District Review Report

Oxford Public Schools

Review conducted April 8-11, 2013

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Oxford Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of system wide functions using the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) six district standards: leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial and asset management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

Districts reviewed in the 2012-2013 school year included those classified into Level 3[1] of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance in each of the state's six regions: Greater Boston, Berkshires, Northeast, Southeast, Central, and Pioneer Valley. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards above. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in each of the district standards review documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers' association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. Subsequent to the on-site review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE. *District review reports focus primarily on the system's most significant strengths and challenges, with an emphasis on identifying areas for improvement.*

Site Visit

The site visit to the Oxford School District was conducted from April 8-11, 2013. The site visit included 23.25 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 59 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 25 elementary school teachers, 15 middle school teachers, and 23 high school teachers. The Oxford review team had five members who were each responsible for one standard; the team shared responsibility for the Student Support standard. As a result, the team conducted two rather than three student support interviews. Also, two focus groups and one interview were conducted without a scribe.

---

[1] Districts selected were in Level 3 in school year 2012-2013; all served one or more schools among the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving common grade levels pursuant to 603 CMR 2.05(2)(a). The districts with the lowest aggregate performance and least movement in Composite Performance Index (CPI) in their respective regions were selected for review from among those districts not exempt under Chapter 15, Section 55A. A district was exempt if another comprehensive review was completed or scheduled within nine months of the review window.

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, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 58 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Oxford has a town manager form of government and the chairman of the school committee is elected by the members. The five members of the school committee meet every two weeks.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2009. The district leadership team includes the following central office positions: superintendent, curriculum director, special education director, business manager, and educational technology director. The number of positions has been mostly stable, but there have been many changes over the last four years. There have been three special education directors since 2007 and the responsibilities of the curriculum director have increased over the same period: from Title I director to Title I director and curriculum director K-8, to curriculum director K-12 as of this school year. Also, the business manager was hired in August of 2009 and the educational technology director was hired in June of 2007.

The district has four principals leading four schools. There are three other school administrators, assistant principals at the middle and high schools and the director of Project COFFEE (Co-Operative Federation for Educational Experiences), an alternative program for high school students that teaches occupational skills along with academics. As of 2012-2013 there were 134.5 teachers in the district.

In 2012-2013, 1,946 students were enrolled in the district's 5 schools:

Table 1: Oxford Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Alfred M. Chaffee	ES	K-2	444
Clara Barton	ES	PK, 3-4	362
Oxford Middle School	MS	5-8	626
Oxford High School	HS	9-12	514
Totals	**4 schools**	**PK-12**	**1,946**
*As of October 1, 2012			

Between 2008 and 2012 overall student enrollment fluctuated, and overall decreased by 60 students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 46 K-12 districts of similar size (2,000-2,999 students) in fiscal year 2011: $11,398 as compared to a median of $11,258. Actual net school spending has been above what is required under state law, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district's level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6) annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for the district and for schools and student subgroups that have at least four years of sufficient data and are therefore eligible to be classified into an accountability and assistance level (1-5). "Sufficient data" means that at least 20 students in a district or school or at least 30 students in a subgroup were assessed on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests for the four years under review.

Four-and two-year trend data are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. Data on student performance is also available in Appendix B. In both this section and Appendix B, the data reported is the most recent available.

1. **The district is Level 3 because the Oxford High School is Level 3.[2]**

   A. The Oxford High School is among the lowest performing 20 percent of high schools and its high needs students are among the lowest performing 20% of subgroups.[3]

   B. The district's three schools place between the 19th percentile and the 39th percentile based on each school's four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other schools serving the same or similar grades: Clara Barton (35th percentile of elementary schools); Oxford Middle School (39th percentile of middle schools); and Oxford High School (19th percentile of high schools).

2. **The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.**

   A. The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students and for high needs[4] students is less than 75 for the

---

[2] Due to the district's Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of "Needs Technical Assistance (NTA)." This serves as an indication that while areas of the district's performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues.

[3] A district is classified into the level of its lowest-performing school unless it has been placed in Level 4 or 5 by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education independent of the level of its schools.

district. The district's cumulative PPI [56] is 70 for all students and 71 for high needs students. The district's cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 72 (low income students), 45 (students with disabilities), 74 (Hispanic/Latino students), and 69 (White students).

3. **The district's English language arts (ELA) performance is low[7] relative to other districts and its growth[8] is moderate.[9]**

    A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students.[10]

---

[4] The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

[5] The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district's, school's or subgroup's cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group's annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale.

[6] The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school's performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades.

[7] All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state's measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: "very high", "high", "moderate", "low" or "very low." In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts' CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools' CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department's School and District Profiles website: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx.

[8] Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student's or group of students' achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student's MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles ("academic peers"). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group's progress toward proficiency based on the group's current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group's progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates "moderate" or "typical" growth if the group's median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles.

[9] For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a.

B. The district met its annual growth for Hispanic/Latino students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.

C. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, Hispanic/Latino students, multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for low income students and multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students.

D. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grade 7, low performance in grades 3, 4, 6, 8, and overall, and very low performance in grades 5 and 10 relative to other districts.

E. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate growth in grades 4, 6, 7, 10, and overall and low growth in grades 5 and 8.

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful[11] gains in grade 3, 4, 8, and 10 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 5. Most of the gains in grades 3, 4, 8, and 10 and declines in grade 5 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

G. The 2012 performance of the Clara Barton School (PK, 3-4) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3. These gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of the Oxford Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 8 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 5. Most of the gains in grade 8 and declines in grade 5 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

---

[10] A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target.

[11] The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa.

I. The 2012 performance of the Oxford High School (9-12) is low relative to other high schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 10. These gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

4. **The district's mathematics performance is low relative to other districts and its growth is moderate.[12] There were variations in performance among grades.**

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, low income students, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for high needs students, students with disabilities, and multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students.

B. The district met its annual growth for Hispanic/Latino students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.

C. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students. It did not earn extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for any reportable group.

D. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grades 4, 6, 7, and 8, low performances in grades 3 and overall and very low performance in grades 5 and 10 relative to other districts.

E. In 2012 the district demonstrated high growth in grade 4, moderate growth in grades 5, 6, 7, 8, and overall, and low growth in grade 10.

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 4 and 8 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 5. Most of the gains in grade 4 and 8 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

G. The 2012 performance of the Clara Barton School (PK, 3-4) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 4 and overall. Most of the gains in grade 4 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of the Oxford Middle School (5-8) is moderate relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 8 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 5. Most of the gains in grade 8 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

---

[12] For mathematics trends in the aggregate, see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b.

I. The 2012 performance of the Oxford High School (9-12) is low relative to other high schools and its growth is low.

5. **The district's science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is low relative to other districts.[13]**

   A. The district did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.

   B. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students and White students. It did not earn extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for any reportable group.

   C. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grade 8, low performance overall, and very low performance in grades 5 and 10 relative to other districts.

   D. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district did not demonstrate potentially meaningful gains or declines.

   E. The 2012 performance of the Oxford Middle School (5-8) is moderate relative to other middle schools.

   F. The 2012 performance of the Oxford High School (9-12) is low relative to other high schools.

6. **In 2012, the district met its annual improvement targets for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate but did not meet its annual improvement goal for the five-year cohort graduation rate.[14] Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available[15], the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate declined, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased.[16]**

---

[13] For STE trends in the aggregate, see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c.

[14] All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state's federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher.

[15] Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote.

[16] For annual dropout rate trends for the last three years available, see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available, see Tables B7a and B7b.

A. Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 2.9 percentage points, from 74.1% to 77.0%, an increase of 3.9 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 1.3 percentage points, from 78.3% to 77.0%, a decrease of 1.7 percent.

B. Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate increased 2.4 percentage points, from 80.1% to 82.5%, an increase of 3.0 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it increased 6.6 percentage points, from 75.9% to 82.5%, an increase of 8.7 percent.

C. Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate increased 1.4 percentage points, from 3.6% to 5.0%, an increase of 40 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it increased 1.8 percentage points, from 3.2% to 5.0%, an increase of 57.5 percent.

7. **Oxford Public Schools' rate of in-school suspensions in 2011-2012 was significantly higher than the statewide rate[17]; however, the rate of out-of-school suspensions did not significantly differ from the state rate.**

   A. The rate of in-school suspensions for Oxford was 8.9 percent, over twice the state rate of 3.4 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Oxford was 6.2 percent, compared to the state rate of 5.4 percent.

