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Executive Summary

The Blackstone-Millville Regional School District has struggled to provide its students with the instructional leadership necessary to move its students forward as engaged learners and critical thinkers. Although the team found strong curricular leadership at the middle school, there was inconsistent evidence districtwide of ongoing support or leadership to ensure high-quality, effective instruction for every student in every classroom. The middle school has implemented processes for the development and use of curriculum maps, and middle-school teachers have structured time to collaborate on curriculum, instruction, and assessments. However, teachers at the elementary level do not have common planning time, and high-school teachers have limited common planning time. District curriculum leadership has been inconsistent and uncoordinated.

Principals reported that they function as instructional leaders; however, most also reported difficulty finding time in their schedules to visit classrooms regularly. Heads of departments at the high school stated that they are managers, not instructional leaders. Classroom instruction in the Blackstone-Millville Regional School District does not systematically reflect high-quality best practice.

The review team found a lack of ongoing coordinated professional development, embedded classroom support, and meaningful monitoring of instructional practice. Texts are old and outdated, technology resources are insufficient and outdated, and there is little support or training for the use of technology in instruction.

Interviews and a document review indicated that the position of assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction went unfilled from 2012 until the 2014–2015 school year. In 2014–2015, the position was reinstated and filled by the current assistant superintendent. At the time of the onsite in May 2017, the team was told that the assistant superintendent would leave the district at the end of the 2016–2017 school year and that that position would once again be eliminated. The team was also told that the middle-school principal would be leaving at the end of the 2016–2017 school year. The expectation is that responsibility for curriculum will move to the principals once the assistant superintendent position is gone, but it is not clear where central coordination will come from. While there are department heads at the high-school level, their role is organizational. At the school level, teachers reported that they have responsibility for curriculum development.

A common theme in this regional school district is the limitations imposed by scarce resources. Interviewees told the team that the district’s difficulties are partly a result of the missed opportunity of the Blackstone and the Millville communities to agree upon and implement a formula for jointly funding their schools. They said that the ill will between the communities is deep and shows little sign of abating. This makes it difficult for the regional school district to sufficiently consider and plan for the needs of its students. The superintendent reported that over the past eight years “staffing has been uneven because of a budget that has not kept pace with the true cost of education.” He stated that the fiscal year 2009 budget was $21.0M and the fiscal year 2015 budget was $21.3M, “a net increase of only 1.4 percent over 6 years.”

Plans to document the district’s curriculum are moving slowly without clear leadership. Data upon which to structure instructional improvements are scarce. The district’s plans for improvement are not sufficiently moving forward.

**Strengths**

The middle school provides the district with a model of instructional and curricular leadership. Teachers have and use formative data to plan their instruction and to focus attention on identified struggling students.

At the same time, the district communicates in multiple effective ways with parents and provides them with opportunities to know their students’ progress and to support the schools with their efforts. The district is fortunate to have an active engaged parent body. Parents participate on councils and organizations in each school. School-based parent organizations support a variety of extracurricular student school events including after-school STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) clubs, trips, and dances. One group of parents has formed the Blackstone-Millville Music Association, a non-profit organization that supports the district’s award-winning music program. Over 200 students participate in various aspects of this program. Outside partnerships enrich the opportunities provided to students.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

The district faces numerous challenges and is not making significant progress across its schools in addressing these challenges. Curriculum development is uneven and slow, in part because of limited central office direction and in part because of the absence of ongoing professional development and of time for teachers to work on curriculum. Administrators and teachers have not defined and so do not promote a model of effective instruction. And the quality of observed instruction was inconsistent. The district does not have formative assessment data at all levels that could focus and improve its instruction.The district does not have a systematic approach for providing academic and non-academic support and ensuring that all students’ needs are met. The district has limited interventions to support struggling students. In addition, several district improvement goals, specifically curriculum development, supporting the co-teaching model in special education, and the establishment of PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) at all levels are far from accomplishment.

The absence of consistent instructional leadership leads to serious concerns about how the district will address these challenges.

**Recommendations**

Across the standards addressed in this report are recommendations that the district establish fundamental elements in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and student support: write the curriculum, promote effective instruction, establish data literacy and a system of benchmark assessments, and provide a consistent system of supports for struggling students. Implementing these recommendations calls for strong leadership from central office administrators and principals.

Blackstone-Millville RSD Targeted District 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 system-wide functions, with reference to three district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). 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. In addition, the targeted district reviews is designed to promote district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps.

Districts whose performance level places them in Level 2 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance will typically participate in a targeted district review (Level 3 and Level 4 districts typically receive a comprehensive review). Other relevant factors are taken into consideration when determining if a district will participate in a targeted or comprehensive review.

This targeted review by the Office of District Reviews and Monitoring focused on the following standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support.

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, parents, and students. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE.

Site Visit

The site visit to the Blackstone-Millville Regional School District was conducted from May 22–24, 2017. The site visit included 18.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 86 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups with eight elementary-school teachers, one middle-school teacher, and nine high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 47 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

Blackstone has a board of selectmen and a town administrator; Millville has a board of selectmen and a town manager. The eight members of the Blackstone-Millville district’s school committee meet twice monthly; the chair of the school committee is elected.

The current superintendent has been in the position since the 2014–2015 school year. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, five principals, the special education director, and the business manager. Central office positions have been stable in number over the past three years. However, at the end of the 2016–2017 school year, the assistant superintendent is leaving and the position has been eliminated. The district has five principals leading five schools. There are two other school administrators, assistant principals at the middle and high schools. In 2016–2017, there were 137 teachers in the district.

In the 2016–2017 school year, 1,747 students were enrolled in the district’s 5 schools:

**Table 1: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2016–2017**

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Kennedy Elementary | ES | K–2 | 292 |
| Millville Elementary | ES | Pre-K–5 | 283 |
| Maloney Elementary | ES | 3–5 | 292 |
| Hartnett Middle | MS | 6–8 | 432 |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High School | HS | 9–12 | 448 |
| **Totals** | **5 schools** | **Pre-K–12** | **1,747** |
| \*As of October 1, 2016 | | | |

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment decreased by 7.2 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 K–12 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: $12,571 as compared with a median of $13,140 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Blackstone-Millville is a Level 2 district because Maloney, Hartnett Middle, and Blackstone-Millville Regional High are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and high needs students.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **Group** | **Annual PPI** | | | | **Cumulative PPI** | **School**  **Percentile** | **Accountability**  **Level** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Kennedy | All | 38 | 63 | 75 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | 50 | 75 | 75 | -- | -- |
| Millville | All | 85 | 65 | 80 | 55 | 68 | 71 | 1 |
| High Needs | -- | 113 | 113 | 38 | 79 |
| Maloney | All | 75 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 63 | 32 | 2 |
| High Needs | 55 | 56 | 85 | 35 | 56 |
| Hartnett Middle | All | 25 | 50 | 60 | 85 | 65 | 42 | 2 |
| High Needs | 25 | 45 | 45 | 80 | 57 |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | All | 79 | 93 | 89 | 36 | 68 | 50 | 2 |
| High Needs | -- | 86 | 90 | 46 | 70 |
| District | All | 39 | 57 | 64 | 50 | 55 | -- | 2 |
| High Needs | 43 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 53 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the PARCC assessment in ELA was 63 percent and was 55 percent in math for all students.**

* The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations was 42 percent in ELA and 36 percent in math.
* The percentage of students from economically disadvantaged families meeting or exceeding expectations was 56 percent in ELA and 44 percent in math.
* The percentage of ELL and former ELL students meeting or exceeding expectations was 48 percent in ELA and 43 percent in math.
* The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations was 18 percent in ELA and 17 percent in math.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on PARCC (Grades 3–8) 2015–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | |
| **2015** | **2016** | **Change** | **2015** | **2016** | **Change** |
| All students | -- | 63% | -- | -- | 55% | -- |
| High Needs | -- | 42% | -- | -- | 36% | -- |
| Economically Disadvantaged | -- | 56% | -- | -- | 44% | -- |
| ELL and former ELL students | -- | 48% | -- | -- | 43% | -- |
| Students with disabilities | -- | 18% | -- | -- | 17% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science declined by 5 percentage points for all students, and by 1 percentage point for high needs students, and improved by 6 percentage points for students with disabilities. In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 3 and 5 percentage points below the 2016 state rate for the district as a whole and for students with disabilities, respectively, and above the 2016 state rate by 4 percentage points for students from economically disadvantaged families and equal to the 2016 state rate for high needs students.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** |  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** | **Above/Below**  **State (2016)** |
| All students | District | 56% | 60% | 55% | 51% | -5% | -3 |
| State | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 |
| High Needs | District | 32% | 38% | 36% | 31% | -1% | 0 |
| State | 31% | 33% | 31% | 31% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | District | -- | -- | 45% | 36% | -- | 4 |
| State | -- | -- | 34% | 32% | -- |
| ELL and former ELL students | District | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | 19% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 0 |
| Students with disabilities | District | 10% | 17% | 16% | 16% | 6% | -5 |
| State | 21% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 0 |

**The district did not reach its 2016 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities. The district reached its ELA and math CPI targets for students from economically disadvantaged families but did not reach the CPI target in science for students from economically disadvantaged families.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | | **Science** | | |
| **Group** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** |
| All students | 88.6 | 93.2 | No Change | 83.2 | 90.3 | Improved Below Target | 80.0 | 89.4 | No Change |
| High Needs | 77.6 | 85.8 | Improved Below Target | 71.8 | 80.6 | Improved Below Target | 67.6 | 80.3 | Declined |
| Economically Disadvantaged[[1]](#footnote-1) | 85.4 | 85.1 | On Target | 78.8 | 77.7 | On Target | 70.8 | 79.5 | Declined |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Students with disabilities | 63.2 | 77.7 | No Change | 57.7 | 70.8 | Improved Below Target | 58.6 | 75.0 | No Change |

**In 2016, students’ growth in ELA and math was moderate compared with their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.**

**Table 6: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2016 Median ELA SGP** | | | **2016 Median Math SGP** | | |
| **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** | **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** |
| All students | 46.0 | Below Target | Moderate | 46.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| High Needs | 42.0 | Below Target | Moderate | 46.0 | Below Target | Moderate |
| Econ. Disad. | 44.0 | On Target | Moderate | 50.0 | On Target | Moderate |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 40.5 | Below Target | Moderate | 45.0 | Below Target | Moderate |

**In 2016, the district’s out-of-school suspension rates were lower than 2016 state rates and the district’s in-school suspension rates were higher than 2016 state rates for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Type of Suspension** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | ISS | 10.4% | 7.7% | 6.0% | 5.4% | 2.9% |
| OSS | 5.9% | 4.3% | 5.3% | 4.1% | 4.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | ISS | 12.6% | 9.1% | 7.1% | 5.2% | 3.2% |
| OSS | 6.5% | 4.2% | 6.4% | 5.0% | 5.6% |
| ELLs | ISS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.9% |
| OSS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4.0% |
| Students with disabilities | ISS | 8.6% | 8.3% | 6.6% | 6.0% | 3.5% |
| OSS | 7.1% | 5.8% | 6.0% | 4.2% | 5.9% |
| All Students | ISS | 7.5% | 4.9% | 4.2% | 4.3% | 1.9% |
| OSS | 3.6% | 2.5% | 3.1% | 2.3% | 2.9% |

\*Suspension rates for students from low income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates for students from economically disadvantaged families.

