



- › BESE Home
- › Board Meeting Schedule
- › Board in Brief
- › Board Meeting Minutes
- › BESE Members
- › Board Documents
- › BESE Advisory Councils
- › Chairman's Statements

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Board Documents - Tuesday, May 19, 2009

Regular Meeting
 Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education
 Brookline High School
 115 Greenough Street
 Brookline, MA 02445
 Tuesday, May 19, 2009, 8:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

[Briefing](#)

Comments from the Chair
Comments from the Commissioner
Comments from the Secretary
Statements from the Public

Routine Business:

Approval of the Minutes of the April 28, 2009 Regular Meeting - **Vote**

Items for Discussion and Action:

1. [Update on State Education Budget and Federal Stimulus Funding for Education](#) - **Discussion**
2. [Charter School Review and Renewal Process](#) - **Initial Discussion**
3. Educator Preparation and Licensure
 1. [Mathematics Subtest for Elementary and Special Education Teachers](#) - **Discussion and Vote to Adopt Emergency Amendment to Educator Licensure Regulations (603 CMR 7) for Transition Period**
 2. [Progress Report on Drafting New Standards for Principals, Superintendents, and Other Leadership Roles](#) - **Discussion**
4. Regionalization and Inter-district Collaboration
 1. [Update on Regional Collaboration Efforts](#) - **Discussion**
 2. [Amendments to Regional School District Regulations \(603 CMR 41\)](#) - **Discussion and Vote to**

Adopt Final Regulations

5. [Update on the State-Led Common Core Standards Initiative and Revision of English Language Arts and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks - Discussion](#)

Other Items for Information:

6. Education-Related News Clippings
7. [Report on Renewal Conditions: Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School](#)
8. Report on Grants Approved by the Commissioner
9. [Directions to the Meeting](#)

last updated: May 14, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Briefing for the May 19, 2009 Meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 8, 2009

The next regular meeting of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education will be on Tuesday, May 19, 2009, at Brookline High School. Board members are invited to arrive by 8 a.m. for coffee and a brief tour of the high school. The meeting will begin at **8:30 a.m.** and will adjourn by **1 p.m.** If you need overnight accommodations or any additional information about the schedule, please call Beverley O'Riordan at (781) 338-3118.

Overview

We are meeting at Brookline High School in honor of AJ Fajnzylber, who in June will conclude his elected term as chair of the State Student Advisory Council and as a member of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Superintendent Bill Lupini, Brookline High School Principal Bob Weintraub, and other local officials will welcome the Board and make a brief presentation at the start of our meeting. The topics for discussion on our agenda are: an update on the state education budget and federal stimulus funding for education, the charter school review and renewal process, two initiatives in educator preparation and licensure (including a vote on an emergency regulation relating to the mathematics subtest for prospective elementary and special education teachers), regionalization and inter-district collaboration (including a vote on final amendments to the regional school district regulations), and an update on revision of the English language arts and mathematics curriculum frameworks.

Comments from the Chair

Chair Banta will report on current issues and activities, appoint members to a committee to evaluate the commissioner's performance and invite Jeff Howard to give an update on the work of the Proficiency Gap Committee. Also, Chair Banta will announce that the Board will hold a special meeting on Monday evening, June 22nd, to discuss the ongoing work to redesign the accountability and assistance system.

Comments from the Commissioner

1. **Teacher recognition.** I was pleased to join Secretary Reville on May 5th at the Statehouse for a reception to honor some of our finest teachers. At the ceremony we recognized the Massachusetts Milken Award winner, five recipients of the Asperger's Association of New England's Award for Excellence in Teaching Students with Asperger's Syndrome, and the state's five finalists for the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. This was a great event and a wonderful opportunity to recognize some of the excellent teaching going on across the Commonwealth. The Milken Award winner was Chris Louis Sardella, a fifth grade teacher from the Marion E. Zeh Elementary School in Northborough. The Asperger's Association award went to Ruth Levine Arnold from the Heath School in Chestnut Hill, Terry Belliveau from the SABIS International Charter School in Springfield, Ruth Bluestone from the Parkview Elementary School in North Easton, Donna Kyed from the Cottage Street Elementary School in Sharon, and Ann Oakes from Brockton High School. Recipients of the Presidential Awards for Math and Science Teaching were Diana Cost from the Abigail Adams Middle School in Weymouth, Deborah Seaver from the Brookside Elementary School in Milford, Erin Flynn from the John D. Philbrick Elementary School in Boston, Kara Frankian from the Floral Street School in Shrewsbury, and Kristen MacDonald from the Fannie E. Proctor Elementary School in Northborough. These teachers exemplify the great skill and dedication that teachers in Massachusetts public schools bring to their work with students every day.
2. **Bureau of Special Education Appeals.** I expect to submit a plan by May 31st to the U.S. Department of Education in response to their directive to me to change the current organizational structure of our Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA) to bring it into full compliance with federal law. Lehigh University Professor Perry Zirkel, a national expert in special education law and due process hearings, will be reporting to me on the meetings he has conducted at my request with key stakeholder groups to get their perspectives on the various options, and on his research on how other states handle the dispute resolution process. We are also talking with other Massachusetts state agencies that might play a role in a restructured BSEA. I have made it clear to all concerned that I have only two objectives: to bring our dispute resolution process into full compliance with federal law, and to do it in such a way that we can continue to offer high quality, impartial services to parents, students, and schools. I will keep the Board posted on this matter.
3. **Reports to the Legislature.** The Department has filed the following reports with the Legislature, in response to directives in the FY09 budget and the General Laws. These reports are posted on our website at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/legislative.html>.
 - *Intervention and Targeted Assistance Efforts* reports on the Department's Accountability and Targeted Assistance Center, which maintains and manages the state's School and District Accountability System. The report includes the state system for identifying underperforming schools and districts; targeted assistance and intervention in Commonwealth Priority Schools, chronically underperforming schools and Commonwealth Pilot Schools; and progress to date in implementing chapter 311 of the acts of 2008, which dissolved the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability and the Education Management Audit Council and shifted the responsibility for review of district performance to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
 - *The Implementation of the Special Education Reimbursement ("Circuit Breaker") Program* reports on audits of school districts that are eligible for reimbursements for (a) students whose special education programs cost greater than four times the statewide foundation budget and (b) claims for extraordinary relief if special education costs in FY08 exceeded FY07 costs by at least 25 percent.

