

Targeted District Review Report

Sutton Public Schools

Review conducted March 14-17, 2016

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Executive Summary.....	1
Sutton Public Schools Targeted District Review Overview	3
Leadership and Governance	15
Instruction.....	19
Human Resources and Professional Development.....	25
Financial and Asset Management.....	30
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit	36
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	38
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	49

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Replay 800-439-2370

www.doe.mass.edu



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner
Published July 2016.

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2016 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



Executive Summary

Strengths

The district's strategic plan is a foundational document that was developed collaboratively by administrators, teachers, students, school committee members, and community stakeholders. Interviewees not only had knowledge of the strategic plan, but also emphasized its focus on curriculum, instruction, and assessment action steps to improve student achievement. Teams of administrators, teachers, and community members work collaboratively to implement, monitor, and evaluate initiatives included in the strategic plan. Administrators and teachers align their goals, school goals, and professional development (PD) with the priorities in the district's strategic plan.

A promising instructional practice is in place at the K-2 Simonian Center for Early Learning: students participate in a 45-minute Response to Intervention (RtI) block of instruction. While the RtI structure varies by grade level, the grade 2 RtI protocol is inclusive and could serve as a model K-5.

Multiple venues are in place for teachers to access professional development (PD) opportunities such as district and school PD days, common planning time, faculty meetings, and grade-level and department meetings. Mentors provide PD for new teachers.

The district budget development process is aligned with the goals of the strategic and school improvement plans. The district has met net school spending requirements and although spending increases have been limited, the district has worked closely with town officials to prioritize additional resources in key areas.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

The district's planning documents do not include many of the elements of effective planning, such as SMART goals (specific and strategic; measurable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused), person(s) responsible for implementing, monitoring, and evaluating plan action steps, and resources to support district improvement initiatives. Principals are *de facto* responsible for implementing plan action steps. The plans do not include interim benchmarks or the level of assessment data needed to monitor goal progress.

The district has not established a common instructional model that articulates best practices including differentiation strategies. In observed classrooms, there was variation in the quality and rigor of instruction.

A review of 30 teachers' personnel files indicated an inconsistent use of self-assessments and SMART goals---important components of the evaluation process needed for teachers to plan a path to success and for evaluators to conduct quality evaluations. Most teachers' evaluations were informative, but not instructive in that they did not include high-quality, evidence-based, actionable recommendations to support professional growth.

The district has had to implement several potentially unsustainable measures to support its budget, including increasing reliance on revolving accounts and implementing user fees.

Recommendations

The district should incorporate in all planning documents strategic and measureable goals, resources to support district initiatives, benchmarks, person(s) responsible, and timelines.

Using current tools as sources of best practice, the district should define the characteristics of high-quality instruction and develop a common instructional model with clearly identified differentiation strategies and a plan to share instructional expectations with staff. The district should ensure that educators have the information and support necessary to meet the district's expectations for instruction.

The district should address inconsistencies in policies, practices, and procedures in its educator evaluation system and provide ongoing training for evaluators to improve the quality of observations and evaluations.

In its continuing work to develop long-range plans, the district should forecast long-term revenue and closely watch fund balances.

Sutton Public Schools Targeted District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of systemwide functions, with reference to three district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). Targeted reviews address one of the following sets of three standards: **Governance and Administrative Systems** (Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management standards) or **Student-Centered Systems** (Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support standards). A targeted review identifies systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, the targeted district reviews is designed to promote district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps.

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

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the three district standards identified as the focus of the targeted review. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a three-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers' association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE.

Site Visit

The site visit to the Sutton school district was conducted from March 14-16, 2016. The site visit included 22 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 55 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, high-school students and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted two focus groups with five elementary school teachers and six middle-and high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 60 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

Sutton has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. The five members of the school committee meet bi-monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 1, 2010. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the assistant superintendent of student services and special projects, the director of technology, the business manager, four principals, and one assistant principal for the middle and high schools. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past five years. The district has four principals leading four schools. In the 2014-2015 school year, there were 99 teachers in the district.

In the 2015-2016 school year, 1,468 students were enrolled in the district's 4 schools:

**Table 1: Sutton Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015-2016**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Simonian Center for Early Learning	ES	Pre-K-2	313
Sutton Elementary	ES	3-5	353
Sutton Middle School	MS	6-8	362
Sutton High School	HS	9-12	440
Totals	4 schools	Pre-K-12	1,468
*As of October 1, 2015			

Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment decreased by 7.9 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 50 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: \$11,248 as compared with \$12,545. Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

District and Subgroup Results

Sutton is a Level 2 district because all its schools with reportable data are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and/or high needs students.

- Sutton as a district has low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for economically disadvantaged students.

**Table 2: Sutton Public Schools
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2012–2015**

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Accountability Level
		2012	2013	2014	2015			
ESS: Somonian Center for Early Learning	All	--	--	--	--	--		--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ES: Sutton Elementary	All	105	65	55	65	66	47	2
	High Needs	80	60	56	56	59		
MS: Sutton Middle School	All	75	45	35	85	61	57	2
	High Needs	90	31	30	40	40		
HS: Sutton High School	All	68	82	75	57	69	60	2
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
District	All	61	64	54	75	65	--	2
	High Needs	71	58	42	50	51		

Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved by 2 percentage points for the district as a whole, and declined by 6 and 5 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively.

**Table 3: Sutton Public Schools
ELA Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2014
All students	District	76%	72%	73%	78%	2	4
	State	69%	69%	69%	--	--	
High Needs	District	48%	42%	44%	42%	-6	-6
	State	48%	49%	50%	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	60%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	34%	34%	36%	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	39%	33%	34%	34%	-5	4
	State	31%	29%	30%	--	--	

Between 2012 and 2015 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in math declined by 2 percentage points for all students, and by 7 and 8 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively.

**Table 4: Sutton Public Schools
Math Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2014
All students	District	65%	63%	63%	63%	-2	3
	State	59%	61%	60%	--	--	
High Needs	District	36%	31%	33%	29%	-7	-7
	State	37%	40%	40%	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	38%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	32%	35%	35%	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	32%	27%	26%	24%	-8	3
	State	21%	23%	23%	--	--	

Between 2012 and 2015 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science declined by 2 percentage points for the district as a whole, and by 6 percentage points for high needs students, and improved by 3 percentage points for students with disabilities.

**Table 5: Sutton Public Schools
Science Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	60%	60%	55%	58%	-2	4
	State	54%	53%	55%	54%	0	
High Needs	District	33%	31%	26%	27%	-6	-4
	State	31%	31%	33%	31%	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	30%	--	-4
	State	--	--	--	34%	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	17%	19%	18%	19%	2	
Students with disabilities	District	25%	27%	11%	28%	3	6
	State	20%	21%	21%	22%	2	

The district did not reach its 2015 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities.