**Between 2013 and 2016, the district’s four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 3.6 percentage points for all students and by 14.2 to 38.0 percentage points for high needs students, students from low income families, and students with disabilities. The district reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students.**[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2016)** | **Cohort Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 49 | 75.9% | 78.5% | 72.3% | 93.9% | 18.0 | 23.7% | 21.6 | 29.9% | 79.1% |
| Low income | 45 | 79.1% | 74.5% | 71.1% | 93.3% | 14.2 | 18.0% | 22.2 | 31.2% | 78.4% |
| ELLs | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 64.1% |
| SWD | 11 | 52.9% | 69.6% | 57.1% | 90.9% | 38.0 | 71.8% | 33.8 | 59.2% | 71.8% |
| All students | 121 | 90.6% | 87.9% | 84.9% | 94.2% | 3.6 | 4.0% | 9.3 | 11.0% | 87.5% |

**Between 2012 and 2015, the district’s five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 4.4 percentage points for all students, and by 1.2 and 16.2 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. The district reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students.**[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012–2015** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2015)** | **Cohort Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2012–2015** | | **Change 2014–2015** | | **State (2015)** |
| **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 47 | 65.0% | 77.8% | 80.0% | 74.5% | 9.5 | 14.6% | -5.5 | -6.9% | 82.0% |
| Low income | 38 | 72.5% | 81.4% | 76.5% | 73.7% | 1.2 | 1.7% | -2.8 | -3.7% | 81.6% |
| ELLs | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70.2% |
| SWD | 14 | 48.1% | 58.8% | 69.6% | 64.3% | 16.2 | 33.7% | -5.3 | -7.6% | 74.5% |
| All students | 106 | 82.4% | 91.3% | 88.7% | 86.8% | 4.4 | 5.3% | -1.9 | -2.1% | 89.4% |

**In 2016, the district’s drop-out rate was lower than the state rate for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, English language learners, and students with disabilities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
| **Group** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | 2.8% | 3.9% | 2.7% | 3.1% | 3.7% |
| Econ. Disad.[[4]](#footnote-4) | 3.5% | 4.1% | 2.9% | 3.9% | 4.1% |
| ELLs | -- | -- | 16.7% | 0.0% | 6.6% |
| SWD | 1.9% | 1.9% | 3.6% | 1.5% | 3.1% |
| All students | 1.4% | 1.8% | 1.5% | 1.3% | 1.9% |

**Grade and School Results**

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students improved by 1.9 points, from 86.7 in 2013 to 88.6 in 2016, 1.4 points above the state CPI of 87.2. ELA CPI also improved in the 3rd, 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades.**

* ELA CPI improved by 4.4 points in the 3rd grade, by 2.6 points in the 5th grade, by 6.8 points in the 6th grade, by 1.0 point in the 7th grade, and by 0.8 point in the 8th grade.
* ELA CPI declined by 2.4 points in the 4th grade and by 2.5 points in the 10th grade.
  + ELA CPI in the 10th grade was 96.3 in 2016, 0.4 point below the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 137 | 84.5 | 87.9 | 85.3 | 88.9 | -- | 4.4 | 3.6 |
| 4 | 116 | 79.5 | 76.6 | 81.6 | 77.1 | -- | -2.4 | -4.5 |
| 5 | 141 | 86.7 | 86.5 | 90.0 | 89.3 | -- | 2.6 | -0.7 |
| 6 | 143 | 81.3 | 90.9 | 86.2 | 88.1 | -- | 6.8 | 1.9 |
| 7 | 138 | 86.9 | 83.2 | 91.7 | 87.9 | -- | 1.0 | -3.8 |
| 8 | 150 | 92.4 | 90.1 | 88.7 | 93.2 | -- | 0.8 | 4.5 |
| 10 | 102 | 98.8 | 98.1 | 99.2 | 96.3 | 96.7 | -2.5 | -2.9 |
| All | 935 | 86.7 | 87.3 | 88.8 | 88.6 | 87.2 | 1.9 | -0.2 |

**The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the PARCC assessment in ELA was 53 percent, 61 percent, and 68 percent at Millville Elementary and 73 percent, 59 percent, and 54 percent at Maloney Elementary in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, respectively, and was 63 percent, 61 percent, and 68 percent at Harnett Middle in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCASS assessment in ELA was 88 percent in the 10th grade at Blackstone-Millville Regional High School.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on PARCC by School and Grade 2015–2016[[5]](#footnote-5)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Kennedy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Millville | 53% | 61% | 68% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61% |
| Maloney | 73% | 59% | 54% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 62% |
| Hartnett Middle | -- | -- | -- | 63% | 61% | 68% | -- | 64% |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 88% | 88% |
| District | 66% | 60% | 58% | 62% | 61% | 68% | 88% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI improved by 2.0 points and 2.8 points at Maloney Elementary and Hartnett Middle, respectively, and declined by 1.5 points and 2.4 points at Millville Elementary and Blackstone-Millville Regional High School, respectively.**

* ELA CPI for high needs students improved by 9.0 points and 3.2 points at Maloney Elementary and Hartnett Middle, respectively, and declined by 4.1 points and 3.9 points at Millville Elementary and Blackstone-Millville Regional High, respectively.
* ELA CPI for students with disabilities improved by 4.8 points and 2.9 points at Maloney Elementary and Hartnett Middle, respectively, and declined by 8.4 points at Millville Elementary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
| **School** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Kennedy | 82.5 | 87.1 | 87.4 | -- | -- |
| High Needs | 72.5 | 79.2 | 74.2 | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 88.3 | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 48.1 | 55.0 | 61.1 | -- | -- |
| Millville | 87.4 | 88.8 | 87.2 | 85.9 | -1.5 |
| High Needs | 78.4 | 80.3 | 76.9 | 74.3 | -4.1 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 88.6 | 79.7 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 71.4 | 70.3 | 67.6 | 63.0 | -8.4 |
| Maloney | 83.5 | 79.4 | 85.1 | 85.5 | 2.0 |
| High Needs | 64.3 | 65.9 | 75.0 | 73.3 | 9.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 79.6 | 85.9 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 50.0 | 47.6 | 56.0 | 54.8 | 4.8 |
| Hartnett Middle | 87.4 | 88.0 | 89.4 | 90.2 | 2.8 |
| High Needs | 75.2 | 74.7 | 75.8 | 78.4 | 3.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 83.1 | 84.2 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 59.0 | 56.3 | 62.5 | 61.9 | 2.9 |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | 98.7 | 98.1 | 99.4 | 96.3 | -2.4 |
| High Needs | 95.8 | 93.9 | 98.2 | 91.9 | -3.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 100.0 | 95.4 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 82.5 | 95.5 | 86.4 | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 1.4 points for all students, from 81.8 in 2013 to 83.2 in 2016. Math CPI also improved in the 3rd, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades.**

* Math CPI improved by 4.4 points in the 3rd grade, by 0.5 point in the 6th grade, by 6.1 points in the 7th grade, and by 6.0 points in the 8th grade.
* Math CPI declined by 2.0 points in the 4th grade, by 0.7 point in the 5th grade, and by 6.6 points in the 10th grade.
  + Math CPI in the 10th grade was 85.9 in 2016, 3.8 points below the 2016 state CPI of 89.7.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 137 | 87.8 | 86.3 | 86.1 | 92.2 | -- | 4.4 | 6.1 |
| 4 | 116 | 76.6 | 75.2 | 80.9 | 74.6 | -- | -2.0 | -6.3 |
| 5 | 140 | 83.3 | 83.7 | 80.7 | 82.6 | -- | -0.7 | 1.9 |
| 6 | 142 | 79.5 | 85.1 | 80.9 | 80.0 | -- | 0.5 | -0.9 |
| 7 | 132 | 72.9 | 72.6 | 79.6 | 79.0 | -- | 6.1 | -0.6 |
| 8 | 146 | 82.8 | 75.9 | 79.8 | 88.8 | -- | 6.0 | 9 |
| 10 | 99 | 92.5 | 93.8 | 95.5 | 85.9 | 89.7 | -6.6 | -9.6 |
| All | 928 | 81.8 | 81.3 | 82.8 | 83.2 | 81.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 |

**The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the PARCC assessment in math was 40 percent, 46 percent, and 75 percent at Millville Elementary and 77 percent, 37 percent, and 47 percent at Maloney Elementary in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, respectively, and was 43 percent, 54 percent, and 72 percent at Harnett Middle in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment in math was 70 percent in the 10th grade at Blackstone-Millville Regional High School.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations on PARCC by School and Grade 2015–2016[[6]](#footnote-6)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Kennedy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Millville | 40% | 46% | 75% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 55% |
| Maloney | 77% | 37% | 47% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 54% |
| Hartnett Middle | -- | -- | -- | 43% | 54% | 72% | -- | 57% |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70% | 70% |
| District | 64% | 40% | 56% | 43% | 52% | 72% | 70% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 3.8 points at Maloney Elementary and Hartnett Middle, and declined by 2.4 and 7.1 points at Millville Elementary and Blackstone-Millville Regional High School, respectively.**