- *After-School and Out-of-School Time Quality Grant* reports on the grant program that provides funding to support and enhance quality in after-school and out-of-school time programs with public and private partnerships across the Commonwealth through activities that include academic tutoring and homework centers; programs that improve the health of students; art, theater, and music programs; enrichment activities; advanced study for the gifted and talented; and community service programs.
- *School Leadership Academies Training Initiative* reports on the ongoing work to support the development and implementation of the School Leadership Academies Training Initiative. The initiative, in partnership with the Legislature, the Wallace Foundation and the Massachusetts Leadership Alliance, is designed to identify, train and support principals and superintendents in order to increase their abilities to provide effective instructional and educational leadership to improve student achievement.

Comments from the Secretary

Secretary Reville will brief the Board on current issues and activities.

Items for Discussion and Action

1. **Update on State Education Budget and Federal Stimulus Funding for Education - Discussion**

I will update the Board on the latest information we have on the state budget for the balance of FY2009 and the budget outlook for FY2010. (We have the FY10 House budget proposal and may have the Senate budget proposal as well by the date of our meeting.) I will also report on the work we are doing in connection with allocation of federal stimulus funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). During the month of May the Department is holding 11 regional workshops for school district leaders throughout the Commonwealth to provide technical assistance on the ARRA grant process and to exchange ideas about how to use the federal funds most effectively. Secretary Reville will brief the Board on the education budget perspective from the Governor's office.

2. **Charter School Review and Renewal Process - Initial Discussion**

At our special meeting on March 23rd on charter school policy, the Board asked me to bring back some options for revising the charter school review and renewal process. We will have an initial discussion of some proposals at this month's meeting. We could, if you wish, use some of the time at the Board's retreat on August 13th to consider further whether and how to modify the current process for discussing and deciding on charter school matters - for example, to delegate certain functions to the commissioner or to a committee of the Board.

3. **Educator Preparation and Licensure**

1. **Mathematics Subtest for Elementary and Special Education Teachers - Discussion and Vote to Adopt Emergency Amendment to Educator Licensure Regulations (603 CMR 7) for Transition Period**

In April 2007, the Board amended the Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program

Approval to strengthen preparation and licensing of elementary and special education teachers to teach mathematics by specifying the subject matter knowledge requirements in mathematics. In December 2007, the Board approved Guidelines for the Mathematical Preparation of Elementary Teachers for use in preparation programs for elementary and K-8 special education teachers. These actions are significant steps to improve student proficiency in mathematics.

The 2007 regulations are now reflected in the Massachusetts Tests of Educator Licensure (MTEL). As of 2009, the revised General Curriculum test includes a separately scored mathematics subtest and a multi-subject subtest. At this month's meeting, I will present my decision for implementing a passing score (cut score) for each subtest and ask the Board to adopt an emergency amendment to the regulations to implement a reasonable transition plan.

The materials for this agenda item will be sent to Board members and posted online on or before May 13th.

2. Progress Report on Drafting New Standards for Principals, Superintendents, and Other Leadership Roles - Discussion

I reported to the Board in October 2008 on our work in educational leadership development, which has been supported by funding from the Wallace Foundation. This month I am presenting an update on our progress since October. I expect to bring proposed educational leadership standards to the Board for initial discussion in June.

4. Regionalization and Inter-district Collaboration

1. Update on Regional Collaboration Efforts - Discussion

Seeking out opportunities for regional collaboration in K-12 education to provide students with a full range of educational and support services at a reasonable cost is a high priority for Governor Patrick, Secretary Reville and me. I will present an overview of our work in this area, which falls under two headings: providing a regional system of support to existing districts, and encouraging our smallest districts to consolidate into larger units.

2. Amendments to Regional School District Regulations (603 CMR 41) - Discussion and Vote to Adopt Final Regulations

At the January 2009 meeting, the Board voted to solicit public comment on proposed amendments to the regulations governing regional school districts, dealing with three issues: a transition period following creation of new regional school districts, procedures for member towns to determine the method of assessing regional district costs, and procedures to be followed if a town fails to hold a town meeting to reconsider a previously rejected regional district budget. The memo under Tab 4(b) summarizes the comments we received on the proposed amendments and our responses. I recommend that the Board vote to adopt the amendments this month.

5. Update on the State-Led Common Core Standards Initiative and Revision of English Language Arts and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks

Deputy Commissioner Jeff Nellhaus and I will update the Board on activity at the national level to develop "common core standards" in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12. We will discuss the

implications of this national initiative for the revision of our Massachusetts curriculum frameworks and update you on progress and anticipated next steps in revising the frameworks.

Other Items for Information

6. **Education-Related News Clippings**

Enclosed are several recent articles about education.

7. **Report on Renewal Conditions: Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School**

The Board renewed the charter for Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School in February 2007 with two conditions, which the school has now met. A report is enclosed for your information.

8. **Report on Grants Approved by the Commissioner**

Under Tab 8 is a report on grants that I have approved, per the Board's vote in October 2008 to delegate grant approvals to the commissioner. This authorization allows us to make decisions and inform grant applicants on a timely basis. The Board also delegated authority to me to approve extended loan terms for charter schools, a routine administrative matter. I have not approved any such loan terms since my last report.

Directions to the Meeting

If you have questions about any agenda items, please call me. I look forward to seeing you at Brookline High School on May 19th.

last updated: May 13, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

FY2010 Senate Ways & Means Budget

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Commissioner

Date: May 14, 2009


This afternoon the Senate Committee on Ways and Means released its Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Recommendations, House # 4101, to the Senate.

The Senate Ways and Means Committee members have recommended a total budget for the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) of \$4.258 billion. This amount reflects a decrease of \$269.5 million below the Department's FY2009 current projected spending of \$4.527 billion, after the October and January 9C budget cuts. The Senate Ways and Means budget represents a \$205.5 million decrease from the Final FY2010 House Budget.

As you may recall, the Governor's House 1 consolidated a majority of DESE's accounts. House 1 took 31 DESE accounts and consolidated similar accounts into 11 new accounts with budget language that gave the Commissioner some discretion in the allocation of limited FY10 resources to priority areas. The Senate Ways and Means Budget does not consolidate accounts as the Governor recommended, with one exception. The three literacy programs are consolidated, but fully reference the previous literacy line item language for the Bay State Reading Institute, the John Silber Literacy Program and the Early Literacy Program.