**Table 6: Sutton Public Schools
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup**

Group	ELA			Math			Science		
	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating
All students	90.7	93.5	Improved Below Target	83.9	89.5	Improved Below Target	83.8	87.9	Improved Below Target
High Needs	72.9	83.8	No Change	63.4	77.4	No Change	66.7	76.5	Improved Below Target
Economically Disadvantaged ¹	81.4	--	--	68.8	--	--	71.2	--	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	68.1	79.6	Improved Below Target	59.6	73.3	No Change	64.3	73.7	Improved Below Target

Students' growth in ELA and math was moderate compared to their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities.

**Table 7: Sutton Public Schools
2015 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

Group	Median ELA SGP			Median Math SGP		
	District	State	Growth Level	District	State	Growth Level
All students	53.0	50.0	Moderate	45.0	50.0	Moderate
High Needs	50.0	47.0	Moderate	43.0	46.0	Moderate
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs	--	53.0	--	--	51.0	--
SWD	50.0	43.0	Moderate	45.0	43.0	Moderate

¹ The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group and will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

Sutton did not have a reportable number of out-of-school and in-school suspensions in 2013 and 2015.

**Table 8: Sutton Public Schools
Out-of-School and In-School Suspensions by Subgroup 2013–2015**

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	--	1.9%	--	4.8%
	ISS	--	0.8%	--	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	--	2.0%	--	5.4%
	ISS	--	1.5%	--	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	--	2.1%	--	6.1%
	ISS	--	0.6%	--	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	--	--	--	3.8%
	ISS	--	--	--	1.8%
All Students	OSS	--	0.9%	--	2.9%
	ISS	--	0.3%	--	1.8%

*Low income students' suspensions used for 2014.

Between 2012 and 2015 Sutton's four-year cohort graduation rate for all students was above the state rate by 6.5 percentage points and was higher than the state rate by 5.9 to 9.3 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. Sutton reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students, high needs students, and low income students.²

**Table 9: Sutton Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012-2015**

Group	Number Included (2015)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2012-2015		Change 2014-2015		State (2015)
		2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	32	78.3%	76.2%	81.8%	84.4%	6.1	7.8%	2.6	3.2%	78.5%
Low income	13	84.6%	81.8%	87.5%	84.6%	0.0	0.0%	-2.9	-3.3%	78.2%
SWD	24	69.2%	58.3%	75.0%	79.2%	10.0	14.5%	4.2	5.6%	69.9%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.0%
All students	112	90.8%	93.1%	95.7%	93.8%	3.0	3.3%	-1.9	-2.0%	87.3%

² The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate.

Between 2011 and 2014 Sutton’s five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.5 percentage points for all students, and between 7.2 and 22.4 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. Sutton reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students.³

**Table 10: Sutton Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2011-2014**

Group	Number Included (2014)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	22	79.2%	78.3%	81.0%	86.4%	7.2	9.1%	5.4	6.7%	80.3%
Low income	16	71.4%	84.6%	81.8%	93.8%	22.4	31.4%	12.0	14.7%	79.6%
SWD	12	75.0%	69.2%	66.7%	83.3%	8.3	11.1%	16.6	24.9%	73.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69.8%
All students	94	94.3%	90.8%	94.1%	96.8%	2.5	2.7%	2.7	2.9%	88.5%

Sutton’s dropout rates for all students, high needs students, and economically disadvantaged students were lower than the state rate for each group.

**Table 11: Sutton Public Schools
Dropout Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015⁴**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	2.7%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	3.3%
SWD	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	3.8%	3.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	1.9%

Grade and School Results

Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved in the district as a whole and in each tested grade except the 6th and the 10th grades.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved by 2 percentage points in the district as a whole, and by 6 percentage points in the 3rd grade, and by 1 to 3 percentage points in the 4th, 5th, and 8th grades.
 - ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate by 12 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 11 percentage points in the 7th and 8th grades, by 9 percentage points in the 3rd grade, and by 1 to 3 percentage points in the 6th and 10th grades.

³ The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2013 graduation rate. Low income students did not receive a 2015 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

⁴ Low income dropout rate used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged dropout rate.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates declined by 3 percentage points in the 10th grade and by 1 percentage point in the 6th grade and did not improve in the 7th grade.
 - ELA proficiency was 71 percent in the 5th grade equal to the state rate of 71 percent.

**Table 12: Sutton Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012–2015**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	109	63%	58%	63%	69%	60%	6%	6%
4	131	64%	43%	52%	65%	53%	1%	13%
5	126	68%	74%	65%	71%	71%	3%	6%
6	122	73%	79%	79%	72%	71%	-1%	-7%
7	117	81%	73%	84%	81%	70%	0%	-3%
8	156	90%	80%	77%	91%	80%	1%	14%
10	101	97%	93%	93%	94%	91%	-3%	1%
All	862	76%	72%	73%	78%	--	2%	5%

ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 3rd and 4th grades and equal to the state rate in the 5th grade at Sutton Elementary. ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at Sutton Middle. ELA proficiency in the 10th grade was 94 percent at Sutton High, above the state rate of 91 percent.

**Table 13: Sutton Public Schools
ELA Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	69%	65%	71%	--	--	--	--	68%
MS: Sutton Middle School	--	--	--	72%	82%	92%	--	83%
HS: Sutton High School	--	--	--	--	--	--	94%	94%
District Total	69%	65%	71%	72%	81%	91%	94%	78%
State	60%	53%	71%	71%	70%	80%	91%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved by 2 percentage points at Sutton Elementary and by 1 percentage point at Sutton Middle School, and declined by 3 percentage points at Sutton High.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates for High needs students declined by 11 percentage points at Sutton Middle and by 9 and 5 percentage points at Sutton High and Sutton Elementary, respectively.
- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 11 percentage points at Sutton Elementary and by 4 and 3 percentage points at Sutton Middle and Sutton High, respectively.

**Table 14: Sutton Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	66%	59%	61%	68%	2
High Needs	39%	28%	26%	34%	-5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	59%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	35%	25%	17%	24%	-11
MS: Sutton Middle School	82%	78%	81%	83%	1
High Needs	58%	51%	55%	47%	-11
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	61%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	44%	39%	44%	40%	-4
HS: Sutton High School	97%	94%	94%	94%	-3
High Needs	83%	68%	87%	74%	-9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	80%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	73%	57%	78%	70%	-3

Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates did not improve in the district as a whole and declined in the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 10th grades.

- Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates declined by 1 percentage point in the district as a whole, by 9 percentage points in the 7th grade, by 6 and 5 percentage points in the 10th and 4th grades, respectively, and by 3 percentage points in the 5th and 6th grades.
 - Math proficiency rates in the district were below the state rate by 8 percentage points in the 5th grade, and were equal to the state rate in the 4th grade.
- Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates improved by 9 percentage points in the 3rd grade and by 6 percentage points in the 8th grade.
 - Math proficiency rates in the district were above the state rate by 7 percentage points in the 3rd and 7th grades, by 6 percentage points in the 8th grade, by 4 percentage points in the 10th grade, and by 1 percentage in the 6th grade.

**Table 15: Sutton Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	109	68%	65%	75%	77%	70%	9%	2%
4	130	52%	43%	50%	47%	47%	-5%	-3%
5	126	62%	67%	66%	59%	67%	-3%	-7%
6	121	66%	66%	66%	63%	62%	-3%	-3%
7	117	67%	57%	61%	58%	51%	-9%	-3%
8	156	60%	57%	44%	66%	60%	6%	22%
10	100	89%	89%	85%	83%	79%	-6%	-2%
All	859	65%	63%	63%	64%	--	-1%	1%

Math proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 3rd grade, equal to the state rate in the 4th grade, and below the state rate in the 5th grade at Sutton Elementary. Math proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at Sutton Middle. Math proficiency in the 10th grade was 83 percent at Sutton High, above the state rate of 79 percent.

**Table 16: Sutton Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	78%	47%	60%	--	--	--	--	60%
MS: Sutton Middle School	--	--	--	63%	59%	67%	--	63%
HS: Sutton High School	--	--	--	--	--	--	83%	83%
District Total	77%	47%	59%	63%	58%	66%	83%	64%
State	70%	47%	67%	62%	51%	60%	79%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates declined by 6 percentage points at Sutton High and by 2 percentage points at Sutton Elementary and Sutton Middle School.

- Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 18 percentage points at Sutton Middle and by 8 percentage points at Sutton High.
- Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 13 percentage points at Sutton Middle School and by 3 percentage points at Sutton Elementary.

**Table 17: Sutton Public Schools
Math Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	62%	59%	65%	60%	-2
High Needs	36%	28%	36%	36%	0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	44%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	36%	26%	28%	33%	-3
MS: Sutton Middle School	65%	61%	57%	63%	-2
High Needs	38%	32%	26%	20%	-18
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	30%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	28%	28%	24%	15%	-13
HS: Sutton High School	89%	91%	87%	83%	-6
High Needs	44%	57%	60%	36%	-8
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	36%	38%	36%	--	--

Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates declined in the district as a whole and in the 5th and 10th grades. The science proficiency rate was above the state rate for the district as a whole and in the 5th and 8th grades.

- The 5th grade science proficiency rate declined 4 percentage points, from 60 percent in 2012 to 56 percent in 2015, 5 percentage points above the state rate of 51 percent.
- The 8th grade science proficiency rate increased 4 percentage points, from 49 percent in 2012 to 53 percent in 2015, 11 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent.
- The 10th grade science proficiency rate declined 9 percentage points, from 76 percent in 2012 to 67 percent in 2015, 5 percentage points below the state rate of 72 percent.

**Table 18: Sutton Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	125	60%	64%	54%	56%	51%	-4%	2%
8	156	49%	46%	41%	53%	42%	4%	12%
10	96	76%	74%	73%	67%	72%	-9%	-6%
All	377	60%	60%	54%	58%	54%	-2%	4%

In the 5th grade at Sutton Elementary the science proficiency rate was 56 percent, 5 percentage points above the state rate of 51 percent. In the 8th grade at Sutton Middle the science proficiency rate was 53 percent, 11 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent. In the 10th grade at Sutton High the science proficiency rate was 67 percent, 5 percentage points below the state rate of 72 percent.

**Table 19: Sutton Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	--	--	56%	--	--	--	--	56%
MS: Sutton Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	53%	--	53%
HS: Sutton High School	--	--	--	--	--	--	67%	67%
District Total	--	--	56%	--	--	53%	67%	58%
State	--	--	51%	--	--	42%	72%	54%

Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates declined for all students by 10 percentage points at Sutton High School and by 6 percentage points at Sutton Elementary. Between 2012 and 2015 he science proficiency rate for all students improved by 3 percentage points at Sutton Middle School.

- Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 10 percentage points at Sutton Elementary and Sutton Middle School and declined by 5 percentage points at Sutton High.
- Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 5 percentage points at Sutton Middle and declined by 7 percentage points at Sutton Elementary.

**Table 20: Sutton Public Schools
Science Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Simonian Center for Early Learning	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Sutton Elementary	62%	64%	55%	56%	-6
High Needs	41%	45%	18%	31%	-10
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	31%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	38%	42%	15%	31%	-7
MS: Sutton Middle School	50%	46%	42%	53%	3
High Needs	30%	7%	18%	20%	-10
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	11%	0%	4%	16%	5
HS: Sutton High School	77%	75%	73%	67%	-10
High Needs	26%	43%	57%	21%	-5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	10%	36%	25%	--	--

Leadership and Governance

Contextual Background

The Sutton Public Schools have the benefit of leadership that has developed and implemented a strategic plan that is inculcated throughout the district. The plan drives instructional changes, staffing patterns, and budget decisions. In addition, there is a collaborative relationship among the administrators which extends to the school committee and other elected and appointed town officials. As a result the district enjoys a relationship with a community which endeavors to provide the necessary support to the schools. Examples of support that supplements the operating budget are the construction/renovation of three of the district's four schools and the adoption of a new math series in the elementary school.

Strength Finding

- 1. A collaborative system of interrelated teams has developed and embedded a strategic plan that guides the core of the district's work to raise student achievement.**
 - A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the superintendent has built a collaborative culture that includes all stakeholders.
 1. The cabinet comprises the central office staff: superintendent, assistant superintendent, business manager, technology director, and facilities director; the Instructional leadership team comprises the principals, the assistant principal, the assistant superintendent, and the superintendent.
 2. The district learning team is broad based and includes teachers, administrators, parents, students, and other community members who assist in drafting/revising the strategic plan and meet approximately four times per year to discuss education policy issues that affect the district.
 3. In addition, teachers and administrators meet annually in a curriculum summit to review and make suggestions for revisions to curricula and recommendations for professional development.
 4. Central office administrators and principals described their relationship with each other, teachers, and the superintendent as one in which ideas are exchanged and problems solved in a collaborative and collegial manner.
 5. The executive board of the Sutton Teachers' Association (STA) described their relationship with the superintendent as one in which they "can speak the truth." Although meetings are not regularly scheduled with the superintendent, association members told the team that there is an open atmosphere in which they are able to meet either spontaneously or by

appointment with the superintendent. The superintendent expressed his willingness to include members of the STA on any of the districts' teams.