   B. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for out-of-school suspensions but not for in-school suspensions. The out-of-school-suspension rate was 10 percent for African-American/Black students, 11 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 4.4 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 5.9 percent for White students.

   C. There was a significant difference[18] between the in-school suspension rates of high needs students and non high needs students (13.1 percent compared to 6.2 percent), and low income students and non low income students (14.7 percent compared to 6.2 percent).

   D. There was also a significant difference between the rates of out-of-school suspensions for high needs students and non high needs students (12.3 percent compared to 2.3 percent), low income students and non low income students (12.8 percent compared to 3.1 percent), students with disabilities and students without disabilities (18.7 percent compared to 4.2 percent), and English language learners and non English language learners (23.5 percent compared to 6.0 percent).

   E. On average students in the Oxford Public Schools missed 2.8 days per disciplinary action[19], slightly lower than the state average of 3.1.

---

[17] Statistical significance based on one sample T test. P≤ .05
[18] Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square. P≤ .05
[19] Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting.

Oxford Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. **School committee members, the superintendent, other administrators, and the officers of the Oxford Educators Association (OEA) reported improved labor-management relations between the school committee and superintendent and the OEA. This has made possible a negotiated three-year successor agreement between the school committee and the teachers' association, adoption of the new educator evaluation system, a substantial decrease in the number of grievances, and regularly scheduled meetings between the superintendent and the president of the teachers' association.**

   A. During interviews with the review team school committee members spoke positively about the changed relationship with the teachers' association.

      1. One school committee member characterized the relationship as "healthy." In addition, she said that the recent negotiations with the teachers' association had produced a "good contract for both sides." Furthermore, this same school committee member mentioned that the atmosphere surrounding negotiations was "the opposite of before" and "nowhere near as contentious." Another school committee member said that he has not seen a grievance this year. A third member spoke about the work-to-rule the district had experienced in the past and said that the departure of the committee's former negotiator had improved the relationship with the association.

   B. The superintendent made favorable comments about his relationship with the teachers' association.

      1. The superintendent said that for years the relationship with the teachers' association was adversarial, but now "we all work together." He characterized the work-to-rule in 2010 as a time of difficult district/association relations. He also said that the former labor counsel was not at the negotiating table during the most recent negotiations. Rather, the superintendent and the business manager negotiated with the teachers' association representatives directly, and things went smoothly. Finally, the superintendent said that there had not been any grievances to that point in the 2012-2013 school year.

   C. Other administrators said that the relationship between the school committee and the Oxford Educators Association (OEA) had improved.

      1. One administrator said that the relationship between the parties has "improved greatly." According to this administrator the superintendent and the president of the OEA meet frequently. A second administrator said that the parties were able to negotiate a three-year contract last year and that "speaks volumes." This administrator also mentioned that during his first year in his position there were more grievances filed than he had ever seen, but since then "it has died down to a trickle." A third administrator said that a few years

ago, there was a very adversarial relationship with the teachers' association and the teachers participated in a work-to-rule. However, there had not been any grievances this year.

D. The officers of the teachers' association acknowledged that the relationship between the school committee and superintendent and the OEA has improved.

1. The officers said that the superintendent has made gains with open communications. They offered the example of the superintendent allowing the association input on the school calendar. Also, they expressed the opinion that the superintendent had seen success in dealing with teachers, and that he wanted a "more open" relationship and "happy teachers." In addition, they mentioned that issues now got resolved before initiating the grievance process. They said that this said a lot about the relationship between the association and the superintendent. The officers said that negotiations with the school committee on a new collective bargaining agreement went well, that negotiations were done in a month (five sessions), ratified the first time around, and the relationship between the parties during the process was "collaborative, amiable, and professional." Finally, association leaders said that last year they completed negotiations with the school committee and adopted with few changes the new ESE evaluation system.

2. The superintendent said that the school committee and the teachers' association had signed a Memorandum of Agreement adopting the educator evaluation system with some adapted language; the district had submitted the MOA to ESE.

Impact: Improved relations between the school committee/superintendent and the OEA enable both teachers and administrators to focus more of their time on improving student achievement throughout the district.

Financial and Asset Management

2. **The district's budget document provides the community with a comprehensive, clear, and concise rationale for its funding request.**

A. The budget provides background on positive developments in the schools, including improvement in scores in English language arts, the addition of the STEM Course and Math Assessments Program at the middle school, the required community service in all schools, and the Special Olympics Programs at the middle school. These concrete examples demonstrate to the community that the district is taking steps to improve.

B. The budget provides comparative budget history from the previous three years with documentation concerning funding sources and specific expenses. In this way the community has a clear and transparent presentation of previous budgets and can see how the current proposal compares with and improves upon previous ones.

C. The budget provides detail on specific district and school needs as well as capital requests. The needs are highlighted in the presentation of the district's Optimal FY14 Budget.

Impact: By providing the community with a clear message through its budget document, the district is better able to gain support for its budget request through more awareness of how the budget is derived, how the funding will be allocated, and what the budget goals for the year are, as well as the specifics of additional personnel, capital needs, and areas of concern for the schools.

3. **The district has made strategic investments in technology as a vehicle to promote its educational priorities; these investments have a long term pay-off in efficiency.**

   A. The iPASS system allows parents to access information about the school and their children's performance. With this connection, the district advances its commitment to enhance the partnership between the schools and the parents.

   B. The Atlas Rubicon program is an electronic platform that provides a comprehensive template so that teachers can directly input their curriculum. This enables the district to continue developing its curriculum.

   C. Tracker enables regular education teachers to access their students' educational plans and identify required accommodations and supports.

   D. The district's actively maintained webpage provides the community with an up-to-date picture of what is happening in the schools.

   E. The district uses technology to streamline its mandatory training. In this way, the district reserves its professional development time to address important instructional needs.

Impact: The district has limited resources and many needs. It provides a number of technology platforms to enable staff to tackle those needs swiftly and effectively.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

It is important to note that district review reports prioritize identifying challenges and areas for growth in order to promote a cycle of continuous improvement; the report deliberately describes the district's challenges and concerns in greater detail than the strengths identified during the review.

Leadership and Governance

4. **The district has a limited ability to direct, measure, and communicate its progress because it does not have a shared vision, the goals in the District Improvement Plan and the School Improvement Plans are not aligned, and progress toward those goals is for the most part not tracked and reported.**

   A. A review of documents by the visiting team showed that the district's vision was adopted in 1995 and revised in 1997.

1. Administrators do not share a clear understanding of the district's vision. When administrators were asked about the district's vision, one central office administrator said that the vision of the district was to provide reading at every grade level and to prepare students for college and beyond. When school level administrators were asked what the district's vision is, one replied: "There is a disjointed vision and we are not collectively rolling in the same direction; two years ago we knew we needed a more cohesive one, but it fell away." Another said that the fact that the administrators all paused when the question was asked was an indication of their uncertainty about the vision.

B. In most instances, the goals in the DIP and in the SIPs are not aligned.

1. A review of the DIP and the SIPs by the team shows an absence of alignment of the SIP goals with those in the DIP. According to the superintendent, the district does not have one person who is responsible for aligning the goals in the SIPs with the goals in the DIP and that responsibility rests with him and other administrators.

C. The DIP and SIPs do not have a common template.

1. The 2012-2013 DIP provided to review team members is a one-page document that lists five objectives, each having anywhere from two to five strategic goals. The DIP does not have a template. An examination of the SIPs showed that the high school SIP consists of five statements and does not have goals or a template. The middle school SIP has nine goals, and a five column template. The SIP for the Clara Barton Elementary School has four goals and a six column template; the SIP for the Alfred Chaffee Elementary School has four goals, and a five column template.

D. Progress on DIP and SIP goals is not regularly reported.

1. According to one school committee member, upon request the committee receives a mid-year report concerning where each school is as far as meeting its goals. One central office administrator said that the superintendent does not give DIP goal updates to the administrative team. The superintendent said that he did not provide enough feedback on performance in the district. All principals said that they did not report progress on SIP goal attainment to their staffs. When teachers in focus groups were asked about how often they received progress reports about SIP goal attainment, one middle school teacher replied, "Never, from anyone." A high school teacher said that administrative progress reports on SIP goals were not given to staff.

Impact: The absence of a shared vision for the district and of alignment of SIP goals with DIP goals leads to confusion among stakeholders as to where the school system is heading, the way in which it intends to get there, and their roles in that process. Templates among the improvement plans that vary and do not take into account the action steps needed to accomplish a goal add to this confusion and give the impression that the schools are working independently rather than as a system. Without the superintendent reporting periodically to the school committee, staffs, and other stakeholder groups about the progress being made on the DIP goals and without principals reporting to staffs, parent councils, parents, and other groups on progress toward achieving the SIP goals, these constituencies do not know what progress is being made with these plans.