Both the Senate Ways and Means and the House budgets transfer all DESE IT funds to the Secretary of Education, in concurrence with the Governor's plan for state-wide IT consolidation.

The FY2010 Senate Ways and Means Budget is scheduled for debate by the Senate starting the week of May 19th. I will send you an updated narrative and funding analysis when House #4101 is adopted by the Senate and the final Senate Budget is released by the Senate Clerk.

The *attached chart*  lists all of the Department's accounts in numeric order. The columns list the original FY09 DESE appropriations, the FY09 DESE current appropriations after the two (October & January) 9C cuts, the specific FY10 House 1 account recommendations, the FY10 House Recommendations, and the variance between the House and Senate Ways & Means Budgets.

We will continue to analyze the Senate Ways and Means Budget, and the details behind the major variances between the two budgets. I will provide you with an update on the FY2010 Budget and the Federal Stimulus funding at the May Board meeting.

The full text of the Senate Ways and Means FY2010 Budget Recommendations is available online at: <http://www.mass.gov/legis/10budget/senate/intro.htm>. Section 2 contains all the budget line items and ESE's line items start at 7010-0005.

If you have any questions regarding this budget, please feel free to call me.

last updated: May 14, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Charter School Agenda Items - Possible Changes to the Board's Work Process

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 8, 2009

At the Board's special meeting on charter school policies on March 23, 2009, one of the topics we discussed was the Board's significant workload in carrying out its responsibilities as the only charter authorizing body in the state. You asked me to identify possible options for balancing the time spent on charter school matters with the Board's many other policy responsibilities. This matter will be particularly relevant during the upcoming year, when we will need to deal with a record nineteen charter renewal requests.

Here are three possible approaches to this problem:

1. A committee of the Board could be formed to review my recommendations on charter renewals and charter amendments. The committee, operating under the Open Meeting Law, would have a detailed discussion and make a recommendation to the full Board. This option assumes that the full Board would be prepared to give significant weight to the committee's findings, in order to reduce the discussion time required at the regular Board meeting.
2. The Board could, under its existing authority, delegate the following decisions to the Commissioner:
 - any charter renewals that are recommended without conditions or probation; and
 - all charter amendments other than those for changes in grade span, maximum enrollment, or districts served.

The Commissioner would report all delegated decisions to the Board at the subsequent month's meeting. The Board would retain direct authority for:

- the award of new charters;
 - charter renewal recommendations involving conditions or probation;
 - recommendations for non-renewal of a charter; and
 - all charter amendments involving changes in grade span, maximum enrollment, or districts served.
3. The Board could recommend to the Legislature that a totally separate and independent authorizing board be established, as is the case in many other states. Although this would provide the most significant reduction in the Board's workload, I believe there is great value in having a single board oversee all public schools in the state. Therefore, I consider this a less desirable option than either of the first two.

Finally, I would recommend that you revisit whether it is necessary to have each charter school decision discussed at two successive Board meetings. As you know, this practice is based on article II, section 7, of the Board's by-laws, which reads:

Except in an emergency, the Board shall take action on a matter of policy only when the matter has been discussed by the Board at a previous meeting. This provision may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the members present.

Actions involving specific schools, whether it be the award, the renewal, or the amendment of charters, are more operational than policy in nature, and it may not be a productive use of your time to assume that every one of these decisions requires two separate discussions. I would suggest that the norm should be discussing and voting on these items at a single meeting. For particular items requiring additional discussion or time for reflection, the Board always has the option of tabling a discussion to a future meeting.

I am presenting these proposals for your initial consideration this month. Since you will be discussing various aspects of Board operations at the retreat scheduled for August 13th, that might be an opportune time for the Board to decide whether and how to modify the current process for discussing and deciding on charter school matters.

last updated: May 13, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Mathematics Subtest for Elementary and Special Education Teachers: Determination of Passing Score and Proposed Amendment to Educator Licensure Regulations for Transition Period

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 13, 2009

Introduction and Overview

In April 2007, the Board of Education (as it was then called) adopted amendments to the *Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approval* for the purpose of strengthening preparation and licensing of elementary and special education teachers to teach mathematics. As a result, the regulations now specify the subject matter knowledge requirements in mathematics, focusing on outcomes rather than on a list of arts and sciences coursework. In December 2007, the Board approved and endorsed *Guidelines for the Mathematical Preparation of Elementary Teachers* and commended their use in all preparation programs for elementary and K-8 special education teachers. These actions are significant steps to improve students' proficiency in mathematics.

The 2007 regulations are now reflected in the Massachusetts Tests for Educator Licensure (MTEL). As of 2009, the revised General Curriculum test includes a separately scored mathematics subtest and a multi-subject subtest. At this month's meeting, I am presenting my decision for implementing a passing score (cut score) for each subtest. I am asking the Board to approve an emergency amendment to the regulations in order to implement the transition plan discussed below.

Massachusetts and most other states have long used multi-subject tests to determine whether candidates for licenses at the elementary level are sufficiently knowledgeable to be licensed and begin teaching in grades 1 to 6. Massachusetts is, however, the first state to include a separate requirement for passing a mathematics component of an elementary test for licensure.

The new test was administered for the first time on March 7, 2009. A panel of higher education faculty and public

school educators was convened on March 25, 2009 to review and rate the General Curriculum test items in order to provide information for the Commissioner to use in establishing each subtest cut score. For the General Curriculum multi-subject subtest of language arts, history & social science, and science & technology engineering, we will implement the panel-recommended cut score. As applied to the examinees from the first test administration on March 7, just over one-half of the test-takers will pass the multi-subject subtest.

The mathematics subtest presents several policy challenges that I want to discuss with the Board, as well as my recommended approach for addressing them. The test is fair but demanding, as can be seen by the sample items in the Addendum. The panel-recommended cut score for the mathematics subtest was responsive to the Board's charge to ensure that candidates seeking to enter elementary school teaching in Massachusetts have a solid mathematical content knowledge base. Notwithstanding, implementing the panel-recommended cut score would result in only a 27% pass rate for individuals who took the math subtest on March 7.