* Math CPI for high needs students improved by 0.9 point, 12.2 points, and 8.7 points at Millville Elementary, Maloney Elementary, and Hartnett Middle, respectively, and declined by 15.2 points at Blackstone-Millville Regional High.
* Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 0.9 point, 12.8 points, and 11.9 points at Millville Elementary, Maloney Elementary, and Hartnett Middle, respectively.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 16: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
| **School** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Kennedy | 86.7 | 87.0 | 86.8 | -- | -- |
| High Needs | 82.5 | 82.1 | 70.8 | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 85.0 | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 69.2 | 68.3 | 61.1 | -- | -- |
| Millville | 88.5 | 87.3 | 88.7 | 86.1 | -2.4 |
| High Needs | 74.1 | 78.0 | 74.0 | 75.0 | 0.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 90.9 | 87.5 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 64.3 | 67.2 | 63.2 | 65.2 | 0.9 |
| Maloney | 78.7 | 76.4 | 77.4 | 82.5 | 3.8 |
| High Needs | 61.1 | 63.8 | 68.2 | 73.3 | 12.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 73.1 | 80.2 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 50.0 | 49.2 | 52.0 | 62.8 | 12.8 |
| Hartnett Middle | 79.6 | 77.9 | 80.3 | 83.4 | 3.8 |
| High Needs | 62.3 | 59.4 | 61.0 | 71.0 | 8.7 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 67.2 | 76.8 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 40.3 | 41.1 | 46.5 | 52.2 | 11.9 |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | 92.9 | 94.6 | 95.9 | 85.8 | -7.1 |
| High Needs | 84.5 | 84.5 | 92.6 | 69.3 | -15.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 100.0 | 78.4 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 60.0 | 80.0 | 51.2 | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 5 percentage points in the district as whole, from 56 percent in 2013 to 51 percent in 2016, 3 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.**

* 5th grade science proficiency rates decreased by 10 percentage points, from 61 percent in 2013 to 51 percent in 2016, 4 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
* 8th grade science proficiency rates improved by 4 percentage points, from 33 percent in 2013 to 37 percent in 2016, 4 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
* 10th grade science proficiency rates declined by 14 percentage points, from 87 percent in 2013 to 73 percent in 2016, equal to the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 5 | 142 | 61% | 56% | 52% | 51% | 47% | -10 | -1 |
| 8 | 150 | 33% | 43% | 34% | 37% | 41% | 4 | 3 |
| 10 | 91 | 87% | 87% | 88% | 73% | 73% | -14 | -15 |
| All | 383 | 56% | 60% | 55% | 51% | 54% | -5 | -4 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science in the 5th grade was 73 percent and 43 percent at Millville Elementary and Maloney Elementary, respectively, compared with the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. The science proficiency rate in the 8th grade was 38 percent at Harnett Middle, 3 percentage points below the state rate of 41 percent. The science proficiency rate in the 10th grade at Blackstone-Millville Regional High was 73 percent, equal to the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Kennedy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% |
| Millville | -- | -- | 73% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 73% |
| Maloney | -- | -- | 43% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 43% |
| Hartnett Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 38% | -- | 38% |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 73% | 73% |
| District | -- | -- | 51% | -- | -- | 37% | 73% | 51% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 41% | 73% | 54% |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates improved by 13 percentage points at Millville Elementary and by 4 percentage points at Hartnett Middle, and declined by 18 percentage points at Maloney Elementary and by 15 percentage points at Blackstone-Millville Regional High School.**

* Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 7 percentage points and 22 percentage points at Maloney Elementary and Blackstone-Millville Regional High School, respectively, and improved by 7 percentage points at Hartnett Middle.
* Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 10 percentage points at Maloney Elementary and did not improve at Hartnett Middle.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
| **School** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Kennedy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Millville | 60% | 63% | 71% | 73% | 13% |
| High Needs | -- | 35% | -- | 42% | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | 20% | -- | -- | -- |
| Maloney | 61% | 54% | 47% | 43% | -18% |
| High Needs | 31% | 24% | 35% | 24% | -7% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 39% | 30% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 7% | 22% | 14% | 17% | 10% |
| Hartnett Middle | 34% | 43% | 34% | 38% | 4% |
| High Needs | 17% | 28% | 17% | 24% | 7% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 23% | 26% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 6% | 14% | 7% | 6% | 0% |
| Blackstone-Millville Regional High | 88% | 87% | 88% | 73% | -15% |
| High Needs | 69% | 73% | 73% | 47% | -22% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 88% | 60% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | 50% | 16% | -- |

Curriculum and Instruction

***Contextual Background***

As part of the site visit, the team observed 47 classes throughout the district: 18 at the high school, 10 at the middle school, and 19 at the 3 elementary schools. The team observed 17 ELA classes, 10 mathematics classes, 10 science classes, and 10 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education classes, and one SEI class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. These data are presented by indicator and school type in Appendix C.

Teachers and administrators do not appear to have a clear common understanding of, nor have they implemented, high-quality, evidence-based instruction for all students. In observed classrooms, instructional practice was inconsistent throughout the district. There was a generally lower incidence of characteristics of effective instruction at the high school. Differentiated instruction to meet students’ specific learning needs was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction at all school levels.

The district is struggling to develop effective curricular practices. In recent years, districtwide leadership for curriculum has been erratic because of a pattern of eliminating and reestablishing the position of assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. At the time of the review in May 2017, the district had an assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction who was the recognized curriculum leader in the district; however, the position was slated to be cut in July 2017.

Led by the assistant superintendent, the district has been working to develop written documentation of the curriculum. While the district has made progress in developing scope and sequence documents, it does not have a cohesive written curriculum. Only the middle school has regular structured opportunities for teachers to collaborate on curriculum. As a result, the district is at various stages in curriculum development and documentation of standards-based units. This remains a challenge for the district given limited resources, time, and support.

For K–5 literacy, the district uses Reading Workshop*,* a research-based reading approach, and teachers have received ongoing professional development from Teachers for Teachers over the past three years to implement Reading Workshop. The phonics program, Fundations, is used in kindergarten through grade 2. The district does not have a single writing program at the elementary level. For K–5 mathematics, the district follows the enVisions 2.0 program, first implemented in 2015–2016. Teachers reported receiving limited support to implement the new math program.

The district is working toward aligning kindergarten through grade 8 curriculum with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework. Although the district set May 2017 as a goal for completing this alignment, at the time of the review in May 2017 the work was not completed.

**Strength Finding**

1. **Leadership from the principal and structured time for teacher collaboration have supported the development of curriculum maps at the middle school.**
2. Middle-school teachers identified the principal as their curriculum leader. Further, they said that the principal’s longevity in this leadership role provided consistency and follow-through for curriculum development.

**B.** Middle-school teachers indicated that they collaborate to provide content support to one another as they develop curriculum.

1. Interviews with teachers and school and district leaders and a document review indicated that middle-school teachers have developed monthly curriculum maps in core subjects that are used across teams at each grade level.

a. Curriculum maps reviewed by the team contain some components of an Understanding by Design (UbD) curriculum template. The maps include: an overview of the monthly curriculum focus; standards (for math, ELA, and social studies, but not for science); key objectives and understandings; essential questions; vocabulary; anchor texts; assessments; and resources for enrichment.

b. Teachers are expected to use the curriculum maps and the related assessments. In addition, middle-school leaders refer to the maps when they conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure that the instruction is aligned with the documented curriculum.

c. The middle school’s monthly newsletter includes curriculum maps for each grade and core subject and a guide for parents to navigate and make meaning of the maps to better support their children’s learning.

1. Middle-school teachers have structured time during the school day to collaborate on curriculum, instruction, and assessments.
   * 1. The team was told that each grade at the middle school has two interdisciplinary teams, and the teams are each responsible for ELA, math, science, and social studies. In addition to using their personal prep time to collaborate, teachers meet in teams twice a week. One meeting concerns student issues and the other focuses on curriculum and instruction.
     2. In addition, middle-school teachers meet in professional learning communities (PLCs) once a week. PLC time is teacher driven and is used to review STAR assessments, to plan instruction, and to collaborate on curriculum development.

**Impact**: Having continual leadership to define expectations for schoolwide development of the curriculum while providing teachers with time and support to do the work likely leads to improved student achievement.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**District curriculum leadership over the past five years has been inconsistent and uncoordinated.**

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the position of assistant superintendent went unfilled from 2012 until the 2014–2015 school year. In 2014–2015, the position was reinstated and filled by the current assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. However, with the assistant superintendent’s departure from the district at the end of the 2016–2017 school year, that position has once again been eliminated.

1. Interviewees reported that before 2014–2015, when curriculum became a focus in the district, they could not remember when the district had a formal curriculum development cycle.

2. In the district’s self-assessment submitted in advance of the onsite, the district noted that it did not complete alignment of its curriculum to the Massachusetts 2011 math and ELA curriculum frameworks until May 2016. Districts were expected to fully implement the 2011 curriculum frameworks by September 2014.

**B.** The district established curriculum improvement as a major initiative during the 2016–2017 school year with curriculum development and mapping as its goal.

1. The district embarked on a curriculum mapping project during the 2015–2016 school year, using the Understanding by Design (UBD) format when developing the curriculum on the district’s online Aspen X2 platform. This work has continued during the 2016–2017 school year.

2. Some high-school teachers said that written documentation of the curriculum is not scheduled to be completed until the 2018–2019 school year.

**C.** The district has not fully developed curricular practices to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment with the standards as well as to provide support to teachers as they develop curriculum.

1. Teachers and school leaders reported that formal meetings are not held to establish vertical alignment in content areas. Some elementary teachers told the team that they do not have a clear understanding of what comes before their grade level and what comes after it in the ELA scope and sequence.

2. Grade-level communication across elementary schools is limited to informal communication between teachers. Apart from meeting in grade-level teams for Reading Workshop training, the district has not provided cross-district opportunities for teachers to ensure horizontal alignment.