5. **At the time of the review, the superintendent had not completed any written evaluations of administrators in Oxford.**

   A. Document review by the team and interviews showed that district administrators had not been formally evaluated by the superintendent during his tenure in the district, in contravention of the requirement of Mass. Gen. Laws c. 71, s. 38, for yearly evaluation of administrators.

   1. A review of the personnel files of central office administrators and principals showed that they did not contain evaluations by the superintendent.

   2. When central office administrators were asked how often the superintendent evaluated them, one administrator said that no evaluation had been done by the superintendent. Another said, "I don't recall."

   3. School principals told the review team that they had not been evaluated in the past three school years.

   4. The superintendent said that he had not done any formal evaluations of administrators for the previous three school years. However, he described providing administrators with informal assessments.

Impact: The absence of an annual formal evaluation deprives administrators of a picture of their performance for the year as well as recognition of accomplishments and suggestions for improvement. It also de-emphasizes the importance of the evaluation process and means administrators do not have a working model for evaluating their staff members. This may result in low levels of confidence in the new educator evaluation system. Finally, the absence of a formal evaluation system means that school and central office administrators are relatively independent and not necessarily working toward accomplishing district priorities.

Curriculum and Instruction

6. **The district does not have aligned, complete curriculum documents or a central office leader with adequate authority and responsibility in charge of curriculum development and revision and the monitoring of the curriculum's implementation. This leaves matters of what to teach and how to teach up to individual schools and classroom teachers.**

   A. The district's curriculum director was originally hired as the Title I director. In 2009-2010 she became the half-time curriculum director for K-8 and in 2012-2013 became .7 FTE as K-12 curriculum director and .3 FTE as Title I director. The team was not provided with a job description for her position; according to the curriculum director, she does not observe classrooms or evaluate staff.

   1. Teachers said that principals (and, at the high school, the assistant principal) are considered curriculum leaders.

   2. New teachers' understanding about what to teach also comes from their mentors; one mentor mentioned providing curriculum guides to mentees.

   B. Currently, districtwide curriculum is not consistent, aligned, or comprehensive.

1. Teachers said that some teachers teach to the textbook instead of to the state standards.

2. The Atlas Rubicon curriculum platform enables the process of collecting the curriculum into one coherent system accessible to all teachers. However, a review of over 400 curriculum entries into Atlas Rubicon showed that some critical components of complete curriculum documents such as assessments, learning activities, and instructional practices were not included.

3. Vertical alignment of curriculum is limited. The district runs curriculum meetings after school and stipends teachers but finding time to get teachers together is challenging because of the different release times at the various levels, according to administrators.

C. An informal district goal is to have the curriculum documents for both ELA and math completed by September 2013.

1. In interviews administrators suggested that these documents were about 50 percent completed. However, high school administrators and teachers said that the high school would not be ready, as they had just completed the training on how to use the Atlas Rubicon technology two weeks before the site visit. Currently there are very few documents in the electronic platform from the high school and none from grades 11 and 12.

Impact: Without a carefully crafted job description and sufficient responsibility and authority for a districtwide curriculum leader, without a documented process for developing, reviewing, revising, and monitoring the curriculum, and without opportunities to bring together the appropriate teachers, the district cannot ensure that all students have access to a comprehensive, high-quality, aligned curriculum.

7. **The district does not have an instructional model in place that reflects a shared understanding of the components of effective instruction. This limits administrators' and teachers' ability to provide an effective learning environment for students.**

A. A document review by the visiting team showed that district and most school improvement goals did not include expectations for high quality instruction.

B. In interviews district administrators and teachers did not articulate a common understanding of good instructional practices. When asked about instructional practices and related professional development, teachers offered the John Collins writing program. When teachers were asked about instructional practices in classes, they mentioned "Collins Writing" and "Do Now" practices.

C. Limited tiered instructional support is offered to students. Tiered instruction is predominately in the form of pull-out or push-in by special education and Title I teachers or replacement classes taught by literacy teachers. Placement of students into these services is typically based on scores on the MAP, by IEP or, in the case of the high school, by MCAS results and IEPs.

D. Because of an absence of common planning time in some schools, all teachers do not have regular opportunities for grade level meetings for professional development, collaborative review of student work, or other activities that would lead to a shared understanding of good instruction. High school teachers said that they had a

common prep time for individual teachers, but this was not for teacher meetings. The elementary schools do not have common planning time, according to teachers.

Impact: The absence of a shared instructional model for teaching and learning leads to wide variation in instructional quality. Without a shared instructional language and common understanding of good instruction, the district cannot ensure that students will achieve at high levels. Without access to targeted professional development in instructional practices, teachers have limited understanding of how to improve their instruction.

8. **The quality of instruction in observed classrooms was inconsistent; in most cases the review team did not find clear and consistent evidence of research-based practices.**

   The team observed 58 classes throughout the district: 17 at the high school, 21 at the middle school, and 20 at the elementary schools. The team visited 28 ELA classes, 21 mathematics classes, and 9 classes in other subjects, including two special education classes. These observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. Review team members collected data using ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. (Please see Instructional Inventory results in Appendix C.)

   A. With a few exceptions, the high school had the lowest incidence of effective characteristics observed. In some cases the incidence of these characteristics in the high school was considerably lower than those for the elementary and middle school. For example, for characteristic 17 (students are engaged in productive learning environments), there was clear and consistent evidence in 50 percent of elementary classrooms, 67 percent of middle school classrooms, and only 18 percent of high school classes.

   B. For instructional inventory characteristics related to teaching and learning (8-24) as opposed to learning environment (1-7), clear and consistent evidence was for the most part in place in less than 50 percent of observed classes at each level.[20] For example, for characteristic 18 (students are engaged in challenging academic tasks) there was clear and consistent evidence in 45 percent of elementary classrooms, 43 percent of middle school classrooms, and 29 percent of high school classrooms observed. For characteristic 13 (implements appropriate and varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs) there was clear and consistent evidence in 40 percent of elementary classes, 33 percent of middle school classes, and 6 percent of high school classes observed.

Impact: The inconsistent and often weak instructional practice observed by the review team means that students are not achieving at the levels they could be.

---

[20] Out of 51 possible instances (17 characteristics multiplied by three levels), there were 18 instances of clear and consistent evidence of the characteristic in 50 percent or more of observed classes.

Assessment

9. **Limited dissemination of and teacher access to MCAS student achievement data hinders teachers from adjusting instruction to meet their students' needs and denies students opportunities to achieve at higher levels.**

   A. The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) provides districts with a measure of students' proficiency on the state frameworks.

      1. MCAS results at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 provide districts with data to inform teachers' instruction as students move through the grades.

      2. Students cannot receive a high school diploma without satisfying the requirements of the Competency Determination, which are based on MCAS. See 603 CMR 30.00.

   B. Teachers said that once they are trained in using the Education Data Warehouse (EDW) they can use it to access MCAS results.

      1. Teachers receive training on the use of EDW through paid after-hours professional development. Some teachers have not been trained.

      2. Teachers said that some principals did not provide teachers with hard copies of school and classroom MCAS results. They also said that there was "little emphasis" at the high school on MCAS results.

   C. The district limits the access of those teachers who are trained in the Education Data Warehouse to MCAS results for students within their own schools.

      1. Given the number of transitions students in the district make from school to school (grade 2 to grade 3, grade 4 to 5, and grade 8 to 9) teachers frequently do not have information concerning the achievement levels of students whom they currently teach or whom they taught the previous year.

      2. Teachers in grades 5, 9, and 10 do not have access to MCAS scores for current students because the assessments took place in a school other than their own. Also, teachers in grades 4 and 8 do not have access to results for students whom they taught the previous year because the students have moved on to another school.

Impact: With data on students' previous MCAS results not consistently available, teachers in grades 5, 9, and 10 cannot accurately frame instruction to address their students' strengths and challenges in ELA and math. Without access to MCAS results for students whom they previously taught, teachers in grades 4 and 8 cannot learn from those results about the possible strengths and limitations of their previous year's teaching. Also, teachers who have not been trained in the Education Data Warehouse and whose principal does not provide hard copies of MCAS results, do not know their students' level of achievement on the MCAS tests. These knowledge gaps seriously impede teachers' ability to address the needs of their students and to adjust their current instruction to improve their students' learning.