The General Curriculum test is a requirement for both prospective elementary school teachers and special education teacher candidates. While there is currently an oversupply of elementary school teachers statewide, special education is an area of persistent and significant shortage. I believe it is important to uphold the recommended standard, and to do so in a manner that is sensitive to the need to build the capacity of aspiring educators and the institutions that prepare them.

Accordingly, after a thorough internal review, I have determined to:

1. Set the cut score for both the General Curriculum multi-subject and math subtests at the panel-recommended levels and determine that candidates who score at or above those levels have passed the subtest (s) and have met the knowledge requirements for their licenses. Candidates who pass one but not both subtests will not have to retake the subtest that they pass.
2. Establish a transition phase for this new and demanding math subtest. For a limited time (i.e., three years) we will deem those who earn a scaled score of at least 227-239 to have passed the subtest for the purpose of their first stage of licensure.

These teachers, however, will have to retake and earn a scaled score of 240 or above on the math subtest in order to renew the license or move up to the next stage of licensure. Only upon meeting the panel's recommended cut score will they have fully met the knowledge requirements of the license.

N.B. By statute, the preliminary and initial licenses are valid for five years of employment. Thus, such teachers would have five years in which to achieve the panel's recommended cut score and demonstrate that they have met the knowledge requirements of the license.

3. At the end of three years (beginning in July 2012), all candidates for the elementary and special education licenses must score 240 or above.

Regulatory Amendment

To allow for such a transition period, it is necessary for the Board to amend the *Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approval* (603 CMR 7.00) in order to create the new category for candidates in # 2, above. Our proposed amendment to the regulations is as follows:

Between March 7, 2009 and June 30, 2012, candidates for the following preliminary and initial licenses who earn a scaled score of at least 227-239 on the Mathematics portion of the General Curriculum test: Elementary, Teacher of Students with Moderate Disabilities, Teacher of Students with Severe Disabilities, Teacher of the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing and Teacher of the Visually Impaired, will be deemed to have passed the Mathematics portion of the General Curriculum test. All candidates who are licensed under this provision must earn a scaled score of 240 or above on the Mathematics portion of the General Curriculum test in order to be eligible for the next stage of licensure or to renew their initial license.

We are presenting it as an emergency regulation, in order for the Board to be able to adopt the amendment at our May 19 meeting and have it take effect immediately. Given that the delay in test score release has already created considerable concern among candidates and preparing institutions, we want to act on this issue as soon as possible.

The emergency amendment, if passed, would be effective for three months, during which time we must solicit and review public comment and then bring the regulation back to the Board for a final vote. The proposed regulation would sunset after three years (June 30, 2012). As a practical matter, this means that candidates in category # 2 who are licensed in 2009 would have until the end of their fifth year of employment to meet the math standard, and any candidate who scores in this range in subsequent test administrations before June 30, 2012 would likewise have a five-year period of employment to meet the panel recommended cut score. This aligns with the statutory requirements of our licensure framework. Any candidate who applies in July 2012 or thereafter, however, would have to earn a score of 240 or above on the math subtest.

Finally, I am directing staff at the Department to continue to work with preparing institutions to help them prepare candidates to meet this new standard. We will also review whether the Department can sponsor special institutes or other technical assistance for candidates and preparing institutions as we work together to develop statewide capacity to meet this challenging new mathematics standard.

Additional Background

Individuals seeking licensure as an elementary or special education teacher at the elementary level in Massachusetts are expected to demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing and multiple subject matter areas. The Board requires candidates to pass the MTEL Communication and Literacy Skills, Foundations of Reading, and General Curriculum tests as part of the licensure requirements. The previous General Curriculum test, administered for the last time in November 2008, addressed the content areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, History, Social Science, Science and Child Development.

In December 2006, the Board supported the Commissioner's proposal to establish a separately scored mathematics subtest for aspiring teachers at the elementary level. The new approach came in response to mounting evidence, both statewide and nationally, that elementary teachers are the front line of mathematics education. They prepare all students for the secondary grades, for college, and for careers that require increasingly demanding levels of mathematical skill and thinking. Our students' math achievement is ahead of the nation but below that of their top performing international peers. It will not rise until K-12 mathematics teaching and learning improves substantially starting with elementary school.

At its January 2007 meeting, the Board voted to solicit public comment on proposed amendments to the

Regulations for Educator Licensure and Preparation Program Approval (603 CMR 7.06 (7) (b) 2. a.-c.). These amendments were designed to strengthen mathematics preparation of elementary and special education teachers at the elementary level and to clarify the breadth and depth of mathematics knowledge topics addressed on the General Curriculum test.

Overall, the comments we received on the proposed amendments were supportive of the need to strengthen the mathematics preparation of teachers at the elementary level by specifying the knowledge standards that candidates are expected to demonstrate and expanding the mathematics subject matter knowledge requirements for preparation and a separately scored General Curriculum mathematics subtest.

Based on the comments, the Department made some revisions to the proposed amendments. The Board discussed and adopted the amendments to the regulations on April 24, 2007. Following is the text of the regulation (emphasis added):

2. Mathematics.

1. Basic principles and concepts important for teaching elementary-school mathematics in the following areas.
 1. Number and operations (the foundation of areas ii-iv)
 2. Functions and algebra
 3. Geometry and measurement
 4. Statistics and probability
2. Candidates shall demonstrate that they possess both fundamental computation skills and comprehensive, in-depth understanding of K-8 mathematics. They must demonstrate not only that they know *how to do* elementary mathematics, but that they *understand* and can explain to students, in multiple ways, *why it makes sense*.
3. The Commissioner, in consultation with the Chancellor of Higher Education, **shall issue guidelines for the scope and depth of knowledge expected in mathematics**, described in a. and b. above.

The regulations directed the Commissioner, in consultation with the Chancellor of Higher Education, to issue guidelines for the scope and depth of knowledge expected in elementary mathematics in order to assist Massachusetts teacher preparation programs in revising how they prepare candidates for licenses at the elementary level, including K-8 special education teachers. The completed publication, *Guidelines for the Mathematical Preparation of Elementary Teachers*, was distributed to the Board in August 2007. The Board endorsed the guidelines in December 2007. The document was also distributed to all Massachusetts educator preparation programs and posted on the Department's website.