**D.** The district’s progress on alignment of curriculum with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework is in question as teachers grapple with limited support and resources to effectively achieve the alignment.

1. Some teachers reported that they were “left on their own” trying to figure out the alignment for the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework. They also reported an absence of supplies, of up-to-date textbooks, and of the equipment required to implement the new standards.

a. Some science textbooks at the elementary level date from 1993.

2. Some elementary- and middle-school teachers stated that when the district provided them with four days of release time to work on the alignment with the new science standards, the only direction they received was brief instruction from district leaders at the outset.

**E.** The district has provided limited ongoing support to ensure the best outcome for the implementation of programs.

1. Some teachers reported that training for the enVisionmath2.0 program in 2015–2016 began 7 weeks after they started to use the program. They described limited training over the course of the year with ongoing support not provided. Support for teachers to implement the Big Ideas math program in grade 6 in 2016–2017 consisted of one full day of training.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that the goal of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative for grades 9 and 10 in 2016–2017 was to integrate technology into the curriculum.

a. However, teachers stated that most teachers did not have Chromebook training, and student training was limited to an all-school assembly to introduce the concept. Only a few teachers have been trained in technology integration.

b. While students are able to take Chromebooks home, they were not purchased for teachers thus limiting teachers’ ability to integrate technology into the curriculum. Further, the roll-out of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative was delayed from September 2016 until January 2017 because of an absence of resources.

**Impact**: Without consistent districtwide curriculum leadership and ongoing support, the district cannot ensure that the curriculum is aligned, consistently delivered, and continuously improved to promote higher levels of student achievement.

**3. Teachers have not been given ongoing professional development and sufficient time to document the curriculum. Teachers said that no one person oversees the quality of the documentation on the online platform.**

1. At the time of the review in May 2017, the district was completing a full school year during which revision and documentation of its curriculum in all subjects was taking place.
2. District and school leaders stated that they introduced the Understanding by Design (UbD) format for teachers to use when developing a digital curriculum on the district’s school management portal, Aspen X2.
   1. District and school leaders stated that training for UbD would take place over three years, corresponding to the three stages of UbD. During 2016–2017, teachers would receive training in stage 1 which focuses on desired results and includes the following components: overview, standards covered, enduring understanding/objectives, essential questions, knowledge and skills covered.
   2. Training for stage 2 (assessments) would take place in 2017–2018; stage 3, the learning plan, would be completed in 2018–2019.
3. The team reviewed over 50 ELA, math, and science curriculum maps/units across all levels and representative samples from social studies, technology, and art that had been uploaded to the Aspen portal.

a. Overall, the team found a range in completeness and quality in curriculum maps/units reviewed.

b. Almost all documents reviewed included scope and sequences for subjects and/or courses as well as timelines.

1. Training for teachers to learn how to develop curriculum based on the UbD format was limited. Additionally, teachers said that they find it challenging to upload curriculum to the Aspen platform.

District and school leaders reported that teachers had three hours of training during professional development time for implementing UbD.

2. Teachers described training for the online platform, AspenX2, as “a few people got two hours of training in Aspen.” Teachers stated that they find features in Aspen difficult to manipulate and confusing. They also reported that they do not have explanations of the platform’s features and are not able to print out the curriculum.

3. When the team asked teachers who provides oversight to ensure the quality of curriculum uploaded onto the Aspen platform, teachers replied that no one has this responsibility. In response to the same question, district and school leaders stated that they gave teachers the freedom to add files to and delete files from the platform and held school administrators responsible for reviewing the uploaded curriculum for quality.

a. The team found that documents on the Aspen X2 platform were not organized in a coherent way, making navigation of the site difficult. For example, documents were not in order by level, subject, and/or course. In one instance, there were over 20 entries for one curriculum map which was blank.

1. Time to collaborate on curriculum development and write documentation is limited and varies by level in the district.

When teachers were asked about time to write curriculum, they reported that during the 2016–2017 school year, they had attended five one-hour, after-school meetings where there was some training and time to work on curriculum. However, teachers stated that not all the time was used for curriculum development.

At the elementary level, teachers do not have common planning time (CPT) to collaborate on curriculum. Teachers told the review team that they collaborate on their own time.

Interviewees told the team that the middle school has PLC time once per week when teachers look at assessments. Middle-school teachers also have two CPT meetings, one for student issues and the other for curriculum and instruction.

The team was told that high-school teachers meet in PLCs once every seven-day cycle depending on availability of substitutes. They reported that it was difficult to use the time to write curriculum because they only have 40 minutes. High-school teachers also meet six times a year in after-school department meetings. Interviewees stated that not all department meetings are focused on curriculum.

The team was told that the district does not have the resources to support summer curriculum work for teachers.

**Impact**: By not providing teachers with sufficient training, support, and time to develop and document curriculum, the district cannot ensure that the curriculum is guaranteed and viable for all students.

**Instruction**

**4.** **In observed classrooms throughout the district, the quality of instruction was inconsistent. There was a generally lower incidence of characteristics of effective instruction at the high school. In observed classrooms differentiated instruction to meet students’ specific learning needs was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction at all school levels.**

**A.** **Focus Area #1-Learning Objectives & Instruction.** Overall, in most observed classrooms, teachers demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter and content. At the same time, there was variation among levels in the use of clear learning objectives, of lessons reflecting high expectations aligned to learning objectives, and of instructional strategies well-matched to the learning goals.

1. Team members found moderate and strong evidence of lessons that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objectives (characteristic # 3) in 79 percent of elementary classes, in 60 percent of middle-school classes, and in just 44 percent of high-school classes.

a. In a grade 1 reading class that reflected high expectations, the teacher asked the students to “turn to your partner and discuss what you think is going to happen.”

b. Similarly, in a middle-school English class, the teacher asked students to discuss, “What makes a great, well -written narrative using humor?” and then to write a humorous story about personal household rules.

c. In contrast, in a high-school history class, the teacher asked only for discrete “correct” answers and did not lead students to analyze or explain their answers.

2. The team noted strong and moderate evidence that the teacher used appropriate instructional strategies well-matched to the learning objective (characteristic # 4) in 79 percent of elementary classes, in 80 of percent of middle-school classes, and in only 44 percent of high-school classes.

a. In an example of appropriate instructional strategies well-matched to the learning objective, in a grade 5 ELA class, the teacher used a graphic organizer to promote critical thinking by asking students to make a prediction and to show evidence from the text.

b. In a middle-school science class, the observer teacher used a variety of instructional strategies to support the stated learning objective, including video, discussion-experiment-discussion, and guided practice.

c. In several high-school classes, expectations for student work were low. For example, after students completed a worksheet, they sat with nothing to do for 10 minutes or more.

**B. Focus Area #2: Student engagement & Critical Thinking.** Although interviewees identified student engagement as a district goal during the 2016–2017 school year, the team noticed a wide variation in the degree to which student engagement was evident districtwide.

1. The team observed strong and moderate evidence that students were motivated and engaged in the lesson (characteristic # 5) in 84 percent of elementary classes, in 100 percent of middle-school classes, and in 50 percent of high-school classes.

a. In an elementary class, the teacher organized centers with a variety of activities that kept all students motivated and engaged.

b. In a middle-school history class, students were highly engaged in a collaborative newspaper project discussing how the first five presidents helped to shape our new country.

c. In a high-school English class, however, instruction was whole class and teacher centered. When the teacher asked questions, students’ answers were primarily short, one-word responses.

2. Review team members saw moderate and strong evidence of students assuming responsibility for their own learning (characteristic # 7) in 68 percent of elementary school classes, in 70 percent of middle-school classes, and in just 39 percent of high-school classes. In these classes, students were often seen working individually, in pairs, and in groups.

a. In a 4th grade math class, students worked in pairs to determine, “How do you add and subtract mixed numbers with like denominators.” They were required to use “math language.”

b. Grade 7 math students worked in pairs to measure angles with a protractor and to determine whether the angle was acute angle or obtuse.

c. In contrast, in the majority of observed high-school classes, the teacher did most of the work and students were not given sufficient opportunities to be responsible for their own learning.

**C.** **Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture.** The team found that in observed classrooms differentiated instruction was the least developed instructional practice districtwide. Although teachers had established a positive academic environment in 92 percent of observed classes, of concern were the 22 percent (4 of 18) of observed high-school classes where teachers had not firmly established rituals and routines.

1. Review team members saw moderate and strong evidence that teachers appropriately differentiated instruction to make the lesson content accessible for all learners (characteristic # 8) in just 42 percent of elementary classrooms, in 50 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 34 percent of high-school classes.

2. While resources were limited throughout the district, teachers worked to make use of those available. Observers reported moderate and strong evidence that teachers used appropriate resources aligned to student’s diverse learning needs including technology, manipulatives, and support personnel (characteristic # 9) in 69 percent of elementary school classes, in 70 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 34 percent of high-school classes.

a. In an elementary sheltered English instruction (SEI) class, the teacher made effective use of an interactive whiteboard to enhance a lesson on analog clock reading and line plotting. In a 6th grade science class, the team observed the teacher make effective use of an interactive whiteboard to access video clips, laboratory equipment for students to conduct experiments, and graphic organizers to report results.

b. In a middle-school math class, after conducting a discussion with students, the teacher had students use tablets to access websites to gather data for making decisions.

c. While the team observed additional adults in a number of classrooms across all levels, it was often difficult for the team to determine the roles of the additional adults. Some were identified as co-teachers, paraprofessionals, and one-to-one aides. While some additional adults did provide some help, frequently they sat in the class and participated little in the activities during observations.

3. The review team observed moderate and strong evidence that classroom climate was characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse (characteristic # 10) in 100 percent of elementary and middle-school classes, and in 78 percent of high-school classes.

a. In several observed classes at the high school, reviewers noted students continually talking among themselves and ignoring the teacher.

**Impact**: Without consistent use of high-quality, research-based instructional strategies across the district, students likely do not have the instruction and support that they need to achieve at higher levels.