10. **The district does not make full use of the assessment data available. This limits the district's ability to provide appropriate targeted interventions to improve student learning.**

   A. The district has MCAS assessment data in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, as well as MAP test results in kindergarten through grade 8. These results have the potential to provide teachers with rich information about the instructional needs of their students, but data analysis has not been a focus districtwide.

      1. Administrators and teachers said that analysis of MCAS and MAP assessment results had not been a focus in the district.

      2. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey teachers expressed a desire for professional development on designing instruction to address student achievement needs revealed by data. For example, when teachers were asked about the areas in which they needed professional development to teach students more effectively, 67 percent of survey respondents from Oxford High School said that they needed professional development in using data to drive instructional decision making.

      3. The superintendent agreed that data analysis had not been a high priority in the district.

   B. Teachers in the elementary schools told the review team that they used MAP data to sort students into levels.

      1. Teachers at Chaffee Elementary School said that they used MAP data to create flexible groups for Rock to Read when it takes place four days in every six day cycle and to assign students to literacy teachers for additional support.

      2. Teachers at Clara Barton Elementary told the review team that they used MAP data to create leveled groups for ELA and math instruction and to assign students to literacy teachers for additional support.

      3. Elementary teachers said that they used MAP results to assign books to students according to their lexile levels.

   C. Teachers in the middle school reported little use of MAP data.

   D. Teachers did not report making decisions about classroom instruction based on data analysis.

   E. Teachers reported little use of data at the high school.

      1. The district discontinued the implementation of the MAP test at the high school because the results were not being analyzed, according to teachers. Instead the district introduced MAP testing at the kindergarten level.

      2. Teachers in a focus group said that few high school teachers had access to the Education Data Warehouse.

      3. Teachers at the high school said that hard copies of MCAS results were not disseminated to staff.

Impact: The use of MAP results to sort students into groups for separate instruction by levels is a valid use of assessment data, but when that is its major use, teachers are missing important opportunities provided by data analysis opportunities:

- to see content that students either have not been taught or have been taught and have not learned and

- to adjust their instruction accordingly.

Simply using the results to create leveled groups does not guarantee that students within these leveled groups will receive the specific instruction that the data shows they need.

Without full access to comprehensive data and a focus on data analysis, teachers at all levels do not have crucial information about students' needs and cannot plan and provide instruction matched to these needs.

Human Resources and Professional Development

11. **The district has begun to implement a new educator evaluation system, as required for Race to the Top participants in 2012-2013. In the past, the district did not evaluate educators as required by the state.**

   A. As a participant in the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant program, Oxford was required to implement an evaluation system consistent with the new state system in the 2012–2013 school year.

   B. On May 23, 2012, the district sent ESE the agreement on educator evaluation that had been negotiated with the teachers' association, with minor changes from the ESE model.

   C. At the time of the review training for all staff had just been completed.

   D. A review of educator plans found evidence of student learning and professional practice goals.

   E. According to principals, the superintendent expected them to complete a full evaluation process for half of their teachers. According to teachers' association officials, there was much support for evaluations at the elementary level, evaluations were completed at the middle school, but evaluations were inconsistent at the high school.

      1. Teachers said that they had been observed in 2012-2013 but not in the past.

      2. Teachers in the high school focus group who had been observed said that evaluators had not followed up with feedback.

      3. Administrators said that they were making informal classroom visits as frequently as possible this year.

   F. A review of administrator personnel files by the review team showed that, except for the superintendent, administrators had not been evaluated during the previous three school years (2009-2010 to 2011-2012). A review of documents showed that school committee policy did not require the evaluation of administrators other than the superintendent.

      1. The superintendent said that he had done informal assessments and evaluations but had not completed any formal evaluations of administrators for the past three years.

   G. A review of randomly selected teachers' personnel files showed that since 2001 a triennial evaluation cycle had been in effect for teachers with professional status, in contravention of Mass. Gen. Laws c. 71, s. 38, which

requires a two-year cycle. An annual evaluation of teachers without professional status had been in place. The evaluation process for teachers with professional status for the most part did not include observations, instead relying on self-initiated goal setting and a summary review of goal attainment at the end of the school year. Some personnel files did not contain evaluations after 2003. Most did not contain recommendations for professional development.

Impact: The absence in the past of regular classroom observations and evaluations of educators means that the district has much to do to implement the new educator evaluation system consistently and effectively and make it a lever for change in the district.

12. **The district's hiring process is not uniform from school to school, nor is it tied to district priorities as outlined in district and school improvement plans; this compromises the district's ability to hire candidates whose background and training are aligned with district priorities.**

    A. The district does not have formal school committee policies or administrative protocols to guide supervisors in their screening and interviewing of candidates for teaching and support positions.

        1. The district does not have written school committee policies to provide guidance to the superintendent and administrators concerning the recruitment and selection of viable candidates for vacant positions.

        2. When there are vacancies, supervisors operate independently as they organize the screening of applications and plan interview questions and scoring mechanisms to identify the best candidates.

        3. The district does not have requirements for model lessons, portfolio submissions, or other pre-employment evidence of teaching competency or evidence of the likelihood of a new hire's positive impact on student learning.

Impact: Not to use screening and interview protocols aligned with district priorities and not to uniformly require pre-employment evidence of probable impact on instruction from new employees weakens the district's efforts to provide highly competent replacements for vacant teaching and support positions.

Finance and Asset Management

13. **The district reports significant expenditures on administration, specifically its business and finance functions, primarily as a result of expenditures reported on the End of Year Financial Report as spent by the town. Given the margin by which the district's spending exceeds its Net School Spending (NSS) requirement, if the district and town came to a new agreement on how much of these and other costs (see finding #14) should be accounted for as part of NSS, there could be an impact on meeting the requirement. For this reason, the current arrangement potentially limits the amount of resource dollars available for other areas of the district's budget.**

    A. In fiscal year 2012, the district spent $600 per in-district pupil on administration compared to the state rate of $471. Within this function, spending on business and finance is responsible for most of the difference. The

district spent $356 per in-district pupil in business and finance compared to the state rate of $163. In fiscal year 2012, the district reported $694,475 for its business and finance expenditures, of which 60 percent ($418,994) was expended by the town.

1. In fiscal year 2012, the district spent $1,414,348 (7.7 percent) more than its NSS requirement of $18,299,262. It accounts for $5,345,798 (29 percent) of its NSS requirement as spending by the municipality on areas including administration, maintenance, and benefits.

B. The district and town have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) whereby the district is assessed a percentage of the total town costs for town administration, employee benefits, snow plowing, insurances, and services provided by the town's facilities and maintenance department to support the schools. It is charged the same rate, 46 percent, of the cost of each of these functions.

1. Neither the district nor the town was able to produce the written MOU, but both sides acknowledged that there was a written agreement. No one has been able to locate the document since the school district relocated its central offices. District officials said that the calculation of charges followed the same form from year to year.

2. The superintendent said that he was urging the town to renegotiate the indirect cost charges agreement.

Impact: If the indirect cost charge agreement is not renegotiated between the district and the town, the district may continue to experience limitations on the resources available to it.

14. **The district reports a higher than average spending on insurance for active employees. These expenditures are reported as expenditures by the town, a common practice. However, the district and town's indirect cost charge agreement as currently framed potentially limits what can be allocated to other parts of its budget (see finding #13). Because of these factors, the superintendent is advocating for a new agreement, and the town and district are considering other health insurance options.**

A. In fiscal year 2012, the district spent $1,615 per in-district pupil on insurance for active employees compared to the state per-pupil spending of $1,444. Overall, the district spent $11,834 per in-district pupil, which is lower than the state per-pupil spending of $13,121. The district is spending proportionately more on insurance for active employees than is spent across the state and therefore has proportionately less to spend on other activities.

B. Per the MOU (see 13.B. above), the district is assessed 46 percent of the town's costs for certain functions, including health insurance.

C. A town official said that the district and town were collaboratively looking into a joint purchase agreement and other insurance options, and that the town had an insurance advisor. At the present time, the town has two insurance providers from which its employees can choose plan options. The superintendent expressed the opinion that the district exceeded its net school spending over the past few years because of health insurance costs.

D. As stated in the previous finding, the superintendent is urging the town to renegotiate its agreement with the district on these matters.

Impact: The town and district's current approach to the health insurance program, in terms of both the way the district's cost is accounted for by the town and the insurance program itself, may be limiting the financial resources available to other parts of the budget.