The *Guidelines for the Mathematical Preparation of Elementary Teachers* articulate the scope and depth of mathematics knowledge—*both skills and understanding*—expected of elementary teachers. The guidelines require candidates to delve more deeply into the underlying structures of mathematics than previously. They require mathematics and teacher preparation program faculty to substantially rethink and redesign their courses. [<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/pd.html>]

General Curriculum Test Development

Test development activities for the General Curriculum test, beginning early in 2007, involved the participation of public school educators and higher education faculty across the state. The two-year period from the Board's adoption of the new regulations to the first administration of the new test were intended to provide candidates, educator preparation program faculty and others with time to prepare for the new requirement. Below is a summary of the test development process.

Test Objectives Development (completed June 2007)

The General Curriculum test objectives, which are broad, meaningful statements of subject matter knowledge and skills that are important for entry-level teaching in Massachusetts public schools, define the test. The test objectives were prepared based on several sources, including the educator licensing regulations and student learning standards, with extensive input from and review by educators. The draft test objectives were reviewed by bias review and content advisory committees of Massachusetts higher education faculty and public school educators from across the state.

Content Validation Survey (Fall 2007)

A Content Validation Survey was conducted to provide empirical and confirmatory evidence in support of the validity of the General Curriculum test objectives. The Content Validation Survey, which is sometimes referred to as a *job analysis survey*, validates the test objectives that form the basis of the test content by ascertaining that job incumbents and educator experts (i.e., Massachusetts public school educators, arts and sciences faculty, and educator preparation faculty) consider the content of each test objective important for entry-level teaching. Participants provided ratings to indicate the importance of each objective and its set of descriptive statements, which provide examples of content that may be included on the General Curriculum test. Respondents also provided information about how well the set of objectives, as a whole, represent the subject matter knowledge required for entry-level teaching in the state. The survey results confirmed each test objective as valid.

Item Development and Review (Winter 2008)

Following the Content Validation Survey, test items, or questions, were developed based on the validated test objectives and other relevant materials from the content advisory committee. Draft test items were reviewed, revised as necessary, and approved by the committee and by the Department.

Pilot Testing (Spring/Summer 2008)

The items for the new General Curriculum test were pilot tested to gather information about their quality and technical characteristics. The pilot test provided teacher candidates and other individuals at Massachusetts institutions the opportunity to respond to test items that may be included on future test forms.

Practice Test (June 2008)

The new test objectives and a full-length General Curriculum practice test were posted on the MTEL website to further assist candidates and institutions in preparing for the content and structure of the new test. The practice test includes the test directions, answer sheets, multiple-choice test items and answer keys, open-response (written)

assignments, and sample weak and strong open-response items. The answer key provided with the practice test identifies the specific objective addressed in each test question.

Test Administration (March 2009)

The new General Curriculum test was first administered on March 7, 2009. A total of 905 examinees took the multi-subject subtest only, and a total of 680 examinees took the mathematics subtest only. A total of 596 examinees took both of the subtests. As with the Communication and Literacy Skills Test, examinees have the option of taking one or both General Curriculum subtests per test date. The choice is made at the time of registration.

Qualifying Score Conference (March 2009)

Following the first administration of the test, a panel of 25 Massachusetts higher education faculty and public school educators (about one-third of whom participated on the content advisory committee) participated in qualifying score activities in which they reviewed results of the March 7 test administration and provided the Department with information to use in setting the passing standards for the test. The qualifying score activities began with an extensive orientation and training session, followed by a test simulation task during which panel members independently took the test that was administered on March 7 and then provided a rating for each test item to indicate the percentage of just acceptably qualified entry-level educators who would answer the item correctly.

Following the independent item ratings, the panel engaged in additional discussion about the level of knowledge and skills required in Massachusetts of entry-level educators as well as factors that could influence examinee performance on the test. The final task for the panel was to complete a second round of item ratings, in which they had the opportunity to change their initial ratings if they chose to do so.

Following the Qualifying Score Conference, the state's contractor for the MTEL program, Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, calculated the recommended qualifying score for each General Curriculum subtest based on the panel's item ratings. The panel-recommended qualifying score was calculated as the sum of the individual item medians, and the information was submitted to the Commissioner to use in establishing the test cut scores. This process is consistent with the modified-Angoff method that has historically been used in making MTEL qualifying score recommendations.

At each stage of the General Curriculum test development process, two meetings of the content advisory committee and one of the qualifying score committee, participants were provided with copies of the *Guidelines for the Mathematical Preparation of Elementary Teachers* in order to ensure they understood our expectations for the level of competence we believe is required to establish a solid foundation in mathematics for all students.


The panel's test item ratings and recommended passing score are consistent with the high expectations highlighted in the Guidelines. The qualifying score derived from their item ratings is beyond the capabilities of nearly three-fourths of the current candidates for the elementary and related special education licenses. For those who have been concerned about the weak mathematical content knowledge base of many elementary and special education teachers, the low results were anticipated as a possible outcome. In light of the challenge inherent in transforming the quality of mathematics preparation within our elementary and special education teaching force, I believe it is appropriate to transition to this goal over a reasonable period of time. We are adopting this approach in our



proposed amendment.

The proposed approach reflects an attempt to balance higher expectations for mathematics knowledge and skills with the understanding that fundamentally changing the depth of mathematics competence among beginning teachers is a significant and ambitious undertaking that will take some time. During this transition stage we will expect to see pass rates for the mathematics subtest that are lower than for other MTEL tests as educator preparation programs and candidates work toward meeting the new mathematics standard.

This is a challenging new standard for our state's aspiring educators and preparing institutions to meet. I am confident that the approach we are recommending upholds our commitment to high standards while allowing a reasonable transition. This initiative will result in better prepared elementary and special education teachers, and more importantly, students who are provided a strong early foundation in mathematics.

Attachments:

  [Sample General Curriculum Mathematics Subtest Items](#)

  [MTEL General Curriculum, Mathematics Subtest Committee Members Motion](#)

last updated: May 18, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › BESE Home
- › Board Meeting Schedule
- › Board in Brief
- › Board Meeting Minutes
- › BESE Members
- › Board Documents
- › BESE Advisory Councils
- › Chairman's Statements

District/School Administration › Administration ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Progress Report on Drafting New Standards for Principals, Superintendents, and Other Leadership Roles

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 13, 2009

At our meeting in October 2008, I updated the Board on the Department's work in educator leadership development. (Please see the attached memo dated October 21, 2008, or view it at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/1008/item6.html>.) As noted in the October memo, we have found wide agreement among Massachusetts public school administrators and their associations, as well as among representatives of the higher education community, that our current professional standards for administrators are outdated and far too general to serve as an effective basis for the preparation, licensing, and ongoing development of school and district administrators.