6. Teachers also told the team about this spirit of collaboration and cooperation. Teachers work in teams at all grade levels. In these teams, they conduct professional activities that include, but are not limited to, developing instructional strategies and reviewing data and developing curriculum. Structures such as lead teachers at the elementary level and team time and planning periods in common at the middle school are supported through reallocation of funds and school schedules.
 7. School committee members stated that they work cooperatively with the superintendent and administrators. They offered as an example of this collaboration the development of the annual budget in which members are invited to be included in the internal discussions among administrators.
 8. Town officials reported that they work as a team with the superintendent to develop the town's budget. This cooperation has resulted in a commitment by the town to provide additional monies to support school initiatives. For instance, the new elementary mathematics program was funded through the town's capital plan. In addition, there is a standing commitment to provide additional funding to the schools when new revenue is realized.
- B.** The strategic plan is the centerpiece of initiatives to raise student performance.
1. The strategic plan includes the school improvement plans (SIPs) which include best practice action steps to raise student achievement.
 2. The strategic plan is developed through a collaborative process involving teachers, administrators, school committee members, and citizens from the community. It is focused on curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
 3. District and school leaders told the team that the strategic plan is updated annually.
 4. Administrators repeatedly referenced using the strategic plan as the guide and driver for improvements in their schools. They described monthly reviews of progress toward the strategic goals.
 5. Teachers and STA representatives also referenced the plan as the blueprint for enhancing instruction and student performance.
 6. The school committee demonstrated substantial knowledge of the strategic plan. They said that they review it in depth during summer retreat and use it to frame the budget and decisions about the operation and policies of the district.

Impact: As a result of having a strategic plan in place that serves as the basis for improvement efforts in the school district, districts' resources are focused on the same goals. Teachers and administrators work together to support higher levels of student performance.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The strategic plan includes limited specific detail about how to implement district improvement initiatives or to assess progress toward school and district goals.

- A. A document review indicated that the strategic plan does not include many of the elements of effective planning documents, including: SMART goals, progress benchmarks, person(s) with primary responsibility for implementing and monitoring action steps, and resources to support district improvement activities.
1. The goals of the strategic plan are not SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked). They are broad general goals that do not specify specific targets or the rate of change that can be realistically expected. For example, at the elementary level, the student achievement goal states: "Improve student achievement in critical and independent thinking." Some of the activities for the current school year include:
 - a. "Continued training and development in Investigations and Everyday Counts programs."
 - b. "Standards based reports will be aligned to the ELA Common Core Standards."
 - c. "Teachers will be provided training on assessing reading standards through trade books."
 - d. "New writing program pilot will be continued/expanded."
 2. With the exception of standardized summative assessment data from MCAS, MAP, SAT and AP testing, the strategic plan does not include interim benchmarks or student achievement data to monitor progress. When a desired outcome is not achieved in the current year, the goal is moved to the next year's plan keeping it in an active status. However, refining of the goal is mostly based upon evidence provided by teachers and administrators at the summer summit rather than on explicit data gathered over the course of the year.
 3. Principals told the team that they are responsible to monitor the progress of the strategic plan in their schools. However, they are not formally identified in the plan as the person(s) with primary responsibility for monitoring the overall achievement of the goals in the strategic plan.

4. Although the cost of implementing the strategic plan is reflected in the annual budget in the form of principals' budget requests, these costs are not reflected in the district's planning documents.

Impact: Without a comprehensive, actionable strategic plan with SMART goals, monitoring benchmarks, and person(s) with primary responsibility for meeting goals in the strategic plan, the ability of the district to assess its progress toward meeting the goals for improving student performance is compromised. Without interim benchmarks, there is limited evidence to assess academic progress during the course of the school year and limited opportunity to make necessary mid-course adjustments.

Recommendation

1. **The district should consider incorporating standard strategic planning components to add clarity of focus and actions to its planning documents.**
 - A. Each SMART goal should include key activities, person(s) responsible, resources required (time, money, and people), timelines, implementation benchmarks, and measureable outcomes.
 - B. Interim benchmarks should include student achievement targets and professional development /implementation strategies to monitor progress throughout the school year.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean a clearer and more defined structure to implement the strategic plan. When teachers and administrators know and understand the improvement targets, they will be better able to structure their efforts to reach their goals. The inclusion of interim benchmarks will enable the district to be more reflective in assessing its progress over the course of the school year. In addition, interim benchmarks will provide valuable data to inform the direction the district should take to adjust instruction. Lastly, clearly identifying the resources needed to implement the strategic plan will aid the district in developing its budget.

Recommended resources:

- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs
- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.

Instruction

The team observed 60 classes throughout the district: 22 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 23 at the 2 elementary schools. The team observed 18 ELA classes, 13 mathematics classes, and 29 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

Strength Finding

1. The district has established a promising instructional practice at the K-2 Simonian Center for Early Learning: students in each grade participate in a 45-minute response to Intervention (RtI) block of instruction. While the RtI structure varies at each grade level, the grade 2 RtI protocol is inclusive and could serve as a K-5 model for the district.

A. Interviews, a document review, and observations indicated that grade 2 teachers have developed a protocol that provides all students, regardless of performance level, with targeted instruction and/or practice of skills.

1. Teachers and special educators work collaboratively to analyze data (quick phonics screening assessment, fluency, and MAPs) to establish instructional groups and identify personnel who will support or monitor each group.
 - a. Teachers in grades 1 and 2 have agreed to share instructional assistants (IAs) so that all grade 2 groups receive support during the instruction block.
2. Targeted focus areas and activities are identified for groups and for those students receiving one-on-one support. Learning activities range from instruction directed toward narrowing performance gaps to enrichment and extension of grade-level learning standards.
3. The grade 2 team reviews data, regroups students based upon need, and revises instructional focus every three weeks.

B. In kindergarten and grade 1, RtI block structures are more typical and are geared toward students who are underperforming as determined by DIBELS, MAP, and fluency data. These students are generally pulled in small groups for targeted instruction by teachers and IAs. Students in kindergarten and grade 1 who are at or above grade level are provided a choice of activities such as mathematics games, blocks, and dramatic play during the RtI time.

Impact: When systems of support are thoughtfully developed and implemented so that all students' needs are met regardless of their level of performance, conditions for optimal learning are established. The strategic analysis of data to inform student groupings and interventions sets the stage for students to master skills, deepen their knowledge-base, and ultimately advance their learning. Protocols that

incorporate these attributes within a tiered system of support maximize all students' learning potential and ensure that no child "falls through the cracks."