15. **While the budget document itself is clear and comprehensive as noted in this report, the district's financial processes and procedures are not institutionalized or systematic. The district's business manager has begun the process by documenting the policies and procedures followed by managerial personnel.**

    A. The district's financial processes and procedures are not institutionalized or systematic.

        1. The district's business office manager said that he recognized that it was necessary to develop and implement written policies and procedures to systematize the manner in which district financial affairs are conducted. Toward that end he said that he has initiated the process, beginning with documenting the policies and procedures followed by managerial personnel, including the accounts payable and purchasing agent positions.

    B. School and district administrators outside the central office do not currently receive regular financial reports pertinent to their respective positions.

Impact: Because the district has not previously developed and distributed guidance on financial procedures, personnel in the district have been without direction on the manner in which the district's financial affairs are to be conducted. As the business office does not provide regular and timely reports to school level administrators, the district does not have a universally understood and transparent approach to district financial affairs.

Oxford Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

1. **The school committee and the superintendent should examine and revise as needed the current vision for the district and then share it with all school employees and the community. Furthermore, the superintendent, with representatives of stakeholder groups, should develop a three-year District Improvement Plan (DIP) designed to accomplish the approved vision. Principals, with the assistance of their school councils, should then construct yearly School Improvement Plans (SIPs) that have SIP goals aligned with DIP goals in pursuit of this same vision.**

   A. The school committee, superintendent and other stakeholders should examine the vision for the district, revise it as needed, and then share it with the community.

   B. A three-year DIP should be developed under the leadership of the superintendent, with input from representatives of stakeholder groups and with guidance and assistance from DSAC. The plan should be aimed at attaining the vision, with priority placed on improving student achievement and narrowing proficiency gaps.

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

         a. A resource that might be helpful as the district establishes SMART goals is *Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf), which describes different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.

      2. The DIP should use a detailed template that identifies elements such as objectives, action steps, benchmarks, person(s) responsible, measures, resources (including dollar amounts), and deadlines.

      3. Once the school committee approves the DIP, it should be shared with school employees and the citizens of Oxford. Also, the superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff members, and the community on progress made on each of the goals.

      4. The district should leverage the educator evaluation system by aligning the superintendent's Annual Plan with the DIP, so that in its annual evaluation of the superintendent the school committee holds the superintendent accountable for progress made on key DIP goals.

   C. Principals should develop School Improvement Plans that contain SMART goals that are aligned with the DIP goals and reflect the district's vision.

      1. The principals, with input from members of their school councils, should prepare annual SIPs that have SMART goals aligned with the goals in the DIP and use a similar format as the DIP.

      2. It is suggested that the superintendent or his designee review each SIP, make certain that the SIP goals are rigorous and aligned with the DIP goals, provide feedback to help improve the plans, and then share each SIP with the school committee.

3. The superintendent should periodically review progress with each principal in order to update the plans and strategize about how best to meet SIP goals.

4. Once the SIPs have been reviewed by the school committee, the principals should share the SIPs with all staff members and the community. As with the superintendent, the principals should report periodically to their staff, school council, parents, and the community on the progress being made toward achieving each SIP goal.

5. Principals' Educator Plans should be coordinated with their SIPs so that each principal's yearly evaluation from the superintendent addresses progress toward key SIP goals.

Benefits: Having a shared vision allows every school employee and member of the community to know where the school system aspires to be in the future. The DIP and the SIPs can be tools for laying out the goals that must be met in order to attain the vision and the steps the district and the individual schools anticipate taking to achieve each goal. District and school leaders' periodic reports about the plans will help keep everyone informed about the progress that the district and the schools are making each year.

2. **The district must assign a high priority to successful implementation of the new educator evaluation system.**

A. The superintendent should annually evaluate all central office administrators and principals to ensure that each administrator is making satisfactory progress relative to district goals and the standards and indicators of the new educator evaluation system.

1. The superintendent is required under the adopted regulations of the new educator evaluation system to evaluate all central office administrators and principals each year.

a. The superintendent should evaluate these administrators, as specified in the educator evaluation system, based on the four standards and the various indicators associated with each standard.

2. The school committee should make certain that the superintendent evaluates each central office administrator and principal every year.

B. The new educator evaluation system represents a substantial change from the district's former evaluation process. Frequent observations of practice coupled with goal development and annual ratings, both formative and summative, can easily become challenging to implement unless timelines and quality are carefully managed and concerns about interpretation of requirements are resolved quickly and fairly.

1. The district should consider appointing an individual or committee of individuals known for fairness and problem-solving to support the superintendent in overseeing the implementation of the educator evaluation system, to ensure that all steps in the process are timely and are properly paced.

Benefit: The new educator evaluation system establishes a method whereby the superintendent must report on progress made toward the goals in the Superintendent's Annual Plan and on performance against the Standards and Indicators for Effective Superintendent Practice. Likewise, principals are accountable to report to the superintendent on

progress made toward goals and on performance against the Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrator Leadership Practice. In effect, the system provides the superintendent with the opportunity to set an example by modeling for the administrative staff the evaluations that they will provide for their school staffs. Implementing this system thoroughly at all levels will help the district to build a purposeful, goal-oriented culture in which staff can continually reflect about and further their professional growth and their impact on student learning.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. **The district should ensure that it has a central office administrator with the authority to observe in classrooms, monitor curriculum implementation, and evaluate staff, as well as to direct curriculum development and revision.**

    A. The district should create a job description for the curriculum director position, making clear the duties of the position with respect to classroom observation and evaluation of staff as well as coordination of curriculum development and revision districtwide.

        1. The updated, clarified responsibilities of the position should be clearly and widely communicated, to ensure that all staff members understand the curriculum director's role.

    B. The district should then determine the best way to implement this job description, re-examining the assignment of the duties currently shared between the curriculum director/Title I director and other Title I staff.

    C. The superintendent should ensure that the goals in the curriculum director's Educator Plan under the new educator evaluation system are aligned with the key responsibilities of the position, including the development and monitoring of curriculum.

Benefits: Having a district leader with broad authority over curriculum and instruction and charged with implementing a unified vision in these areas will be of great value in helping the district improve its curriculum and instruction, and specifically in carrying out the two following recommendations.

4. **The district should create and put in place a detailed plan for developing and implementing its curriculum.**
    A. This plan should include the scope of the work, the individuals responsible, development of a common list of required elements, completion dates, and the resources required to accomplish the work.

        1. Continued use of the Atlas Rubicon platform will facilitate the work since it contains all the elements of a complete curriculum.

        2. The DSAC has the expertise to inform and support the district's development of a comprehensive and useful curriculum.

        3. The Common Core State Standards Initiative page of the ESE website (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/) could be a useful resource. It contains information

relevant to curriculum development and refinement, including implementation resources, model curriculum units, assessment resources, and information about transitioning to the 2011 frameworks.

4. An ESE presentation about curriculum mapping, *How to Develop Curriculum Maps to Support a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum that Guides Instruction* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/summit/), shares definitions of curriculum mapping, model maps, and ideas for the curriculum mapping process.

B. Broad inclusion of teachers in the process is essential for production of a quality product and for final teacher buy-in of that product. This work should be closely monitored as it proceeds, and teacher participation should be required.

Benefits: The district will provide its teachers with a living document that communicates how to address the requirements of the state frameworks in classrooms. This will ensure that students have access to a high-quality, comprehensive curriculum and will ensure students' opportunity to grow as learners.

5. **The district should develop and communicate a set of common, effective instructional practices that it expects to be used throughout the district, and provide support for teachers' implementation of these practices.**

A. TELL Mass survey results, Instructional Inventory data, and other information should be used to identify teachers' instructional needs in order to inform the identification of the supports needed for teachers to master this set of expected instructional practices.

B. Targeted professional development should be provided to broaden teachers' knowledge of a range of instructional strategies, with the expectation that they be supported as they begin to implement these strategies in their classrooms.

C. The district should plan training to build the capacity of district administrators as supervisors of instruction, with a focus on building administrators' capacity to provide targeted, useful feedback to teachers on the identified strategies.

1. The district should continue to take advantage of the direction and support available from its DSAC. The DSAC can assist the district in focusing its efforts and can provide expertise in this important area.

D. The supports provided by the district should include supports for the development of a system of tiered instruction.

1. The district should create and implement a comprehensive schedule of assessments that support tiered instruction.

2. Guidelines for matching specific interventions to assessment results should be provided.

3. Teachers should be trained to deliver identified interventions and to use data to identify when students are ready to exit the interventions or need more intensive supports.

