% | 19% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 15% | 69% | 15% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 22% | 61% | 17% | 2.9 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 10 | 37 | 10 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 18% | 65% | 18% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **11.7** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **11.3** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **11.1** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **11.4** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** | 12% | 15% | 62% | 12% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 15% | 46% | 31% | 8% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 6% | 56% | 33% | 6% | 2.4 |
| **Total #** | 6 | 20 | 26 | 5 | 2.5 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 35% | 46% | 9% |  |
| 10. The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies. | **ES** | 0% | 42% | 38% | 19% | 2.8 |
| **MS** | 0% | 38% | 62% | 0% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 6% | 83% | 11% | 0% | 2.1 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 31 | 20 | 5 | 2.5 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 54% | 35% | 9% |  |
| 11. Classroom routines and positive supports are in place to ensure that students behave appropriately. | **ES** | 0% | 12% | 50% | 38% | 3.3 |
| **MS** | 0% | 31% | 31% | 38% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 11% | 44% | 44% | 3.3 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 9 | 25 | 23 | 3.2 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 16% | 44% | 40% |  |
| 12. The classroom climate is conducive to teaching and learning. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 58% | 42% | 3.4 |
| **MS** | 0% | 23% | 46% | 31% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 0% | 44% | 56% | 3.6 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 3 | 29 | 25 | 3.4 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 5% | 51% | 44% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **12.2** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **11.1** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **11.3** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **11.7** |

1. High-quality feedback is specific, timely, and actionable. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Each of the three districts (Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro Regional) has its own school committee. The fourth school committee, Superintendency Union #3, focuses primarily on hiring and evaluating the superintendent. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Each of the three districts (Northborough, Southborough, and Northboro-Southboro Regional) has its own school committee. The fourth school committee, Superintendency Union #3, focuses primarily on hiring and evaluating the superintendent. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Tables 5 a-c in Appendix B. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. High-school teachers use the term “master maps” to refer to the curriculum maps they create complete with timelines and common assessments. Administrators use these master maps to review curriculum implementation. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. SMART goals are Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. CORI stands for Criminal Offender Record Information. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. High-quality feedback is specific, timely, and actionable. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. DESE developed the Educator Evaluation Framework to support effective implementation of the educator evaluation regulation, 603 CMR 35.00, by districts and schools across the Commonwealth. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The elementary schools include 4 K–5 schools, 1 school that serves pre-kindergarten through grade 1, 1 school that serves grades 2–3, and 1 school that serves grades 4–5. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. In 2018, the state average for in-district per-pupil expenditures for operations and maintenance was $1,197.93. The in-district per-pupil expenditures for operations and maintenance for the Northborough, Southborough, and the Northboro-Southboro Regional school districts was $1,049.65, $1,556.75, and $1,999.66, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. A document review indicated that identified losses for the districts amounted to $383,602.05. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The districts received full restitution for the loss of funds through a combination of insurance and legal action. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)