This memorandum is an update on our progress since October in developing the leadership policy standards and building a cohesive educational leadership system. Key activities have included:

- November 2008 -A national panel of experts met with about 20 administrators and staff from our Massachusetts Cohesive Leadership System (MCLS) team sites to share their experiences with instituting new leadership standards. The panel emphasized the challenges and opportunities entailed in using such standards to create a more cohesive leadership system - specifically, getting the standards from policy into program redesign and ensuring that they are levers for changing practice. The panel identified specific roles for various constituencies in that process.

Also in November 2008, the Wallace Foundation sponsored a national forum in Boston for over 75 Wallace-funded researchers and state and district leaders to learn about work underway on using formative assessments to strengthen leaders' performance. A national town hall meeting conducted by the New York Times, which some Board members attended, included a panel discussion with Massachusetts education leaders to explore the question, "What Kind of Leaders Do Our Schools Deserve?"

- December 2008 -A team from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), consisting of individuals who

have been working with the Wallace Network states on the development of cohesive leadership systems, provided written and verbal feedback to the Department and our district partners, Springfield and Boston, on the draft standards and performance indicators.

- Ongoing -The district-based programs in Springfield and Boston continue to work with the analytical process they developed as part of the Massachusetts Cohesive Leadership System for redesigning their principal preparation programs to ensure that candidates will be prepared to meet the new standards when they are adopted.
- April 2009 -Dr. Joe Simpson facilitated a full-day workshop with Massachusetts stakeholders and representatives from eight preparation programs, most of whom have agreed to pilot the analytical redesign review using the new standards next year (formerly called a gap analysis). Participants worked through a series of activities as a whole and in small groups to come to consensus on a definition of effective education leadership and the dispositions required of candidates for the role.
- April 2009 -David Haselkorn joined the Department as the new Associate Commissioner to lead the Center for Educator Policy, Preparation, Licensure, and Leadership Development.
- May 2009 - The Department submitted a new scope of work to the Wallace Foundation for their final cycle of funding. The scope emphasizes scale and sustainability activities for implementing the new standards and performance indicators once they have been approved by the Board. The grant would be for \$2 million to support ongoing work of the Department and its partner districts of Springfield and Boston.

In June, I will present new standards for educational leaders for the Board's approval in the form of proposed amendments to the licensure regulations. Consistent with the performance-based Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISLLC: 2008), they will identify broad policy standards and program and practice standards in the form of performance indicators differentiated by position and career stage. The broad policy standards, (which were shared with the Board in draft form last October) are staked to the four key areas that research has identified as critical in the preparation and ongoing development of strong educational leaders: (1) leadership for learning and instruction; (2) organizational management and operations; (3) community partnerships; and (4) reflective leadership.

These broad policy standards inform the development of the draft performance indicators that we will bring to you in June. Taken together, they will address what beginning principals should know and be able to do, as well as the core dispositions such educational leaders should possess. Work is also underway on performance indicators for experienced principals and beginning and experienced superintendents.

Our initiative to build a cohesive standards-based, results-oriented system for leadership development has included significant engagement with the field here in Massachusetts, with state and national researchers, and with other state partners in the Wallace network. The new policy standards and performance indicators, when adopted, will help to guide the identification, recruitment, preparation, mentoring, and assessment of a new generation of education leaders who will lead the way to increased academic achievement for all our students.

Attachment:

[October 21, 2008 memo](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Update on the Department's Regional Collaboration Efforts

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 13, 2009

The proposed amendments to the regional school district regulations on the agenda for our May 19 meeting give me an opportunity to update you on the Department's efforts to foster more regional collaboration among the Commonwealth's 330 operating school districts. Half of our school districts have fewer than 2000 students, making it difficult for many of them to provide a full range of educational and support services at a reasonable cost. Given our limited fiscal resources, seeking out new opportunities for regional collaboration in K12 education is a major priority for the Governor, the Secretary, and me.

Our efforts in this area fall under two general headings - providing a regional system of support to existing districts, and encouraging our smallest districts to consolidate into larger units.

Regional system of support

The Department's Center for Targeted Assistance is working to provide a statewide regional system of support through a two-tiered strategy. The ten largest, highest poverty districts in the Commonwealth are known as the Commissioner's Districts and are given first priority for State oversight and support (Tier 1). For each of these districts we are providing the following targeted assistance: guidance, training and specific data collection tools that serve instructional leadership, classroom practice, and teacher collaboration; conducting and modeling structured school site visits; and conducting data-driven problem solving sessions with district leaders. To improve student performance in the remaining districts (Tier 2), we are seeking to provide this same range of support through two regional approaches. First, in an effort to leverage resources and maximize the impact of federal funds, we directed a percentage of the FY 08 and FY 09 Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) regionally to Title I schools. This regional distribution of funding enabled us to pilot a more collaborative approach to supporting small- and medium-sized districts in need of intervention that alone lack the infrastructure and capacity to address causes of low performance. The regional approach to this grant program, now in its second year, has initiated and promoted cross-

district collaboration and cooperation by concentrating and pooling resources to realize better economies of scale and benefit from collaboration that transcends district boundaries.

The second Tier 2 regional effort began in November 2008 when the Department launched a pilot "regional school improvement assistance center" to enhance the capacity of district personnel to identify and respond to the assistance needs of low performing schools in the Greater Boston metropolitan area. Serving the districts of Revere, Somerville, Everett, Saugus, Malden, Medford, Winthrop, Cambridge and Chelsea, the School Improvement Assistance Center (SIAC) is currently engaged in facilitating a range of multi-district program initiatives identified by the participating district leaders. The Center for Targeted Assistance plans to launch three additional "regional school improvement assistance centers" by fall 2009 that would serve districts in the southeastern, western and central parts of the state. The Department is currently engaged in discussions with the Executive Office of Education to integrate the activities of these three regional centers with the Governor's proposed Commonwealth Readiness Centers.