E. The district should leverage common planning time as a way for all teachers to provide support and guidance for one another's instructional practice.

25

1. Scheduling issues that are barriers to common planning time should be addressed.

2. Guidance for the effective use of common planning time, such as clear goals and recommended agenda items, should be communicated to teachers.

Benefits: Providing teachers with professional development on the implementation of a range of effective instructional practices and high quality feedback from administrators will enable them to improve the quality of instruction offered to students. Scheduling common planning time to help teachers collaborate will support the sharing of instructional practices. A clear and systematic approach to tiered instruction will lead to more targeted and impactful supports for students. These steps are necessary in order to improve student achievement.

Assessment

6. **The district should take full advantage of its assessment data by providing teachers with full access to the data and by guiding and supporting teachers as they connect assessment results to the improvement of student learning.**

   A. The district office and its schools should provide teachers with full access to MCAS results for their current and former students, not simply access to data after voluntary Education Data Warehouse training. Providing teachers access to MCAS results gives them information that is critically important for their work.

      1. School leaders should provide staff with opportunities to review and analyze relevant district, school, and classroom results.

   B. Teachers, following the lead of administrators and with their support, should plan their instruction around formative and summative assessment results.

      1. Teachers should work with administrators and with peers to analyze grade level and content area results and then plan and implement instruction to address their students' needs.

      2. It is recommended that the district contact and visit similar-sized districts with effective practices for data dissemination and analysis. The DSAC is an excellent resource for recommendations on particular districts.

Benefit: By implementing this recommendation teachers will be better equipped to provide curriculum and instruction that addresses students' specific strengths and needs.

Human Resources and Professional Development

(see also second Leadership and Governance recommendation above, on educator evaluation)

7. **The district should establish and clearly communicate a hiring policy and process that clarifies roles, is consistent throughout the district, and ensures candidates are selected based on their ability to help the district move toward its goals, as outlined in the District Improvement Plan.**

   A. As part of this initiative, the district should identify the competencies needed for each position.

      1. Although Oxford schools are not designated as Level 4, the ESE presentation *Selecting Outstanding Teachers for Level 4 Schools* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/SelectingTeachers.pdf) is a recommended resource. It includes teacher competencies, staffing and recruiting strategies, and other information that might be useful for the district to consider as it reflects on its teacher selection practices.

      2. Similar considerations should be made for administrator positions at the school and district levels.

   B. The district should establish a hiring process that is linked to district priorities and is uniform from school to school.

      1. The district should develop protocols to guide supervisors in their screening and interviewing of candidates for teaching and support positions. These protocols should be aligned with the DIP and SIPs, to ensure that successful candidates bring the specific experience and competencies needed to help the district make progress toward its goals.

      2. The protocols should include the types of evidence (e.g., model lessons) that the district will require to ensure that candidates demonstrate the desired competencies.

Benefit: By systematizing and focusing its hiring process, the district will be able to select candidates whose experience and abilities will help the district to meet its goals. By clarifying roles, the district will be able to identify the necessary competencies that each job requires in order to continuously improve teaching and learning and the supervision of instruction in the district.

Finance and Asset Management

8. **The school committee, the superintendent and the business manager should engage in discussions with the town to examine the history of their indirect cost charge agreement with the goal of developing a new written and signed Memorandum of Understanding between the district and the town. The discussions should also include an in-depth investigation of health insurance alternatives that will potentially be more cost efficient to both the town and the district.**

   A. In examining the history of this agreement, the review team recommends that district administrators focus their discussions primarily on two specific areas:

1. The district should examine the impact of the method used in calculating indirect cost expenses back to the district for administrative services provided by the town. In discussing alternative means of calculating charges for administrative services provided by the town, consideration should be given to alternative cost calculation methods, such as using the ESE Per Pupil Administrative Cost Average.

   To the extent that using these alternative calculations results in actual NSS decreasing below required NSS, meaning that additional dollars would be needed to ensure the district meets its spending requirement, the district may realize an increase in funding in its annual operating budget. This would help the district address existing needs. A resource that the district could consult to compare agreements in similar communities would be the Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials (MASBO).

2. The district should work with the town to evaluate health insurance alternatives that may be more cost effective to both the town and the district.

3. Both the district and the town have said that they are collaboratively looking into a joint purchase agreement as well as other insurance options.

Benefits: The district may realize an increase in funding options in its annual operating budget that it could use to address existing needs. This could increase the likelihood of improved educational opportunities becoming available for students and it could potentially enhance the likelihood of improving student achievement.

9. **The district should develop and distribute a written set of procedures that will provide a systematic and transparent approach to district financial affairs. The district should provide training in the use of these procedures. Also, regular and timely financial reports should be provided to school level administrators.**

   A. The district should systematize its financial processes and procedures. It has initiated the process of documenting financial procedures and processes beginning with those used by confidential managerial personnel.

   B. The district should ensure that school and district administrators outside the central office level receive regular financial reports about the final budget.

Benefits: Developing and implementing a written set of financial procedures with appropriate training for staff and providing regular and timely reports to school level administrators will result in a universally understood, systematic approach to district financial affairs. Providing regular and timely reports to school level administrators will help the district monitor expenditures on key initiatives.

Recommended resources include the following:

- Chapter 70 Information: The Chapter 70 program is the major program of state aid to public elementary and secondary schools. In addition to providing state aid to support school operations, it also establishes minimum spending requirements for each school district and minimum requirements for each municipality's share of school costs.

Overview: http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/chapter70/

Direct link, Chapter 70 trends: http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/chapter70/profile.xls

- State regulations on School Finance and Accountability at 603 CMR 10.00:
  http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html
- *Smart School Budgeting*: The Rennie Center's summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and
  reallocation.

  Overview: http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html

  Direct link: http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf

  The Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials (http://www.masbo.org/HOME.aspx) provides
  resources and services to school business officials.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 8-11, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. John Kulevich, leadership and governance

2. Mary Eirich, curriculum and instruction

3. Patricia Williams, assessment, review team coordinator

4. Dr. Thomas Johnson, human resources and professional development

5. Dr. William Contreras, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager, accounts payable clerk, and purchasing agent.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the School Committee: chair and three members.

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

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

The team visited the following schools: Chaffee (kindergarten to grade two), Barton (pre-kindergarten, grades 3-4), Oxford Middle School (grades 5-8) and Oxford High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 4 principals and focus groups with 25 elementary school teachers, 15 middle school teachers, and 23 high school teachers. The team conducted two student support interviews rather than three. The team observed 58 classes in the district: 17 at the high school, 21 at the middle school, and 20 at the 2 elementary schools.

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

o Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.

o Data on the district's staffing and finances.

o 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).

o 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.

o All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 4/8/13	Tuesday 4/9/13	Wednesday 4/10/13	Thursday 4/11/13
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association, and review of personnel files.	Interviews with district staff, principals, and students; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to the middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Chaffee and Barton schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to middle and high schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

Table B1a: Oxford Public Schools

2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Asian	20	1.0%	56,517	5.9%
Afr. Amer./Black	17	0.9%	81,806	8.6%
Hispanic/ Latino	155	8.0%	156,976	16.4%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat.	60	3.1%	26,012	2.7%
Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl.	2	0.1%	1,020	0.1%
White	1,691	86.9%	630,150	66.0%
All students	**1,946**	**100.0%**	**954,773**	**100.0%**

Note: As of October 1, 2012

Table B1b: Oxford Public Schools

2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Group	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	303	38.3%	15.5%	163,921	35.5%	17.0%
Low income	634	80.1%	32.6%	353,420	76.5%	37.0%
ELL and Former ELL	21	2.7%	1.1%	95,865	20.7%	10.0%
All high needs students	**792**	--	**40.4%**	**462,272**	--	**47.9%**

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,960; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

Table B2a: Oxford Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013

| | FY11 | | FY12 | | FY13 |
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated
Expenditures					
From local appropriations for schools					
By school committee	14,955,409	15,234,455	15,220,067	15,454,958	16,048,972
By municipality	8,042,237	7,391,904	8,442,198	14,275,613	7,598,062
Total from local appropriations	22,997,646	22,626,359	23,662,265	29,730,571	23,647,034
From revolving funds and grants	---	4,175,896	---	3,848,448	---
Total expenditures	---	26,802,255	---	33,579,019	---
Chapter 70 aid to education program					
Chapter 70 state aid*	---	9,390,325	---	9,764,153	10,160,549
Required local contribution	---	8,351,513	---	8,535,109	8,878,897
Required net school spending**	---	17,741,838	---	18,299,262	19,039,446
Actual net school spending	---	19,187,832	---	19,713,610	20,681,240
Over/under required ($)	---	1,445,994	---	1,414,348	1,641,794
Over/under required (%)	---	8.2	---	7.7	8.6

*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.

**Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Sources: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved March 6, 2013 and (for c. 70) April 17, 2013; c. 70 figures for FY13 updated July 19, 2013

Table B3: Oxford Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010–2012

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012
Administration	$552	$583	$600
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$811	$792	$927
Teachers	$4,172	$4,300	$4,311
Other teaching services	$965	$1,023	$1,039
Professional development	$21	$34	$47
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$378	$247	$313
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$285	$298	$326
Pupil services	$1,013	$984	$1,026
Operations and maintenance	$887	$1,016	$1,049
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$1,955	$2,122	$2,196
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$11,040	$11,398	$11,834

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

Table B4a: Oxford Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	150	83.3	82.2	83.1	86.0	2.7	2.9	Yes	Low
	P+	150	56%	56%	58%	65%	9	7		--
4	CPI	145	78.5	74.9	69.7	78.8	0.3	9.1	Yes	Low
	P+	145	44%	37%	38%	51%	7	13		--
	SGP	139	38.0	29.0	34.0	48.0	10.0	14.0		Moderate
5	CPI	171	87.6	86.5	84.8	72.4	-15.2	-12.4	Yes	Very Low
	P+	171	65%	63%	63%	47%	-18	-16		--
	SGP	156	68.0	49.5	51.0	39.5	-28.5	-11.5		Low
6	CPI	167	85.5	89.7	88.6	86.5	1.0	-2.1	--	Low
	P+	167	67%	72%	70%	68%	1	-2		--
	SGP	152	50.0	54.0	50.0	53.0	3.0	3.0		Moderate
7	CPI	144	91.5	91.0	92.7	91.8	0.3	-0.9	--	Moderate
	P+	144	77%	76%	77%	78%	1	1		--
	SGP	137	66.0	51.0	48.0	47.0	-19.0	-1.0		Moderate
8	CPI	175	87.8	86.9	88.1	92.4	4.6	4.3	Yes	Low
	P+	175	71%	72%	73%	82%	11	9		--
	SGP	164	36.0	47.0	29.0	40.5	4.5	11.5		Low
10	CPI	116	89.1	92.1	90.3	94.4	5.3	4.1	Yes	Very Low
	P+	116	71%	80%	76%	87%	16	11		--
	SGP	101	43.0	51.0	46.0	43.0	0.0	-3.0		Moderate
All	CPI	1,068	86.2	86.1	85.1	85.7	-0.5	0.6	--	Low
	P+	1,068	65%	65%	64%	68%	3	4		--
	SGP	849	50.0	48.0	42.0	45.0	-5.0	3.0		Moderate

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The "2012 Performance" column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	150	81.3	79.1	81.0	80.7	-0.6	-0.3	--	Low
	P+	150	53%	56%	52%	63%	10	11		--
4	CPI	146	77.8	72.6	74.0	81.5	3.7	7.5	Yes	Moderate
	P+	146	41%	32%	35%	51%	10	16		--
	SGP	139	37.0	37.0	43.0	64.0	27.0	21.0		High
5	CPI	171	78.2	74.7	74.2	70.8	-7.4	-3.4	Yes	Very Low
	P+	171	57%	43%	45%	42%	-15	-3		--
	SGP	156	51.5	44.0	42.0	45.0	-6.5	3.0		Moderate
6	CPI	167	77.3	84.3	85.4	82.8	5.5	-2.6	--	Moderate
	P+	167	55%	65%	65%	62%	7	-3		--
	SGP	152	57.5	63.5	70.0	56.5	-1.0	-13.5		Moderate
7	CPI	144	70.7	77.6	79.3	79.3	8.6	0.0	--	Moderate
	P+	144	44%	52%	54%	51%	7	-3		--
	SGP	137	58.0	54.0	56.0	48.0	-10.0	-8.0		Moderate
8	CPI	174	69.4	64.9	71.6	77.4	8.0	5.8	Yes	Moderate
	P+	174	44%	34%	48%	56%	12	8		--
	SGP	163	54.0	39.5	41.5	47.0	-7.0	5.5		Moderate
10	CPI	114	82.6	89.9	83.1	82.7	0.1	-0.4	--	Very Low
	P+	114	68%	76%	67%	67%	-1	0		--
	SGP	99	31.0	47.5	42.0	33.0	2.0	-9.0		Low
All	**CPI**	**1,066**	**76.6**	**77.5**	**78.1**	**79.0**	**2.4**	**0.9**	**--**	**Low**
	P+	**1,066**	**52%**	**51%**	**51%**	**55%**	**3**	**4**		**--**
	SGP	**846**	**51.0**	**47.0**	**50.0**	**49.0**	**-2.0**	**-1.0**		**Moderate**

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The "2012 Performance" column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Table B4c: Oxford Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
5	CPI	171	82.7	81.9	70.3	68.4	-14.3	-1.9	--	Very Low
	P+	171	56%	53%	34%	39%	-17	5		--
8	CPI	174	70.4	71.0	75.5	76.7	6.3	1.2	--	Moderate
	P+	174	34%	38%	44%	44%	10	0		--
10	CPI	105	86.2	86.9	79.6	80.2	-6	0.6	--	Very Low
	P+	105	63%	63%	55%	54%	-9	-1		--
All	**CPI**	**450**	**79.3**	**79.0**	**74.7**	**74.4**	**-4.9**	**-0.3**	**--**	**Low**
	P+	**450**	**50%**	**50%**	**43%**	**44%**	**-6**	**1**		**--**

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above.

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	421	74.6	77.2	75.9	76.4	1.8	0.5
		P+	421	41%	46%	46%	49%	8	3
		SGP	309	41.0	44.0	39.0	42.0	1	3
	State	CPI	235,216	75.3	76.1	77.0	76.5	1.2	-0.5
		P+	235,216	44%	45%	48%	48%	4	0
		SGP	177,719	45.0	45.0	46.0	46.0	1	0
Low income	District	CPI	349	78.7	81.2	79.0	79.5	0.8	0.5
		P+	349	50%	53%	53%	54%	4	1
		SGP	261	45.0	46.0	38.0	42.0	-3.0	4.0
	State	CPI	180,261	75.5	76.5	77.1	76.7	1.2	-0.4
		P+	180,261	45%	47%	49%	50%	5	1
		SGP	137,185	45.0	46.0	46.0	45.0	0.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	141	60.2	61.0	59.9	60.5	0.3	0.6
		P+	141	14%	16%	15%	22%	8	7
		SGP	92	36.0	36.0	37.0	40.5	4.5	3.5
	State	CPI	91,757	67.8	67.3	68.3	67.3	-0.5	-1.0
		P+	91,757	28%	28%	30%	31%	3	1
		SGP	66,785	40.0	41.0	42.0	43.0	3.0	1.0
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	45,367	64.8	66.1	66.2	66.2	1.4	0.0
		P+	45,367	30%	32%	33%	34%	4	1
		SGP	29,933	51.0	51.0	50.0	51.0	0.0	1.0
All students	**District**	**CPI**	**1,068**	**86.2**	**86.1**	**85.1**	**85.7**	**-0.5**	**0.6**
		P+	**1,068**	**65%**	**65%**	**64%**	**68%**	**3**	**4**
		SGP	**849**	**50.0**	**48.0**	**42.0**	**45.0**	**-5.0**	**3.0**
	State	**CPI**	**497,549**	**86.5**	**86.9**	**87.2**	**86.7**	**0.2**	**-0.5**
		P+	**497,549**	**67%**	**68%**	**69%**	**69%**	**2**	**0**
		SGP	**395,772**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B5b: Oxford Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	420	62.3	65.9	65.9	67.0	4.7	1.1
		P+	420	29%	32%	33%	37%	8	4
		SGP	306	46.0	45.0	43.0	46.0	0.0	3.0
	State	CPI	235,552	64.5	66.7	67.1	67.0	2.5	-0.1
		P+	235,552	32%	36%	37%	37%	5	0
		SGP	178,144	45.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	1.0	0.0
Low income	District	CPI	348	65.6	70.2	69.1	71.5	5.9	2.4
		P+	348	34%	38%	38%	42%	8	4
		SGP	259	50.5	46.0	46.0	49.0	-1.5	3.0
	State	CPI	180,433	64.5	67.1	67.3	67.3	2.8	0.0
		P+	180,433	33%	37%	38%	38%	5	0
		SGP	137,529	44.0	47.0	46.0	45.0	1.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	141	47.5	48.9	46.4	44.9	-2.6	-1.5
		P+	141	9%	12%	7%	10%	1	3
		SGP	89	32.0	42.5	32.5	40.0	8.0	7.5
	State	CPI	91,876	56.9	57.5	57.7	56.9	0.0	-0.8
		P+	91,876	20%	21%	22%	21%	1	-1
		SGP	66,876	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	9	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	45,695	59.2	61.5	62.0	61.6	2.4	-0.4
		P+	45,695	29%	31%	32%	32%	3	0
		SGP	30,189	49.0	54.0	52.0	52.0	3.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	1,066	76.6	77.5	78.1	79.0	2.4	0.9
		P+	1,066	52%	51%	51%	55%	3	4
		SGP	846	51.0	47.0	50.0	49.0	-2.0	-1.0
	State	CPI	497,984	78.5	79.9	79.9	79.9	1.4	0.0
		P+	497,984	56%	58%	58%	59%	3	1
		SGP	396,357	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B5c: Oxford Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
								4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
				2009	2010	2011	2012		
High needs	District	CPI	157	66.3	68.9	64.0	60.7	-5.6	-3.3
		P+	157	31%	34%	27%	22%	-9	-5
	State	CPI	96,996	62.1	64.3	63.8	65.0	2.9	1.2
		P+	96,996	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Low income	District	CPI	122	69.1	74.0	66.3	64.8	-4.3	-1.5
		P+	122	38%	41%	31%	27%	-11	-4
	State	CPI	74,300	61.1	63.6	62.8	64.5	3.4	1.7
		P+	74,300	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	59	55.5	50.0	47.8	46.2	-9.3	-1.6
		P+	59	10%	8%	7%	7%	-3	0
	State	CPI	38,590	58.1	59.0	59.2	58.7	0.6	-0.5
		P+	38,590	18%	19%	20%	20%	2	0
English language learners or Former ELL	District	CPI	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	15,271	50.8	51.8	50.3	51.4	0.6	1.1
		P+	15,271	15%	16%	15%	17%	2	2
All students	District	CPI	450	79.3	79.0	74.7	74.4	-4.9	-0.3
		P+	450	50%	50%	43%	44%	-6	1
	State	CPI	211,464	76.8	78.3	77.6	78.6	1.8	1.0
		P+	211,464	50%	52%	52%	54%	4	2