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The district has not defined a comprehensive model of instruction that articulates a balanced repertoire of best practices including differentiation of instruction. In observed classrooms, there was variation in the quality and rigor of instruction.

- A.** The district employs several research-based instructional tools. While collectively these tools represent effective practice, individually they are not perceived by educators as the district's instructional model or as components of that model.
1. During formal classroom observations evaluators use a checklist to evaluate teacher performance. Administrators reported that this tool has improved teacher practice and promoted conversations about best practice. The classroom walkthrough checklist complements the formal observation checklist and is used by administrators both formally and informally in the evaluation process.
 - a. Principals said that while feedback is provided to individual teachers about their professional practice, some administrators do not use the checklists with staff in large-group settings as a vehicle for professional discourse about instructional expectations or general trends in practice.
 - b. Administrators referred to other instructional resources in the district (for example, the strategic plan, Atlas Rubicon, Understanding by Design, and Schooling by Design) and referred to elements of each when asked about instructional expectations for teachers. Administrators also stated that teachers were more apt to use the checklists as artifacts for summative evaluations rather than as a model of instructional best practice.
 2. Teachers also referred to these instructional resources when asked to describe the district's instructional expectations. They stated that teachers had a "toolbox" from which they could pull strategies. While teachers said that different instructional resources were available (the strategic plan, Atlas Rubicon, Understanding by Design, Schooling by Design, and instructional suggestions from textbooks), teachers did not articulate a common vision for instruction.
- B.** Administrators and teachers reported that the district has offered trainings and workshops on differentiating instruction. However, a discrepancy was noted between administrators' belief that differentiation takes place in classrooms (as stated in interviews) and the instruction that was observed throughout the district. Review team members noted that in observed

classrooms differentiated instruction was the least well- developed characteristic of effective instruction (see Appendix C, the Instructional Inventory, characteristic #8).

1. In 60 observed K-12 classrooms, the team found a low incidence of differentiated instruction or use of appropriate modifications to meet diverse student needs. Teachers appropriately differentiated instruction so the lesson content was accessible for all learners in only 42 percent of classrooms (25 percent, moderate evidence; 17 percent, strong evidence).
 - a. The incidence of differentiation was highest at the elementary level; lessons were structured with multiple entry points that allowed all or almost all learners to access content and accounted for differences in learning needs, interest, and level of readiness in 52 percent of observed elementary classrooms (26 percent, moderate evidence; 26 percent, strong evidence).
 - b. In 40 percent of observed middle-school classrooms (13 percent, moderate evidence; 27 percent, strong evidence), teachers used varied strategies and/or instructional materials to ensure that all or almost all students' learning needs were met. Examples included student choice, differentiated group work, and use of manipulatives and technology that enabled all or almost all learners to access content.
 - c. The incidence of differentiation of instruction was lowest at the high school; teachers appropriately differentiated instruction so that lesson content was accessible to all learners in just 32 percent of observed high-school classes (32 percent, moderate evidence; 0 percent, strong evidence). Most class lessons observed at this level were whole-class, teacher-directed activities or lectures and reflected limited differentiation of content, process, or product.
2. An undated district-developed document, *Planning for Differentiated Instruction*, provides a broad range of differentiated instruction (DI) strategies that includes how to account for varied student learning styles and intelligences, and suggestions for differentiating content, product, and process.
 - a. Administrators said that DI elements would be built into the curriculum and Atlas maps over time.
 - b. Teachers mentioned a limited list of specific DI strategies used to meet the varied needs of their students in daily instruction.
- C. The district strategic plan articulates a goal of "improved student achievement through critical and independent thinking" but does not address a comprehensive list of instructional best practices and strategies necessary to meet the needs of all students and promote increased student achievement.

- D.** In observed classrooms, the incidence of students thinking independently by assuming responsibility for their own learning, whether individually, in pairs, or in groups varied by level.
1. The incidence of this characteristic was strongest at the middle level where students assumed responsibility for their own learning in 80 percent of observed classrooms (47 percent, moderate evidence; 33 percent, strong evidence). In these classrooms teachers took the role of facilitator and students were primarily responsible for doing the thinking. Activities were largely student led.
 - a. For example, students read Civil War poetry and discussed its historic significance or analyzed text to compare/contrast authors' use of literary elements. Other groups engaged in debates about whether a mythological character was treated fairly by the gods.
 2. Students assumed responsibility for their learning in 69 percent of high-school classrooms (64 percent, moderate evidence; 5 percent, strong evidence) while students had opportunities to assume responsibility for their own learning in only 43 percent of observed elementary lessons (26 percent, moderate evidence; 17 percent, strong evidence).
- E.** The incidence of teachers posting or referring to clear learning objectives in observed lessons varied by level.
1. This practice was strongest at the elementary level; teachers posted or referred to clear learning objectives in 70 percent of observed classes (35 percent, moderate evidence; 35 percent, strong evidence).
 2. Teachers at the middle school shared or posted learning objectives in 60 percent of classrooms.
 3. The team found the lowest incidence of this practice at the high school; teachers posted or referred to clear learning objectives in 54 percent of observed classes (36 percent, moderate evidence; 18 percent, strong evidence).
- F.** In observed classrooms, the incidence of teachers conducting appropriate formative assessments to check for student understanding of lesson objectives and content and providing feedback to students varied by level.
1. At the middle school, teachers engaged in this practice in 73 percent of classes (60 percent, moderate evidence; 13 percent, strong evidence).
 2. Elementary teachers checked for understanding and provided feedback to students in 65 percent of observed classrooms (30 percent, moderate evidence; 35 percent, strong evidence).

3. High- school teachers checked for understanding and provided feedback in 50 percent of observed classes (36 percent, moderate evidence; 14 percent, strong evidence).

Impact: A clearly defined and articulated instructional model for teaching and learning provides district administrators and teachers with a common definition of what high-quality instruction looks like. Without a shared and consistent message of expectations for teachers, the district cannot ensure that students will consistently have access to effective instruction that meets their diverse learning needs and optimizes their potential.