**5. The Blackstone-Millville Regional School District does not have sufficient and appropriate instructional leadership.**

**A.** The assistant superintendent is responsible for curriculum and instruction and educator evaluation, but he also has other roles, including the district’s ACCESS for ELLs test coordinator, English language learner director, induction and mentoring contact, MCAS test coordinator, professional development director, SAR/Title II coordinator and Title I director.

1. The assistant superintendent is leaving the district and the school committee has decided to eliminate the position.

**B.** Principals told the team that all principals view themselves as instructional leaders and that across the district principals are working to continually improve instruction and model effective teaching.

1. Principals agreed that their visits to classrooms were “sporadic.” They reported that their time is consumed with responsibilities such as evaluations, struggling teachers, and special education issues.

**C.** When asked to describe their roles, high-school department heads told the team that they are “basically organizers,” who meet monthly with the principal and with their departments after school.

**D.** When high-school teachers were asked to identify their instructional leader, they expressed several responses, including “I consider myself an instructional leader,” and “We are all instructional leaders.”

**E.** Principals reported that instruction was infrequently the focus of leadership team meetings.

**Impact**: Without active monitoring and support of instruction, it is difficult for the Blackstone-Millville Regional School District to ensure that classroom instruction reflects high-quality, effective instructional strategies that support all learners.

**6. Administrators and teachers in Blackstone-Millville do not have a clear, common understanding of high-quality, evidence-based instruction.**

**A.** Members of the district’s administrative staff told the review team that there is no formal instructional framework in the district.

**B.** Principals said that they believe that most teachers can articulate the instructional expectations although not all teachers implement them.

**C.** Teachers reported that they teach the way they believe they need to teach and that the administration gives them the freedom to do so.

**D.** When staff were asked to describe the qualities of high-quality instruction, they indicated a range of answers. Often the responses included some elements of high-quality instruction but the responses did not consistently refer to a common model of effective instruction.

1. One administrator told the team that high-quality instruction included differentiation, student engagement, clear objectives, students who know the purpose of the lesson, and a student- centered rather than teacher-centered lesson. Another stressed student-centered learning, engagement, and the use of technology. A third administrator cited collaborative learning, student engagement, and use of assessments.

2. Teachers listed essential questions and objectives as aspects of effective instruction. One teacher said that the “big topics” for 2016–2017 are student engagement and centers. Teachers said that student engagement is being stressed in 2016–2017.

**Impact**: The absence of a district model of high-quality instruction has contributed to inconsistent instructional practice in observed classrooms across the district, and hinders the ability of the district to improve the achievement of all Blackstone-Millville students.

**Recommendations**

**The district should develop a plan that ensures that the district has a fully documented and aligned curriculum that is available, consistently used, and effectively delivered.**

1. The plan should specify the individual(s) responsible for ensuring that curriculum is high-quality and that curriculum development continues to its completion.

The plan should include a detailed timeline.

2. The plan should include specific details concerning how time will be provided for teachers to accomplish the tasks involved.

3. The district should consider identifying teachers who have expertise in unit design and using the train the trainer model to provide additional support for teachers.

a. The district should consider providing participating teachers with professional development points.

**B**. The district should continue its efforts to document curriculum using its online platform.

1. The plan should provide teachers with additional training on the curricular functions of the Aspen platform.

2. The district should consider forming a committee with teachers from each level who will provide oversight for curriculum uploaded onto the online platform to ensure its quality.

a. The committee should develop a systematic way to organize documents on the platform.

**C.** The district should continue to move forward with its schedule to have the district fully aligned to the 2016 STE Massachusetts Frameworks by May 2017. This should include ensuring that resources such as textbooks and equipment are up-to-date.

**D.** The district should ensure that the curriculum is aligned vertically between grades and at transition points between levels in the district.

1.The district should ensure that elementary teachers have regularly scheduled structured opportunities to collaborate across the district’s elementary schools.

**E.** Math teachers at the elementary and middle levels should receive ongoing training to fully implement the newly adopted math programs.

**F.** The district should develop a plan to appropriately address the integration of technology into the curriculum that includes ongoing training to support all teachers and students in grades 9 and 10 in the effective use of Chromebooks to promote technology integration.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include clearly established responsibilities for the development and implementation of the district’s curricula. Teachers will implement standards-based units that are fully documented and accessible online and that will provide a rich resource for instruction. A comprehensive approach to curriculum development and implementation should lead to greater coherence and higher student achievement.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a year as they worked to develop Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units. It includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
    - *Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu>) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units.
    - The *Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts’ and schools’ curriculum development and revision.
    - ESE’s *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
    - *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
    - Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.

• The Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/review.html>) provides links to the current frameworks and supporting documents, including updated strand maps, crosswalks, and other guidance materials. This web page also includes information on collaborative district networks for the STE implementation and STE ambassadors who are available to assist districts in the implementation.

* + 1. **The district should develop a plan to provide elementary and high school teachers with regular, structured opportunities for collaboration during the school day.**

1. The district should develop a plan to address common planning time for elementary teachers that is separate from personal planning time.

The district might begin this process by researching established common planning time practices in comparable districts.

The district should consider identifying ways to provide teachers at the elementary and high schools with a similar amount of common planning time as the middle school.

1. The district should ensure that teachers at the high school have regular opportunities, not dependent on the availability of substitutes, to meet in their professional learning communities for the purpose of collaboration.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation include increased opportunities for teachers to collaborate on instruction, curriculum, and assessment practices. The implementation of this research-based practice will likely lead to increased student achievement.

**3. The district should make certain that each of its schools, particularly the high school, has clear and sufficient leadership and support to ensure that teachers consistently provide high quality research-based instruction, maintain high and rigorous learning expectations, develop higher order thinking skills, and differentiate instruction to meet the learning needs of all students.**

**A.** The district should identify and support a system of instructional leadership.

1. Instructional leaders should monitor and support instructional quality.

**B.** The district should collaboratively develop a vision and expectations for high-quality instruction and ensure that all teachers and administrators share a common understanding of what constitutes rigorous teaching and learning.

1. As part of this work, district and school leaders should ensure that:

a. instruction includes a range of instructional strategies, well matched to clear learning objective(s);

b. teachers facilitate tasks that encourage students to engage in lesson activities, develop critical thinking, and assume responsibility for their own learning;

c. teachers appropriately differentiate instruction so that lesson content is accessible for all learners.

2. Sufficient and appropriate resources should be available to provide for consistent ongoing leadership, training, support and implementation of high quality, research based instruction.

**Benefits** from adopting this recommendation will include the development and implementation of a common vision and expectations for high quality instruction among all teachers and administrators across the district, as well as the creation of a process to support all teachers as they work to implement the elements of effective instruction.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) 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 *Calibration Video Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/>) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.

ESE’s *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* ***(Updated August 2017)*** (<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.

Assessment

*Contextual Background*

The middle school has implemented effective strategies for the collection and analysis of data and the implementation of instruction and interventions based on that data. The school sought and received support for a standards-based system of formative assessments, and revised the schedule to provide teachers with time to meet, review data, and plan their instruction. The school also revised the schedule to include a daily period for interventions to address the needs of struggling students.

The district does not have a coordinated system of assessments. In the 2016–2017 academic year, the district purchased a limited version of the middle school’s benchmark assessment system for grades 2–5 and grade 9. Teachers in these grades have the assessments, but not the suggested groups or strategies to address students’ needs. While 2016–2017 was only the first year of the administration of the benchmark assessments in grades 2–5 and grade 9, there was little indication during interviews that the data was being used effectively. The high school reported limited use of some common assessments, noting that the collection and review of data was not a key driver of instruction at the high school.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

1. **The use of assessment data is uncoordinated in the district. The assessments in place provide teachers with limited opportunities to identify struggling students and address their needs.**

**A.** The district administers some benchmark assessments.

1. At the time of the onsite in May 2017, the middle school (grades 6–8) was in its second year of administering the STAR (Renaissance Star 360) benchmark assessment in reading and math 4 times per year. This assessment provides data on individual students, suggested student groupings according to need, and resources and strategies for addressing those needs. Quarterly assessment results determine placement of students in math or reading intervention or enrichment during “H” block, a daily intervention period.
   1. Middle-school leaders reported extensive and effective use of STAR results to address students’ needs during the intervention period.

2. In 2016–2017 the district purchased a “bare-bones” version of STAR to be administered 3 times a year in grades 2–5 and in grade 9. This limited version of STAR provides students’ scores only, not suggested groups and interventions.

Interviewees reported that the elementary schools are just beginning to pilot STAR and said that RtI (Response to Intervention) groups are based more on teachers’ assessments than on STAR assessments.

3. Administrators cited the continuing challenge of budgeting $7–8 per student for STAR data.

a. Administrators reported that the district “could not afford” to purchase even the limited version of STAR for kindergarten and grade 10.

4. In kindergarten through grade 5, the district has recently completed training on the Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment. The assessment is a complement to the Reading Workshop model currently in use in the district. It is administered individually twice a year, once in the fall and once in the spring. The results provide an in-depth assessment of the needs of individual students.

**B.** The district uses some summative assessments.

1. In the 2015–2016 school year, the district administered the PARCC assessment for the first and only time.

2. The high school administers common mid-terms and final exams as summative assessments when multiple teachers teach a course. There are several high-school courses taught by only one teacher.

a. Administrators agreed that the common mid-terms and finals are not based on curriculum standards.

b. High-school administrators and department heads acknowledged limited use of the common mid-term and final exam results. Teachers reported some analysis of common mid-terms and finals, noting that it was done “but not in a formal way.” Teachers reported that they “have not fully figured out” how to use the results.

**C.** At the time of the onsite in May 2017, the district was in its second year of implementing the enVisions 2.0 math program in grades 2–5. Teachers reported that implementation has been challenging, in part because of the limited training they have received. As a result, the district is not taking full advantage of the program’s assessments to identify struggling students.

**D.** In 2016–2017, the district eliminated the district data team that had been in place for the previous 3 years. Stipended school data leaders had gathered data for the district data team. Interviewees said that without notice or explanation, data leader positions were not posted for the 2016–2017 year.

1. Teachers reported that in 2015–2016 school year data leaders had collected Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) and Scholastic Math Inventory (SMI) data and forwarded it to the data team, but that the data had not been analyzed.