Regionalization and district consolidation

The Department's Center for School Finance, Planning, Research, and Evaluation coordinates our work in encouraging smaller districts to consolidate into more efficiently-sized entities. Earlier this year we issued planning grants to a dozen groups of communities around the state, ranging from the outer Cape to the Berkshires, giving them the opportunity to begin studying the advantages and disadvantages of various configurations and organizational options. We are also working with the Massachusetts Association of Regional Schools (MARS) on a study of central office staffing patterns that we hope will provide useful information to local officials.

Among the proposals currently under consideration:

- The towns of Ayer, Lunenburg, and Shirley have completed an extensive study resulting in a recommendation to create a new, three-town regional district. This proposal is expected to be presented to their respective town meetings this fall.
- The towns of Berkley and Somerset have begun intensive discussions on creating a new regional high school, with encouragement and support from the Massachusetts School Building Authority.
- Just this past week, a proposal to consolidate the small, K-6 Hawlemont district into the Mohawk Trail district was defeated at one town meeting by only four votes. Although disappointing, the narrow margin of defeat gives us hope that the proposal might be favorably reconsidered in the future.
- The Franklin County School Project, under the auspices of Greenfield Community College and with financial support from the Department and other organizations, has produced an excellent series of reports outlining the challenges and opportunities of regional collaboration and consolidation in one of the state's most rural areas. We have put their most recent report, written by the New England School Development Council (NESDEC), on our Department website (<http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/regional/FranklinCountyStudy.pdf>) as a resource for others around the state.

Regionalization is a difficult political process, in part due to the long history of independent towns dating back to Colonial times, and it can take years of study for a proposal to reach the point of public acceptance. Some states have tried to mandate district consolidation, with varying degrees of success. Right now our approach in Massachusetts is to encourage and assist local officials and citizens in studying options and identifying solutions that make sense for their communities.



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Amendments to Regulations on Regional School Districts, 603 CMR 41

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 8, 2009

At its January 27, 2009, meeting, the Board authorized the Commissioner to solicit public comment on proposed amendments to the regulations governing regional school districts, 603 CMR 41. The proposed amendments dealt with three issues:

- Providing for a transition period of not more than two years following the creation of new regional school districts.
- Clarifying the procedures through which member towns determine the method of assessing regional district costs.
- Clarifying the procedures to be followed if a town fails to hold a town meeting to reconsider a previously rejected regional district budget.



We received several comments in response to the proposed amendments.

- The Massachusetts Association of Regional Schools expressed support for the proposed changes, noting that they will clarify the process by which regional districts interact with their member towns.
- The Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials (MASBO) noted that the transition period proposal will require a clear definition of the respective roles of municipal and district officials during the transition period. We agree, but believe that is best left to be determined by local officials to reflect the unique needs of each consolidation. MASBO also asked for clarification on how regional budget approvals are affected by overrides. This issue has been addressed separately by the Department of Revenue. Finally, MASBO expressed support for the proposed change relating to failure to hold a town meeting.
- Stephen Maio, town administrator of the Town of Wakefield, expressed opposition to the change regarding town meeting votes. He recommends that failure to hold a town meeting be considered a "no" vote on the budget. Wakefield is a member of the Northeastern Metropolitan Vocational Technical District, which

unfortunately has had some contentious budget deliberations during the past several years. We understand his concerns, but the predominant view among officials in other towns is in support of the change, under which a failure to hold a town meeting will be considered a "yes" vote. This will allow towns to avoid the time and expense of a special town meeting in the more typical instance where a regional school committee has made adjustments to the budget in response to the concerns of its member towns.

A copy of the proposed changes is attached, along with a motion for the Board's consideration. I recommend that the Board approve these amendments to 603 CMR 41.

Attachments

  Proposed Amendments to 603 CMR 41.00, Regional School Districts Regulations

last updated: May 18, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Update on the State-Led Common Core Standards Initiative and Revision of Massachusetts ELA and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 8, 2009

The purpose of the memorandum is to: (1) Provide an update on recent developments at the national level relating to the development of "common core standards" in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12; (2) Discuss the implications of the common core standards initiative for the revision of the Commonwealth's English language arts and Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks; and (3) Update you on our progress in revising those frameworks.

I. Common Core Standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices have proposed the development and adoption of a common core of standards in English language arts and mathematics for grades K-12. The intent is to align the standards with college and work expectations, include rigorous content and skills, and benchmark the standards internationally. A second phase of the initiative will be the development of assessments aligned to the core standards.

Governor Patrick and I have signed a Memorandum of Agreement to join this initiative, as summarized below. By signing the MOA, the Governor and I have agreed only to the process and structure for developing the common core standards. We did not commit the Commonwealth to adopting the standards that result from the effort.

Summary of the Common Core Standards Memorandum of Agreement

- *State-based leadership:* The CCSSO and the NGA Center will facilitate a state-led process to develop ELA and mathematics standards that are:

- fewer, clearer and higher, to best drive effective policy and practice;
 - aligned with college and work expectations;
 - inclusive of rigorous content and application of knowledge;
 - internationally benchmarked; and
 - research- and evidence-based.
- *National Validation Committee:* The CCSSO and the NGA Center will create an expert validation group to provide an independent review of the common core and certify state adoption of the standards. Participating states will have an opportunity to nominate individuals to the validation committee.
 - *Develop End-of-High-School Expectations:* The CCSSO and NGA Center will convene Achieve, ACT, and the College Board to develop a set of end-of-high-school expectations in ELA and mathematics by July 2009. States will have an opportunity to provide input on these expectations.
 - *Develop K-12 Standards in ELA and Mathematics:* The CCSSO and NGA Center will convene Achieve, ACT, and the College Board to develop K-12 standards by December 2009. Participating states will provide input and work as partners with the organizations in the development process.
 - *Adoption:* Participating states will be expected to adopt the common core standards within three years. States choosing to adopt the standards would agree to ensure that the common core represents at least 85 percent of the state's standards in ELA and mathematics.
 - *National Policy Forum:* The CCSSO and NGA Center will convene a National Policy Forum comprised of key national organizations to share ideas, gather input, and inform the common core initiative.
 - *Federal Role:* Financial support for developing the common core, common assessments, professional development, and research to improve this effort over time would be sought from the federal government, through funding such as the Race to the Top Fund authorized in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Other federal supports and incentives would also be sought.