Recommendation

1. **It is recommended that the district identify and articulate a common instructional model, communicate this to the full educational community, and support teachers in its implementation.**
 - A. The district should convene a representative group of teachers and administrators to define the characteristics of high-quality instruction.
 1. The district’s learning team might be an appropriate group.
 2. The district has several resources to support this, including *Schooling by Design*, *Understanding by Design*, design elements of *Atlas Rubicon*, *Planning Differentiated Instruction*, and the district’s formal observation and walkthrough checklists.
 3. Key instructional practices should be prioritized as the district’s non-negotiables.
 - B. The model should address the need for differentiation strategies, among other practices.
 - C. Once a model of instructional practice is identified and defined, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing these instructional expectations with staff. This plan should include implementation and monitoring timelines.
 1. Using grade-level, department, and faculty meetings, as well as common planning time, and/or professional development days, the district is encouraged to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model.
 - a. Teachers should be encouraged to share best practices reflective of the instructional model.
 - b. Educators might consider watching videos of effective teaching and discussing instructional strategies as a way to calibrate expectations.
 2. The district should continue its practice of encouraging teachers to observe peers to support the understanding and implementation of the instructional model.

- D. Administrators are encouraged to continue conducting non-evaluative walkthroughs in administrative teams to generalize and share feedback about trends observed and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.
- E. The strategic and school improvement plans should reflect the district's instructional model.
- F. Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.
 1. Professional development should focus on elements of the instructional model.
 2. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district's expectations for instruction.
 3. Teachers should receive frequent, helpful feedback that helps them to continually improve their instruction (see Human Resources and Professional Development recommendation below).

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean clear and articulated expectations for administrators and teachers of what constitutes effective teaching. This will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that provides high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement at school, resulting in increased professional growth and student achievement.

Recommended resources:

- Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.
- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)
- The March 2014 ESE Educator Evaluation e-Newsletter (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/communications/newsletter/2014-03.pdf>) includes a section called *Implementation Spotlight: Strategies for Focusing Observations and Providing Consistent, Constructive Feedback*.

Human Resources and Professional Development

Contextual Background

Administrative personnel matters including payroll are performed by a clerical employee who works under the direction of the business manager. The superintendent posts positions, and principals make hiring decisions for their own schools. Professional development is largely managed by each principal, who has a budget for that purpose. The teachers' collective bargaining agreement provides a districtwide sum for tuition reimbursement for teachers to take graduate courses.

School, administrator, and teacher goals are aligned with those of the district's strategic plan and drive professional development in the district. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system.

The district is making efforts to move toward the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence. In 2015-2016, each teacher is required to implement two District-Determined Measures (DDMs), and discussions are beginning on how to incorporate student and staff feedback into the district's educator evaluation system.

Strength Finding

1. Multiple venues are available for professional development and principals have a professional development budget to support school needs. Administrators and teachers align their goals, school goals, and professional development with the priorities in the district's strategic plan.

A. Administrators, teachers, parents, and community members attend an annual summit in the summer to update the strategic plan and to plan some professional development.

1. Interviews and a review of the 2015-2016 school calendar and the teachers' collective bargaining agreement indicated that the district provides three full days of professional development (PD), five half-days of PD, and two one-hour after-school meetings per month, which can be used for professional development.
 - a. Full days of PD are most often school-based, but are sometimes district led. Examples of district-led professional development include MCAS Administration, PARRC, Google Docs, Teach Point, and Smart Board training.
2. In addition to their daily preparation period, teachers have several opportunities for PD.
 - a. Elementary teachers have one additional prep period weekly for common planning time.
 - b. Middle-school teachers have five team planning periods per week, when feasible.

- c. High-school teachers, department chairs, and teachers of advanced placement courses have one additional prep period per day.
- B.** Professional development is evaluated for effectiveness in various ways, including surveys, observations or walkthroughs, and conversations with teachers.
- C.** School, administrator, and teacher goals are aligned with those of the strategic plan and drive PD opportunities in the district.
 - 1. A goal of the strategic plan is that students will develop critical and independent thinking through a portfolio assessment. A goal of the high school is to incorporate pre-AP and AP skills that promote higher-order thinking skills; many teachers at the high school have adopted a goal related to higher-order thinking skills.
 - a. Aligned to the district goal of developing independent thinking skills, the early elementary grades provided PD about open-response work during RtI and mathematics classes. Teachers said that this work lent itself to the development of higher-order thinking skills.
 - 2. One goal of the strategic plan is that the district's educator evaluation system will be fully implemented. Each principal also has this goal.
- D.** Grade-level team leaders at the elementary school, team members at the middle school, department heads at the high school, and mentors for new teachers provide job-embedded PD through informal coaching and feedback.
- E.** Principals plan school-based PD with input from their teachers, using results of walkthroughs and evaluations, and are supported by a budget of \$10,000 per school.
 - 1. Teachers can ask to attend an outside PD offering and share what they have learned with their colleagues in a train-the-trainer session.
 - a. The educator evaluation rubric identifies modeling for peers as an indicator of exemplary performance. The district encourages teachers to share what they have learned with their peers.
 - b. Teachers and administrators have shared information about PD provided by the Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators' Association.
 - c. Several elementary teachers have attended PD about the Lucy Caulkins writing program and shared information with peers.

Impact: By aligning professional development with district and school priorities, and funding that professional development, the district prioritizes students’ learning, supports teachers as lifelong learners, and helps to implement best practices throughout the district.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system. The professional growth of teachers, which is the goal of the educator evaluation system, is hindered by the inconsistent use of self-assessments and SMART goals, and the quality of feedback provided to educators.

A. The team reviewed the personnel files of 30 teachers and 6 administrators.

1. Most of the personnel files reviewed by the review team did not contain evidence of a self-assessment, which is the first step in the five-step evaluation cycle.
2. Educators’ goals were not consistently SMART (specific and strategic; measurable; action oriented; realistic, rigorous, and results focused; and timed and tracked).
 - a. Examples of goals that were not SMART included, “I will help students achieve growth,” and “I will embed....”

B. Most of the teachers’ evaluations reviewed by the review team were informative but not instructive⁵ ; they did not include specific recommendations that could contribute to professional growth.

1. Observation and walkthrough checklists included behaviors observed and activities in the classroom. The narrative comments included a description of what the teacher accomplished during the observation/walkthrough and encouragement to continue existing practices (“keep up the good work”). Most evaluations, however, did not contain feedback, suggestions, or recommendations of strategies or practices that would help the educator to improve his or her instructional practice and contribute to professional growth and student achievement.
 - a. Of 30 teachers’ evaluations, 18 were not instructive.

⁵ An informative evaluation is factual and cites instructional details such as methodology, pedagogy, Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice or instruction of subject-based knowledge that is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. It does not commit to improvement strategies. An instructive evaluation includes comments intended to improve instruction.