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B6: Oxford Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	3.6%	5.8%	3.2%	5.0%	1.4	40.0%	1.8	57.5%	2.5%

Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B7a: Oxford Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	61	60.5%	56.3%	71.4%	59.0%	-1.5	-2.5%	-12.4	-17.4%	74.1%
Low income	54	57.7%	60.4%	72.2%	64.8%	7.1	12.3%	-7.4	-10.2%	72.4%
Students w/ disabilities	29	51.1%	39.4%	65.5%	34.5%	-16.6	-32.5%	-31.0	-47.3%	68.6%
English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	61.1%
All students	152	74.1%	73.5%	78.3%	77.0%	2.9	3.9%	-1.3	-1.7%	84.7%

Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B7b: Oxford

Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011

Group	Number Included (2011)	School Year Ending				Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011		State (2011)
		2008	2009	2010	2011	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	63	61.3%	67.9%	60.9%	74.6%	13.3	21.7%	13.7	22.5%	76.5%
Low income	54	65.0%	67.3%	66.7%	75.9%	10.9	16.8%	9.2	13.8%	75.0%
Students w/ disabilities	29	52.9%	59.6%	45.5%	65.5%	12.6	23.8%	20.0	44.0%	70.8%
English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.2%
All students	143	80.1%	78.2%	75.9%	82.5%	2.4	3.0%	6.6	8.7%	86.3%

Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B8: Oxford

Attendance Rates, 2009-2012

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All Students	95.5%	95.2%	94.7%	94.9%	-0.6	-0.6%	0.2	0.2%	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 B9: Oxford

Suspension Rates, 2009-2012

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
In-School Suspension Rate	2.0	6.2	8.9	8.9	6.9	345%	0.0	0%	3.4
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	2.5	5.4	4.8	6.2	3.7	148%	1.4	29.2%	5.4

Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence None (0)	Partial (1)	Clear & Consistent (2)	Overall	#	%
1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful.	ES	0	0	20	**(0)**	1	1%
	MS	1	0	20	**(1)**	7	12%
	HS	0	7	10	**(2)**	50	86%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	0	7	13	**(0)**	2	3%
	MS	0	1	20	**(1)**	14	24%
	HS	2	6	9	**(2)**	42	72%
3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.	ES	0	1	19	**(0)**	3	5%
	MS	0	1	20	**(1)**	5	9%
	HS	3	3	10	**(2)**	49	84%
4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations.	ES	0	7	13	**(0)**	9	16%
	MS	4	4	12	**(1)**	18	31%
	HS	5	7	5	**(2)**	30	52%
5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.	ES	0	4	16	**(0)**	7	12%
	MS	2	3	16	**(1)**	13	22%
	HS	5	6	6	**(2)**	38	66%
6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES	4	4	12	**(0)**	25	43%
	MS	9	4	7	**(1)**	10	17%
	HS	12	2	3	**(2)**	22	38%
7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0	3	17	**(0)**	5	9%
	MS	3	2	16	**(1)**	16	28%
	HS	2	11	3	**(2)**	36	62%

Teaching	By Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	**(1)**	**(2)**		**#**	**%**
8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content.	**ES**	4	2	14	**(0)**	8	14%
	MS	2	2	17	**(1)**	10	17%
	HS	2	6	9	**(2)**	40	69%
9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident.	**ES**	10	4	6	**(0)**	19	33%
	MS	2	5	13	**(1)**	13	22%
	HS	7	4	6	**(2)**	25	43%
10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content.	**ES**	9	2	9	**(0)**	22	38%
	MS	6	4	11	**(1)**	14	24%
	HS	7	8	2	**(2)**	22	38%
11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills)	**ES**	0	6	14	**(0)**	6	10%
	MS	2	6	13	**(1)**	21	36%
	HS	4	9	4	**(2)**	31	53%
12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding.	**ES**	9	4	7	**(0)**	21	36%
	MS	5	10	6	**(1)**	22	38%
	HS	7	8	2	**(2)**	15	26%
13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs.	**ES**	6	6	8	**(0)**	26	45%
	MS	10	4	7	**(1)**	16	28%
	HS	10	6	1	**(2)**	16	28%
14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding.	**ES**	1	5	14	**(0)**	5	9%
	MS	2	5	14	**(1)**	22	38%
	HS	2	12	3	**(2)**	31	53%
15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction.	**ES**	5	7	8	**(0)**	18	31%
	MS	5	5	11	**(1)**	17	29%
	HS	8	5	4	**(2)**	23	40%
16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning.	**ES**	16	1	3	**(0)**	38	66%
	MS	11	3	6	**(1)**	9	16%
	HS	11	5	1	**(2)**	10	17%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)		#	%
17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines.	**ES**	2	8	10	**(0)**	9	16%
	MS	2	5	14	**(1)**	22	38%
	HS	5	9	3	**(2)**	27	47%
18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	**ES**	1	10	9	**(0)**	9	16%
	MS	5	7	9	**(1)**	26	45%
	HS	3	9	5	**(2)**	23	40%
19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning.	**ES**	5	4	11	**(0)**	19	33%
	MS	6	3	12	**(1)**	12	21%
	HS	8	5	3	**(2)**	26	45%
20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.	**ES**	8	3	9	**(0)**	21	36%
	MS	7	3	11	**(1)**	11	19%
	HS	6	5	6	**(2)**	26	45%
21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses).	**ES**	7	5	8	**(0)**	26	45%
	MS	10	5	4	**(1)**	14	24%
	HS	9	4	4	**(2)**	16	28%
22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter.	**ES**	9	1	10	**(0)**	14	24%
	MS	2	7	12	**(1)**	13	22%
	HS	3	5	9	**(2)**	31	53%
23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding.	**ES**	18	1	1	**(0)**	41	71%
	MS	17	2	2	**(1)**	3	5%
	HS	16	0	1	**(2)**	4	6%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars.	**ES**	13	4	3	**(0)**	44	76%
	MS	16	3	2	**(1)**	9	16%
	HS	15	2	0	**(2)**	5	8%