**Impact**: With the exception of grades 6, 7, and 8, the district does not regularly generate data that can be used to inform instruction and address students’ learning strengths and needs.

**Recommendation**

1. **The district should re-establish its data team and implement a comprehensive system of formative assessments, along with protocols and support for analyzing and using relevant data.**
   * 1. The district should allocate time and resources in order to re-establish a data team.

1. The data team might have a similar makeup as the previous team, or might be a new group. It should include representation from teachers and administrators at all levels and should work under the direction of the assistant superintendent.

2. The data team should have a collaborative leadership structure in which faculty and administrators work together formally and communicate regularly and systematically. The data team should have clearly defined authority and responsibilities and be provided with the resources and supports needed to sustain its efforts.

**B.** The data team should oversee the implementation of a districtwide system of formative assessments.

1. The data team might consider using the middle school as a model for a system of assessments and data at the elementary- and high-school levels.

2. The team should identify the professional development– including embedded professional development, such as professional learning communities– that should be provided in order to guide and support teachers’ use of assessment data to inform instruction and to identify students who would benefit from interventions and enrichment.

**C.** The data system should provide professional staff with convenient, real-time access to student performance data, as well as other relevant academic and demographic data, as appropriate.

**Benefits:** By establishing formal oversight for a districtwide assessment system, the district will help to ensure that instruction is informed by students’ strengths and needs, which will likely contribute to increased student achievement.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - ESE’s *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
    - ESE’s *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/leadership-and-governance.html>) 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.

Student Support

*Contextual Background*

Blackstone-Millville is a small school system[[7]](#footnote-7) where resources are limited. The district is fortunate to have an active, engaged parent body. Parents participate on councils and organizations in each school. School-based parent organizations support a variety of extracurricular student school events including after-school STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) clubs, trips, and dances. One group of parents has formed the Blackstone-Millville Music Association, a non-profit organization that supports the district’s award-winning music program. Over 200 students participate in various aspects of this program.

The district does not have a comprehensive system of support for students’ academic and non-academic needs. While there are elements of a support system, there is not a reliable, common process that ensures that students’ needs are met. Differentiated instruction in classrooms and researched-based interventions are limited.

The district is making slow and uneven progress in implementing the PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention and Support) program across the district to support students’ social-emotional wellbeing; the 2016–2017 District Improvement Plan calls for the implementation of PBIS by May 2017, the time of the onsite review.

It is unclear whether the district is prepared to adequately support ELLs, especially without an ESL curriculum. Services for many students with disabilities are to be met in co-taught classrooms. However, there has been little training for co-teaching, there is an unclear delineation of responsibilities for co-teachers, and the district has provided little ongoing support.

**Strength Finding**

**1. The district offers many opportunities for parents to stay informed, engaged, and actively involved in their children’s academic and non-academic growth and development. The district has established outside partnerships to support and promote the social-emotional health and safety of students.**

* 1. There are multiple opportunities for parents to be informed and involved in schools.
     1. Parents reported and a review of the district’s website confirmed that the district provides a parent portal for middle- and high-school parents to access student attendance and report cards at any time during the school year.
     2. Elementary, middle- and high-school parents reported that they are also kept informed by regular electronic newsletters, emails, and phone calls.
     3. The middle school publishes and posts online a monthly newsletter that outlines the curriculum content for the month as well as other events and reminders for parents. Interviews and a document review indicated that parents are involved in the development of improvement plans through their school councils.
     4. Each school has active parent organizations. The Millville Elementary School Parent Organization and the Blackstone Elementary Parent Organization (Kennedy and Maloney schools) have raised funds and supported many school events, including Student of the Month Lunch, after-school clubs, STEM club, and field trips.
     5. The Blackstone Millville Music Association (BMMA) is a parent-run group that raises funds and supports the music program, including Marching Band, Color Guard, Winter Percussion, Winter Band, and Jazz Band. BMMA provides chaperones, crew, volunteers for the events, and funds for staff salaries, uniforms, equipment, props, and transportation.
  2. The district has forged partnerships to support students’ social-emotional health and safety.
     1. Interviewees reported that Family Continuity, a community-based organization that supports school-based behavioral health, provides small group and individual counseling in the middle and high schools.
     2. The police departments from Millville and Blackstone both provide police presence in all Blackstone-Millville schools. Interviewees including staff and parents reported that a full-time school resource officer from the Blackstone Police department is assigned to the Blackstone schools, and the duties of a police officer from Millville include checking in at the Millville Elementary School.

**Impact**: A strong working relationship with families and appropriate outside partners strengthens the district and what it can offer students. Active parents and partners enhance the education of all students. Parents and other partners in Blackstone-Millville are providing enriching activities and contributing to the growth and social-emotional development of students.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**2. The district does not have a systematic approach for providing academic and non-academic support and ensuring that all students’ needs are met. The district has limited interventions to support struggling students**.

* 1. There are some structures in place to address struggling students’ academic needs.

Building-Based Student Support Teams (BBSSTs) support struggling students.

The team was told that elementary BBSSTs are composed of the principal, the school psychologist, the referring teacher, and resource teachers. The teams brainstorm strategies that may be used in classrooms to help struggling students.

In the middle school the Response to Intervention (RtI) team serves the same function as the BBSST. It meets once a week. Members include the principal, the vice principal, the adjustment counselor, the guidance counselor, the school psychologist, Title I math and ELA teachers, and the nurse.

High-school interviewees reported that they have a BBSST but it does not meet regularly. The team deals with attendance, academic issues, and discipline.

* 1. A document review indicated that the district’s RtI model includes differentiation of instruction in Tier 1 and targeted interventions in Tier 2; however, the review team found little evidence of either.
     1. In observed classrooms overall, the review team found moderate and strong evidence of teachers appropriately differentiating instruction so that content is accessible for all learners (characteristic # 8) in only 40 percent of classrooms.
     2. Elementary teachers reported that Tier 2 support is missing in the district.
     3. Administrators confirmed the absence of Tier 2 interventions.
     4. Interviewees stated that there is no formal Tier 1, 2, or 3 system of support in place at the high school and that interventions vary with teachers.
  2. Time for supplemental targeted support is uneven across the district.
     1. Interviewees reported that RtI intervention blocks, a 20-minute time when students receive instruction in areas of need, take place inconsistently in different grades. In one school only grade 2 has scheduled time for RtI during the school day.
     2. Administrators reported that the elementary level is struggling with providing extra support for reading. In one elementary school the reading specialist is not able to provide push-in support.
     3. The middle school has scheduled one period each day, H Block, for interventions and enrichment. At the end of each quarter students are re-evaluated and placements are adjusted.

Title I specialists provide interventions in math for students at the middle school. Struggling students may have up to three periods of math every day.

After-school content-specific support is available Monday through Thursday from 2:20–2:35 at the middle school. If students need extra time they are encouraged to make an appointment with the teacher.

* + 1. Teachers and other interviewees told the team that beginning with the 2017–2018 school year the high school plans to have a 20 minute RtI period, a time when students will be able to seek and receive support they need in core subjects.

1. The implementation of a districtwide Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) program has been slow and inconsistent.

To support the social-emotional wellbeing of all students, the most recent District Improvement Plan (2016–2017) calls for the implementation of PBIS in all schools by May 2017.

Teachers told the review team that the middle school is most experienced and has used PBIS for several years. A PBIS after-school club meets with a teacher and organizes PBIS coupons that student earn as rewards when they exhibit certain behaviors such as “kindness.” Students use coupons at the school store.

Interviewees reported that the Millville, Maloney, and Kennedy elementary schools have not started PBIS, noting that Millville plans to launch PBIS in 2017–2018.

High-school teachers told the review team that PBIS has not been implemented and some teachers said that they were not sure what it was. Some interviewees said that the high school will wait until 2017–2018 to implement PBIS, when they can hire a consultant to assist with the implementation.

**Impact**: The absence of a reliable, consistent tiered system of support has hampered the ability of the district to provide for students’ diverse learning needs and to improve student achievement.

* + 1. **The district has not established an effective model of co-teaching.**
    2. While the improvement of special education services, including enhancing the co-teaching model, is a goal of the District Improvement Plan 2016–2017, at the time of the review in May 2017 the team found little evidence of ongoing support and professional development to improve existing practices.

1. The team was told in several interviews that teachers have not had much professional development focused on co-teaching.

Several interviewees reported that the district had one “outstanding” professional development session on co-teaching in 2016–2017 but there has been no follow-up.

2. Interviewees reported that they may have some support for co-teaching, but in most instances the responsibility for effective implementation falls to the classroom teachers.

3. Teachers said that the effectiveness of having both a special education teacher and a general education teacher sharing teaching responsibilities depends on their level of experience and their flexibility in working as team members.

a. Interviewees said that at the high school teachers do not find out who their co-teacher will be until the first day of school and that the district does not have an effective co-teaching model.

4. Some interviewees said that co-teaching partnerships may not last because special education teachers are “bounced around.” Some have been called on to administer tests for students who are not on their caseload.

5. The team was told that there was one effective model of co-teaching in the district, in an elementary school where a full-time general education teacher and a full-time special education teacher plan and work together all year.

Other interviewees reported that the high school has several “true” co-taught classes in grade 9.

**Impact**: Without effective implementation of co-teaching, the district cannot ensure that students with disabilities have full access to the core curriculum and are able to perform to the best of their ability.

**Recommendations**

**The district should develop, document, and communicate its expectations for a systemwide protocol to identify and address students’ academic and nonacademic needs. There should be ongoing support to ensure that these protocols are implemented with fidelity.**

**A.** Guidance on the expectations for building-based student support teams should be developed and distributed to each school.

1. Common referral forms and action plan templates could be developed to create consistency across the district.

2. Differentiated instruction should be an ongoing expectation in every classroom. The district should provide exemplars and share best practices districtwide.