- b. All the administrators' evaluations were instructive.
- C. District leaders and teachers told the team that there is a practice in the district of non-evaluative, undocumented walkthroughs that are followed by a conversation with the teacher.
 - 1. They also said that administrators, including the superintendent and assistant superintendent, are in classrooms frequently for formal observations, walkthrough observations, or non-evaluative walkthroughs.
 - 2. Principals discuss observation trends and evidence at their administrative meetings and participate in walkthroughs to calibrate expectations among evaluators.
- D. The district is beginning to implement the use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence.
 - 1. A review of the strategic plan indicated that in 2015-2016, each teacher is required to identify and to implement at least two District-Determined Measures (DDMs).
 - 2. The administrative team is discussing implementation of and use of student and staff feedback to start in the 2016-2017 school year.

Impact: Without consistency in the implementation and in the quality of feedback to educators, the desired goals of creating a culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation will be difficult to achieve.

Recommendation

- 1. **To improve the implementation of its educator evaluation system and enhance its overall effectiveness, the district should address inconsistencies in policies, practices, and procedures that continue to exist and provide ongoing training for evaluators to improve the quality of observations and evaluations.**
 - A. The district should consider the formation of a joint committee, composed equally of administrators and teacher representatives, which would meet regularly and serve as a formal mechanism to monitor the overall implementation of the educator evaluation system, to identify problems proactively, and to collaboratively develop appropriate and timely solutions.
 - B. The district should provide additional and ongoing professional development for teachers and administrators to further support and promote the educator evaluation system.
 - 1. All administrators should receive targeted training in contemporary supervisory and evaluative practices in order to improve their professional judgment.
 - C. The district, in collaboration with the teachers' association, should continue to identify opportunities for evaluators to calibrate expectations, grounded in the Standards of Effective Teaching and Administrative Leadership Practice.

- D. The district should continue its work to appropriately incorporate multiple sources of evaluative evidence in its educator evaluation system, including District-Determined Measures (DDMs) and student and staff feedback.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will enable the superintendent, his administrative team, and all key stakeholders to more effectively oversee and ensure the full and consistent implementation of the district's educator evaluation system. Additional time and ongoing targeted training will likely improve professional skills and judgment and the overall effectiveness of teachers and administrators and result in an authentic and collaborative culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation.

Recommended resources:

- *District-Determined Measures*
<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTugmiQ9ssquEalxpfpzD6qG9zxvPWl0c> is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).
- *The Transforming Educator Evaluation in Massachusetts (TEEM) Video Series*
[\(http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/teem/\)](http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/teem/) features educators from four districts discussing how to design and implement a meaningful evaluation system aligned to the state framework.
- *The Calibration Video Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/calibration/>) includes videos of classroom instruction and several calibration training protocols for groups of educators to practice conducting observations and giving feedback.
- *The Quick Reference Guide: Opportunities to Streamline the Evaluation Process*
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-Streamline.pdf> highlights some of the ways that districts can adjust the educator evaluation process to ensure that it is efficient, focused on professional growth, and valuable to educators and students.

Financial and Asset Management

Contextual Background

Over the last 10 years, student enrollment in Sutton has declined 12.7 percent, from 1,682 in 2006-2007 to 1,468 in 2015-2016, according to ESE data. From 2011-2015, white students have consistently made up about 92 percent of enrollment. During the same period, English language learners have made up less than 1 percent of the student population. From 2011-2014 students from low-income families made up about 10 percent of enrollment. (In 2015, ESE introduced a different variable called “economically disadvantaged,” which typically is a lower percentage.) Sutton’s economically disadvantaged students were 7.7 percent of enrollment in 2015-2016 compared with the state average of 27.4 percent. Sutton is a school choice district but restricts the number of choice-in students each year to maintain desirable class sizes. More students apply to attend Sutton Public Schools from outside the district than are accepted. Choice-in numbers have been relatively consistent the last few years averaging around 60 students in fiscal years 2012–2014. Choice-out students in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2014 numbered 13, 12, and 16, respectively.

The district exceeded its net school spending (NSS) requirements by 6.5 percent in fiscal year 2015. Between fiscal year 2009 and 2015, the district’s actual NSS decreased from 13 percent above its required NSS in fiscal year 2009 to 6.5 percent above in fiscal year 2015. Sutton’s total in-district per pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for 50 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: \$11,248 compared with \$12,545. Approved budgets over the last two years were increased by 2.5 percent in fiscal year 2015 and by 2.7 percent in fiscal year 2016; there is a proposed increase of 2.5 percent for fiscal year 2017.

The average assessed value of a home in Sutton is \$325,186. The town’s fiscal year 2016 free cash balance is \$1,282,674 and its fiscal year 2015 stabilization fund balance is \$2,251,502. Sutton’s bond rating is Aa3 from Moody’s and AA from Standard and Poor’s. Town officials state that most town revenues come from residential real estate taxes but recent commercial development along Rt. 146 may provide additional revenue.

All four Sutton schools are located on the same parcel of land. The Simonian Early Learning Center (SELC) was built in 1977 with renovations in 1999. The elementary school was added to the SELC building in 1999. The town completed a major renovation of the middle and high schools in September 2015 at a cost of almost \$61 million. The MSBA reimbursement rate was 55 percent. The middle and high schools are connected to the SELC and elementary school by a covered walkway and the district’s administration offices are located in the elementary school.

The district will hire a new school business administrator for the coming year because the current administrator is leaving the district.

Strength Findings

1. The district's budget development process is aligned with the goals and priorities of the district's strategic plan and School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and is thorough, inclusive, and transparent. Budget documents are detailed and accessible to the public.

- A.** District administrators and school committee members told the review team that they expect principals to address the strategic plan and SIPs as they develop their budget proposals.
1. The budget development process is bottom-up, beginning with the principals. The school business administrator provides each principal with four years of historical line-item expense data.
 2. Principals ask team leaders and teachers in their schools what they need.
 3. The superintendent and school business administrator meet with each principal at which time the principal justifies every proposed line item allocation. An administrator described the process as "zero-based."
 4. Each principal presents his or her proposed budget to the full school committee and must justify any requests for new staff or other resource requests.
 - a. Examples of initiatives contained in the strategic plan and SIPs that were approved in recent budgets include a senior internship coordinator position and a community service learning course at the high school.
 - b. Principals can transfer money between budget line appropriations to address needs in the strategic plan and/or SIPs. For example, the middle school principal transferred money within his school budget to purchase algebra textbooks that would align with the high school's new algebra curriculum as outlined in the "Guaranteed Curriculum" section of the strategic plan.
- B.** District administrators include town officials throughout the budget development process.
1. A district administrator said that communication between district administrators and town officials is "constant" and the town administrator speaks with the superintendent daily.
 2. A school committee member described the relationship between the district and town officials as excellent. It was also said that the town manager understands the school budget.
 3. Meetings with the town's finance committee take place early in the budget development process and include administrators and school committee members. For the last three to four years, the district's budget is discussed at joint meetings of the school committee, Sutton finance committee, and the board of selectmen.