II. Implications of the Common Core Initiative for Revising the Massachusetts ELA and Math Frameworks

Given the significance of the common core initiative, I have directed Department staff to ensure that the schedule and process for revising the Massachusetts ELA and Mathematics Frameworks takes into account the development of the common core standards. This does not mean putting our revision process on hold until the common core is completed next December. On the contrary, I have directed staff to continue with the revision process, but to monitor the extent to which the revisions we are contemplating are consistent with information we get from the common core standards initiative. Our current standards will undoubtedly be considered as benchmarks for the common core along with the standards of several other states and nations known for setting a high bar for student learning. The extent to which we have considered how our current standards can be improved even further will only strengthen our ability to inform the development of the common core, and ensure that the end result is a set of standards that the Board would consider integrating into our own curriculum frameworks.

III. Revision of the ELA and Mathematics Frameworks

1. Mathematics Framework

At the request of Board member Tom Fortmann, the Mathematics Framework Revision Progress Report submitted to the Board at the March 2009 meeting was sent to several experts for review. Board member Sandra Stotsky also provided feedback. The attached revised Progress Report reflects the experts' and Sandra Stotsky's comments and will be used to guide the revision of the framework in Phase II, which is scheduled to

begin this summer.

2. **ELA Framework**

You may recall the Department presented a revised draft of the ELA Framework to the Board in January 2009. Several concerns about the draft were raised at that meeting and at a subsequent meeting with Board members Stotsky and Fortmann and Department staff. In response, Department staff have been working on a second draft of the revised ELA Framework. While still a work in progress, the new draft will be more closely aligned with the standards published in 2001 than the version of the revised framework presented to the Board in January. While maintaining the integrity of content standards in the 2001 ELA revision, this second revised draft will include a number of differences:

- Standards will be grade-specific rather than covering grade spans as they did in 2001;
- Standards for the foundations of reading and vocabulary will be different as a result of research that has emerged since 2001;
- Writing standards will be organized by purposes of writing (to convey experience, to explain, and to persuade); these categories are also used by NAEP; and
- The standards will be organized into 15 topics, formerly 27 in the 2001 document, to create a more user-friendly and accessible document.

A draft of the newly revised ELA Curriculum Framework should be completed soon. Our next step will be to share it with a number of experts and evaluate its alignment with the emerging common core standards, before bringing it back to the Board for discussion next fall.



Revised Progress Report: *Mathematics Curriculum Framework* Revision Panel

last updated: May 13, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)



- › [BESE Home](#)
- › [Board Meeting Schedule](#)
- › [Board in Brief](#)
- › [Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- › [BESE Members](#)
- › [Board Documents](#)
- › [BESE Advisory Councils](#)
- › [Chairman's Statements](#)

[District/School Administration](#) › [Administration](#) ›

The Massachusetts Board of Education

Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School - Report on Conditions

To: Members of the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education

From: Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner

Date: May 8, 2009

The charter of Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School (McAuliffe) was renewed with two conditions in February 2007. At this time, the school has met both of the conditions.

Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School

McAuliffe, a regional Commonwealth charter school, is located in Framingham. The school opened in 2002 and is chartered to serve grades six through eight with a maximum enrollment of 306. In 2008-09, McAuliffe is serving 212 students. The school draws its students predominantly from Framingham, with students enrolling from Natick and approximately 16 other Metrowest communities.

The school's mission is "to cultivate within each member of a diverse student body, through the Expeditionary Learning design, an intense commitment to self and community, the courage and insight to set high standards for academic and personal success, and the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to achieve those standards."

Report on Conditions

Condition 1: The Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School will demonstrate significant improvement in its financial condition in FY07 and FY08 as evidenced by:

1. Unqualified audit opinions with no material findings for both fiscal years;

Condition met. The school received unqualified opinions with no material findings for both FY07 and FY08, though in FY08, the school's auditors noted issues related to general ledger closing procedures and

cash controls that the school indicates it will address.

2. Annual surpluses as determined by audited income statements for both fiscal years;

Condition met. The school recorded annual surpluses of approximately \$77,000 and \$10,000 for FY07 and FY08 respectively.

3. Current assets exceeding current liabilities as determined by audited balance sheets for both fiscal years.

Condition met. For FY07, the school's current assets exceeded current liabilities except for \$71,767 of accrued expenses that were budgeted as expense items for FY08 (related to teacher salaries that were paid during the period July 1, 2007 to August 14, 2007 for those teachers that did not return to the school in September 2007). For FY08, current assets exceeded current liabilities by approximately \$99,000.

Condition 2: The Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School will ensure that its facilities are programmatically accessible no later than June 30, 2008.

Condition met. In February 2009, the school made the portion of its building not previously accessible, its cafeteria/auditorium, accessible by purchasing and installing a portable stair lift. The school is now programmatically accessible.

last updated: May 13, 2009

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)


EVENTS CALENDAR

June 2009						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
31	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11



Conference Directions

Brookline - Brookline High School

Brookline High School
 115 Greenough Street
 Brookline, MA 02445

Public Transportation

Take the MBTA Green "D" line to the "Brookline Hills" stop. Brookline High School will be on your left. The main building is straight ahead facing the playground. Enter the door on the left and proceed to the second floor. The auditorium will be on your left.

From the Mass Turnpike

Take Exit 18 (Allston/Brighton/Cambridge) towards Allston/Brighton
 Turn right on Cambridge Street
 Turn left on Harvard Ave. (follow for approximately 1.5 miles into Brookline)
 Turn right on School Street
 Turn slight left onto Cypress Street
 Turn right onto Davis Ave.
 Turn left onto Greenough Street
 Brookline High will be on your right

From Route 128

Take Route 9 East toward Brookline
 Follow Route 9 for approximately 7 miles
 After passing the reservoir on your right, turn left onto Cypress Street
 Take 3rd left onto Davis Ave.
 Turn left onto Greenough Street
 Brookline High School will be on your right

From I-93 North or South

Exit at signs to Mass. Turnpike West (exit #20)
 Follow directions above from Mass. Pike

Parking:

Parking in the vicinity of Brookline High School is very limited. The school will notify Brookline Police not to ticket cars without residential stickers. Residential parking spaces are located on Tappan and Greenough Streets and Sumner Road.

[E-mail this page](#) | [Print View](#) | [Print Pdf](#)

*Massachusetts Department of
Elementary & Secondary Education*

[Search](#) · [Site Index](#) · [Policies](#) · [Site Info](#) · [Contact ESE](#)