**B.** The district should identify and document the resources available for Tier 2 instruction.

1. This information should be shared with teachers.

2. The district should identify and address any gaps in the resources and support available for Tier 2 interventions.

**C.** To hasten the implementation of PBIS across the district, leaders should consult with the middle school where PBIS has been in place for several years. An in-district trainer should be identified to support other schools in their implementation.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include a more consistent and commonly understood system of support. Teachers across the district will know what is expected of them and what supports they can rely on. More importantly, struggling students and those ready for accelerated work will be identified and provided with the support they need.

**Recommended resources:**

* The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* ([www.mass.gov/ese/mtss](http://www.mass.gov/ese/mtss)) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students. The MTSS website includes links to a self-assessment and a variety of helpful resources.

**2. The district should establish clearly defined expectations for co-taught classrooms and provide support to help teachers to meet these expectations.**

**A.** Teachers who are selected for co-teaching should be provided with appropriate professional development and support.

* 1. Responsibilities for each partner should be defined.

**B.** Co-teaching partners should have regular common planning time to prepare lessons and to brainstorm universal teaching strategies that support all learning styles.

1. Co-teaching partners should have opportunities for ongoing support to address any issues that develop during the school year.
2. The district should consider identifying exemplary models that currently exist in the district and use them to promote and expand the model in the district.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include stronger, more consistent co-teaching models where teachers are better prepared to teach together, will have a clear understanding of their responsibilities, and will be supported throughout the year with common planning time and opportunities to address any issues that may arise. Stronger co-teaching partners will lead to students with disabilities and general education students having improved opportunities to learn.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from May 22–24, 2017, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Suzanne Kelly, Curriculum
2. Dr. Richard Silverman, Instruction

3. Patricia Williams, Assessment, *review team coordinator*

4. Lenora Jennings, Student Support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chair, vice-chair.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: president, treasurer, and three building representatives.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and the director of special education.

The team visited the following schools: Kennedy Elementary (K–2), Maloney Elementary (grades 3–5), Millville Elementary (Pre-K–5), Hartnett Middle School (grades 6–8), and Blackstone-Millville Regional High School (9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and three focus groups with eight elementary-school teachers, one middle-school teacher, and nine high-school teachers.

The team observed 47 classes in the district: 18 at the high school, 10 at the middle school, and 19 at the 3 elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**  **5/22/2017** | **Tuesday**  **5/23/2017** | **Wednesday**  **5/24/2017** |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with the teachers’ association; high school and elementary school teacher focus groups; and visits to the Kennedy and Maloney elementary schools for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff and principals; parent focus group; middle school teacher focus group; school committee interview; and visits to the Kennedy and Millville elementary schools, and Hartnett Middle School for classroom observations. | High school student focus group; visits to Hartnett Middle School and Blackstone-Millville Regional High School for classroom observations; meeting with superintendent. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 22 | 1.3% | 84,996 | 8.9% |
| Asian | 23 | 1.3% | 63,690 | 6.7% |
| Hispanic | 95 | 5.4% | 184,782 | 19.4% |
| Native American | 1 | 0.1% | 2,125 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,558 | 89.2% | 584,665 | 61.3% |
| Native Hawaiian | -- | -- | 855 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 48 | 2.7% | 32,635 | 3.4% |
| **All Students** | 1,747 | 100.0% | 953,748 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2016 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Groups** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 315 | 49.1% | 17.8% | 167,530 | 38.4% | 17.4% |
| Econ. Disad. | 357 | 55.6% | 20.4% | 288,465 | 66.1% | 30.2% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 69 | 10.7% | 3.9% | 90,204 | 20.7% | 9.5% |
| All high needs students | 642 | 100.0% | 36.4% | 436,416 | 100.0% | 45.2% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2016. 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 2,049; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,514. | | | | | | |

**Table B2a: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | | | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |  | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 137 | 84.5 | 87.9 | 85.3 | CPI | 88.9 | 4.4 |
| P+ | 137 | 59% | 67% | 62% | Lv 4&5 | 66% | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 116 | 79.5 | 76.6 | 81.6 | CPI | 77.1 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 116 | 53% | 50% | 57% | Lv 4&5 | 60% | -- |
| SGP | 113 | 44.0 | 41.0 | 48.0 | SGP | 37.0 | -7.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 141 | 86.7 | 86.5 | 90.0 | CPI | 89.3 | 2.6 |
| P+ | 141 | 70% | 69% | 73% | Lv 4&5 | 58% | -- |
| SGP | 137 | 61.0 | 56.0 | 56.5 | SGP | 47.0 | -14.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 148 | 81.3 | 90.9 | 86.2 | CPI | 88.1 | 6.8 |
| P+ | 148 | 58% | 79% | 70% | Lv 4&5 | 62% | -- |
| SGP | 135 | 42.0 | 58.0 | 42.0 | SGP | 53.0 | 11.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 138 | 86.9 | 83.2 | 91.7 | CPI | 87.9 | 1.0 |
| P+ | 138 | 65% | 58% | 77% | Lv 4&5 | 61% | -- |
| SGP | 127 | 32.0 | 34.5 | 44.0 | SGP | 33.0 | 1.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 150 | 92.4 | 90.1 | 88.7 | CPI | 93.2 | 0.8 |
| P+ | 150 | 81% | 79% | 71% | Lv 4&5 | 68% | -- |
| SGP | 143 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 1.0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2b: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016[[8]](#footnote-8)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 102 | 98.8 | 98.1 | 99.2 | 96.3 | 96.7 | -2.5 | -2.9 |
| P+ | 102 | 96% | 94% | 97% | 88% | 91% | -8 | -9 |
| SGP | 94 | 77.5 | 66.0 | 62.0 | 58.5 | 50.0 | -19.0 | -3.5 |
| All | CPI | 935 | 86.7 | 87.3 | 88.8 | 88.6 | 87.2 | 1.9 | -0.2 |
| P+ | -- | 68% | 70% | 72% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 751 | 49.0 | 50.0 | 49.5 | 46.0 | 50.0 | -3.0 | -3.5 |

**Table B2c: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | |  | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |  | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 137 | 87.8 | 86.3 | 86.1 | CPI | 92.2 | 4.4 |
| P+ | 137 | 69% | 66% | 74% | Lv 4&5 | 64% | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 116 | 76.6 | 75.2 | 80.9 | CPI | 74.6 | -2.0 |
| P+ | 116 | 43% | 43% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | 40% | -- |
| SGP | 113 | 31.0 | 32.5 | 48.0 | SGP | 26.0 | -5.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 140 | 83.3 | 83.7 | 80.7 | CPI | 82.6 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 140 | 61% | 64% | 55% | Lv 4&5 | 56% | -- |
| SGP | 136 | 38.0 | 64.0 | 58.0 | SGP | 54.0 | 16.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 142 | 79.5 | 85.1 | 80.9 | CPI | 80.0 | 0.5 |
| P+ | 142 | 58% | 66% | 63% | Lv 4&5 | 43% | -- |
| SGP | 136 | 50.0 | 44.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 37.0 | -13.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 132 | 72.9 | 72.6 | 79.6 | CPI | 79.0 | 6.1 |
| P+ | 132 | 48% | 46% | 56% | Lv 4&5 | 52% | -- |
| SGP | 125 | 47.0 | 57.0 | 56.0 | SGP | 57.0 | 10.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 146 | 82.8 | 75.9 | 79.8 | CPI | 88.8 | 6.0 |
| P+ | 146 | 68% | 53% | 59% | Lv 4&5 | 72% | -- |
| SGP | 140 | 48.0 | 47.0 | 57.0 | SGP | 65.0 | 17.0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2d: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**  **Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016[[9]](#footnote-9)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 99 | 92.5 | 93.8 | 95.5 | 85.9 | 89.7 | -6.6 | -9.6 |
| P+ | 99 | 86% | 87% | 88% | 70% | 78% | -16 | -18 |
| SGP | 93 | 52.0 | 58.0 | 41.0 | 33.0 | 50.0 | -19.0 | -8.0 |
| All | CPI | 928 | 81.8 | 81.3 | 82.8 | 83.2 | 81.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 |
| P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | 62% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 745 | 45.0 | 49.0 | 50.5 | 46.0 | 50.0 | 1.0 | -4.5 |

**Table B2e: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 5 | CPI | 142 | 84.4 | 83.9 | 82 | 82.4 | 76.4 | -2 | 0.4 |
| P+ | 142 | 61% | 56% | 52% | 51% | 47% | -10 | -1 |
| 8 | CPI | 150 | 68.8 | 72.8 | 71.5 | 73.7 | 71.3 | 4.9 | 2.2 |
| P+ | 150 | 33% | 43% | 34% | 37% | 41% | 4 | 3 |
| 10 | CPI | 91 | 94.2 | 93.8 | 96.0 | 86.5 | 88.9 | -7.7 | -9.5 |
| P+ | 91 | 87% | 87% | 88% | 73% | 73% | -14 | -15 |
| **All** | CPI | 383 | 80.3 | 82.6 | 81.8 | 80 | 78.7 | -0.3 | -1.8 |
| P+ | 383 | 56% | 60% | 55% | 51% | 54% | -5 | -4 |
| Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE) MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B3a: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[10]](#footnote-10)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | | | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |  | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 333 | 74.6 | 75.8 | 77.3 | CPI | 77.6 | 0.3 | 3.0 |
| P+ | -- | 44% | 49% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 249 | 47.0 | 45.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 42.0 | -8.0 | -5.0 |
| State | CPI | 222,707 | 76.8 | 77.1 | 76.3 | CPI | 77.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| P+ | -- | 48% | 50% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,487 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 207 | -- | -- | 83.7 | CPI | 85.4 | 1.7 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | 62% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 155 | -- | -- | 50.0 | SGP | 44.0 | -6.0 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,877 | -- | -- | 77.6 | CPI | 78.2 | 0.6 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,361 | -- | -- | 46.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 0.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 163 | 59.8 | 58.1 | 64.7 | CPI | 63.2 | -1.5 | 3.4 |
| P+ | -- | 18% | 18% | 28% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 120 | 43.5 | 37.0 | 48.5 | SGP | 40.5 | -8.0 | -3.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,177 | 66.8 | 66.6 | 67.4 | CPI | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| P+ | -- | 30% | 31% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,633 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 24 | 70.0 | 78.6 | 78.6 | CPI | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | -- | 20% | 57% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 12 | -- | -- | -- | SGP | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 52,960 | 67.4 | 67.8 | 68.9 | CPI | 70.7 | 1.8 | 3.3 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,109 | 53.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 | SGP | 54.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 935 | 86.7 | 87.3 | 88.8 | CPI | 88.6 | -0.2 | 1.9 |
| P+ | -- | 68% | 70% | 72% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 751 | 49.0 | 50.0 | 49.5 | SGP | 46.0 | -3.5 | -3.0 |
| State | CPI | 491,267 | 86.8 | 86.7 | 86.8 | CPI | 87.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| P+ | -- | 69% | 69% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,999 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3b: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[11]](#footnote-11)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | |  | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |  | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 326 | 67.4 | 67.3 | 68.8 | CPI | 71.8 | 3.0 | 4.4 |
| P+ | -- | 37% | 36% | 38% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 243 | 38.0 | 45.5 | 46.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 0.0 | 8.0 |
| State | CPI | 222,349 | 68.6 | 68.4 | 67.9 | CPI | 68.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| P+ | -- | 40% | 40% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,191 | 46.0 | 47.0 | 46.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 200 | -- | -- | 75.7 | CPI | 78.8 | 3.1 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | 47% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 151 | -- | -- | 45.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 5.0 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,560 | -- | -- | 69.2 | CPI | 70.0 | 0.8 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,091 | -- | -- | 46.0 | SGP | 45.0 | -1.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 160 | 49.2 | 50.5 | 55.9 | CPI | 57.7 | 1.8 | 8.5 |
| P+ | -- | 12% | 13% | 18% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 115 | 33.0 | 51.0 | 53.0 | SGP | 45.0 | -8.0 | 12.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,049 | 57.4 | 57.1 | 57.3 | CPI | 58.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 22% | 22% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,511 | 42.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 44.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 24 | 75.0 | 67.9 | 62.5 | CPI | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | -- | 50% | 36% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 11 | -- | -- | -- | SGP | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 53,048 | 63.9 | 63.8 | 64.5 | CPI | 65.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,290 | 53.0 | 52.0 | 51.0 | SGP | 50.0 | -1.0 | -3.0 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 928 | 81.8 | 81.3 | 82.8 | CPI | 83.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 |
| P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | 62% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 745 | 45.0 | 49.0 | 50.5 | SGP | 46.0 | -4.5 | 1.0 |
| State | CPI | 490,612 | 80.8 | 80.3 | 80.7 | CPI | 81.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,423 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3c: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 128 | 67.0 | 70.5 | 71.8 | 67.6 | 0.6 | -4.2 |
| P+ | 128 | 32% | 38% | 36% | 31% | -1 | -5 |
| State | CPI | 89,857 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 66.3 | 65.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 |
| P+ | 89,857 | 31% | 33% | 32% | 31% | 0 | -1 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 83 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.6 | 70.8 | 70.8 | -6.8 |
| P+ | 83 | 0% | 0% | 45% | 36% | 36 | -9 |
| State | CPI | 61,476 | -- | -- | 67.1 | 65.8 | -- | -1.3 |
| P+ | 61,476 | -- | -- | 33% | 29% | -- | -4 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 58 | 47.9 | 56.1 | 60.3 | 58.6 | 10.7 | -1.7 |
| P+ | 58 | 10% | 17% | 16% | 16% | 6 | 0 |
| State | CPI | 38,109 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 60.2 | 59.7 | -0.1 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 38,109 | 20% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 18,594 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 53.9 | 54.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| P+ | 18,594 | 19% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 0 | 1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 383 | 80.3 | 82.6 | 81.8 | 80 | -0.3 | -1.8 |
| P+ | 383 | 56% | 60% | 55% | 51% | -5 | -4 |
| State | CPI | 208,262 | 79.0 | 79.6 | 79.4 | 78.7 | -0.3 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 208,262 | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 | 0 |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE). State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Annual Grade 9–12 Drop-Out Rates, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High Needs | 2.8% | 3.9% | 2.7% | 3.1% | 0.3 | 10.7% | 0.4 | 14.8% | 3.7% |
| Econ. Disad.[[12]](#footnote-12) | 3.5% | 4.1% | 2.9% | 3.9% | 0.4 | 11.4% | 1.0 | 34.5% | 4.1% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 1.9% | 1.9% | 3.6% | 1.5% | -0.4 | -21.0% | -2.1 | 58.3% | 3.1% |
| ELL | -- | -- | 16.7% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.6% |
| **All students** | 1.4% | 1.8% | 1.5% | 1.3% | -0.1 | -7.1% | -0.2 | 13.3% | 1.9% |
| Notes: The annual drop-out rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Drop outs are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| All students | 94.8% | 95.0% | 95.0% | 94.9% | 0.1 | 0.1% | -0.1 | -0.1% | 94.9% |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B6 Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY14** | | | **FY15** | | | **FY16** | | | |
|  | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  | | | | | | | | | |
| By school committee | $21,131,051 | $24,380,579 | | $22,216,145 | | $25,717,193 | | $23,310,388-- | | $23,401,216-- |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $2,069,501 | | -- | | $2,583,018 | | -- | | $2,270,701-- |
| Total expenditures | -- | $26,450,080 | | -- | | $28,300,211 | | -- | | $25,671,917-- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $10,637,619 | | -- | | $10,684,594 | | -- | | $10,729,594 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $8,081,231 | | -- | | $8,183,978 | | -- | | $8,234,791 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $18,718,850 | | -- | | $18,868,572 | | -- | | $18,964,385 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $19,967,261 | | -- | | $20,171,931 | | -- | | $20,387,775 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $1,248,411 | | -- | | $1,303,359 | | -- | | $1,423,390 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 6.7% | | -- | | 6.9% | | -- | | 7.5% |
| \*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: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved 12/13/16 and 8/23/17 | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B7: Blackstone-Millville Regional School District**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2013–2015**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |
| Administration | $320 | $421 | $650 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $737 | $614 | $647 |
| Teachers | $4,572 | $4,622 | $4,770 |
| Other teaching services | $817 | $886 | $1,188 |
| Professional development | $31 | $58 | $92 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $32 | $92 | $206 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $318 | $376 | $357 |
| Pupil services | $1,363 | $1,429 | $1,954 |
| Operations and maintenance | $998 | $1,150 | $782 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $1,785 | $1,891 | $1,925 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $10,974 | $11,539 | $12,571 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/)  Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) |  |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content. | **ES** | 0% | 5% | 74% | 21% | 2.2 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 20% | 80% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 6% | 11% | 33% | 50% | 2.3 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 3 | 22 | 21 | 2.3 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 6% | 47% | 45% |  |
| 2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson. | **ES** | 5% | 11% | 79% | 5% | 1.8 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 40% | 60% | 2.6 |
| **HS** | 22% | 28% | 39% | 11% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 7 | 26 | 9 | 1.8 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 15% | 55% | 19% |  |
| 3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s). | **ES** | 5% | 16% | 74% | 5% | 1.8 |
| **MS** | 10% | 30% | 20% | 40% | 1.9 |
| **HS** | 17% | 39% | 33% | 11% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 13 | 22 | 7 | 1.7 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 28% | 47% | 15% |  |
| 4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 5% | 16% | 68% | 11% | 1.8 |
| **MS** | 10% | 10% | 30% | 50% | 2.2 |
| **HS** | 17% | 39% | 33% | 11% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 11 | 22 | 9 | 1.7 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 23% | 47% | 19% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **7.6** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **9.5** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **6.4** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **7.6** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 0% | 16% | 63% | 21% | 2.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 60% | 40% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 6% | 44% | 33% | 17% | 1.6 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 11 | 24 | 11 | 2.0 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 23% | 51% | 23% |  |
| 6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking. | **ES** | 5% | 16% | 74% | 5% | 1.8 |
| **MS** | 11% | 11% | 67% | 11% | 1.8 |
| **HS** | 28% | 33% | 22% | 17% | 1.3 |
| **Total #** | 7 | 10 | 24 | 5 | 1.6 |
| **Total %** | 15% | 22% | 52% | 11% |  |
| 7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | **ES** | 5% | 26% | 68% | 0% | 1.6 |
| **MS** | 10% | 20% | 50% | 20% | 1.8 |
| **HS** | 28% | 33% | 28% | 11% | 1.2 |
| **Total #** | 7 | 13 | 23 | 4 | 1.5 |
| **Total %** | 15% | 28% | 49% | 9% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **5.5** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **6.0** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **4.1** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **5.1** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners. | **ES** | 16% | 42% | 37% | 5% | 1.3 |
| **MS** | 30% | 20% | 50% | 0% | 1.2 |
| **HS** | 28% | 39% | 28% | 6% | 1.1 |
| **Total #** | 11 | 17 | 17 | 2 | 1.2 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 36% | 36% | 4% |  |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel). | **ES** | 11% | 21% | 58% | 11% | 1.7 |
| **MS** | 10% | 20% | 60% | 10% | 1.7 |
| **HS** | 22% | 44% | 22% | 11% | 1.2 |
| **Total #** | 7 | 14 | 21 | 5 | 1.5 |
| **Total %** | 15% | 30% | 45% | 11% |  |
| 10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 74% | 26% | 2.3 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 60% | 40% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 0% | 22% | 61% | 17% | 1.9 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 4 | 31 | 12 | 2.2 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 9% | 66% | 26% |  |
| 11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students. | **ES** | 0% | 21% | 68% | 11% | 1.9 |
| **MS** | 20% | 10% | 60% | 10% | 1.6 |
| **HS** | 17% | 39% | 33% | 11% | 1.4 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 12 | 25 | 5 | 1.6 |
| **Total %** | 11% | 26% | 53% | 11% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | **7.2** |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | **6.9** |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | **5.7** |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | **6.5** |

1. The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years’ CPI targets. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Drop-out rates for students from low income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates for students from economically disadvantaged families. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. According to ESE data, 1,747 students were enrolled in the 2016–2017 school year. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Drop-out rates for low income students used for drop-out rates for students from economically disadvantaged families for 2012, 2013, and 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)