- C. A review of the district's budget documents and related materials indicated that they are complete, detailed, accessible to the public, and include all sources of revenue.
 - 1. The proposed fiscal year 2017 budget document includes a summary narrative, historical spending trends, staffing and expense detail, and special revenue account detail.
 - a. Actual expenses are included for fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015.
 - b. The document includes budget line appropriations for the 2016 fiscal year, fiscal year 2016 expenses year-to-date, and the percentage change from fiscal year 2016 to the proposed appropriation for fiscal year 2017.
 - c. The proposed budget is presented by department and school with detail for all line items, including staff names, full-time equivalents, and salary amounts.
 - d. Revenue and expense detail is provided for 13 revolving accounts as well as estimated revenue for 5 grant accounts.
 - 2. The approved fiscal year 2016 budget, along with 7 related budget documents, are available on the business office page of the district's website. Also available is the proposed fiscal year 2017 budget that was adopted by the Sutton school committee on January 25, 2016, and the budget presentation to the school committee on October 14, 2015.

Impact: A budget process that is inclusive, detailed, and transparent is an effective means of informing students, staff, town officials, and residents about the district's goals and objectives. The attention given to the strategic plan and School Improvement Plans during the budget process demonstrates the district's strategic commitment to improving students' academic achievement.

- 2. **Sutton operates in a constrained fiscal environment where enrollment is declining and spending increases are limited. The town and the district have worked together to prioritize additional resources in certain key areas.**
 - A. Enrollment has declined in recent years. According to ESE data, from 2012 to 2016, enrollment dropped by 8 percent (126 students).
 - B. Between 2012 and 2016, total spending on education and operations has increased by 7 percent (\$1.3M). In the most recent 3 years, spending decreased by 1 percent in fiscal year 2013, and then increased by 2 percent and 5 percent in fiscal years 2014 and 2015, respectively.
 - C. Although the district exceeds the net school spending (NSS) requirement, many district stakeholders agreed that revenue increases provided by the town for the financial support of the district are limited.
 - 1. The district continues to exceed its foundation budget and NSS requirement.

**Table 21: Sutton Public Schools
Foundation Budget and Required and Actual Net School Spending
Fiscal Years 2008-2016**

	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
<i>Required NSS/Foun- dation Budget</i>	101%	97%	100%	103%	105%	107%	108%	110%	110%
<i>Actual NSS/Foun- dation Budget</i>	113%	109%	108%	111%	112%	113%	113%	117%	120%
<i>Actual NSS vs. Required NSS</i>	12%	12%	8%	8%	7%	6%	5%	7%	10%

- D. Because of declining enrollment, Sutton has received limited increases in state aid in recent years.
- E. The town has supported the district’s operating needs by sharing excess funds and by addressing both operating and capital needs of the district through the town’s capital plan.
 1. The recent restructuring of the town’s health insurance plan saved the town \$400,000 which was passed along to the school district as increased town funding.
 2. Textbooks, technology, and school security equipment, are all examples of school district needs that have been addressed in the town’s capital plan.
 3. Town officials said that a proposal has been made for an appropriation at town meeting to create a special account for unexpected special education costs.
- F. The town’s finance committee has encouraged district administrators to develop long-range plans to address revenue and expense needs. The district has moved forward on the town’s recommendations.
 1. In preparation for the middle- and high-school building project that was recently completed, the district conducted an enrollment projection study with the help of The New England School Development Council (NESDEC). The study predicts a continuing enrollment decline.
 2. At the school committee’s October 14, 2015, public meeting to address the budget, district administrators presented a five-year look back at revenues and spending in both the general

fund and revolving accounts as well as projections for level-service expenses for fiscal years 2017-2019.

3. The presentation addressed the future funding gap and brought up the possibility of a Proposition 2 ½ override as a solution. An introductory slide stated that the district was seeking community input on next steps. One hundred and ten community residents attended the hearing.

Impact: The district will continue to grapple with managing declining enrollment, limited funds, and the need to support its students. Continuing collaboration with the town, including new capital funds, will enable it to make improvements that can be demonstrated to the community as necessary to the achievement and success of its students.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

3. The district has had to implement several potentially unsustainable measures to support its budget, including increasing reliance on revolving accounts and implementing user fees.

- A. Since 2009, the district has transferred some expenses from the general fund to revolving funds to spend down significant balances in those funds.
 1. However, the district has been spending more money from revolving funds than it has received for revenue in those funds.
 2. Of particular concern to the superintendent, school committee members, and town officials is the growing reliance on school choice funds to supplement operating revenue. Over the last three fiscal years, the ending balance in the school choice revolving fund has decreased from \$835,167 in fiscal year 2013 to \$224,319 in fiscal year 2015.
- B. Additional fee programs have been instituted and fees increased for existing programs.
 1. An Extended Care program provides before- and after-school care for children K-6. Daily fees are charged, producing additional revenue.
 2. Athletic fees have steadily increased over the last decade, from \$50 per sport to \$300 per sport. Maximum fees per family and for multiple sports are in place.

Impact: Overreliance on revolving funds may compromise Sutton's ability to sustain programs and staff that these funds pay for.

Recommendation

1. The district should build more long-term revenue forecasting and monitoring of fund balances into its continuing collaboration with the town.

- A.** In its continuing work to develop long-range plans, the district should forecast long-term revenue and closely watch fund balances.

Benefit: Incorporating anticipated revenues into long-term forecasts and monitoring fund balances will assure the district and the town that revolving and other funds are managed efficiently and used effectively.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from March 14-16, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Magdalene Giffune, leadership and governance
2. Michele Kingsland-Smith, instruction
3. Anne Marie Stoica, human resources and professional development
4. Margaret Foster, financial and asset management
5. James L. Hearn, *review team coordinator*

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager and payroll/human resource staff.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: two co-presidents, vice-president, secretary, and seven building representatives.

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

The team visited the following schools: Simonian Center for Early Learning Center (Pre-K-2), Sutton Elementary School (grades 3-5), Sutton Middle School (grades 6-8), and Sutton High school (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and focus groups with five elementary-school teachers, and six middle- and high-school teachers.

The team observed 60 classes in the district: 22 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 23 at the 2 elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 03/14/2016	Tuesday 03/15/2016	Wednesday 03/16/2016
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; focus group with grade 6-12 teachers; interviews with school committee members; and visits to the early learning center and the middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; Pre-K-5 teacher focus groups; parent focus group; interview with teacher association members; interview with Town officials; interview with a school committee member; and visits to the early learning center, the elementary school, and the middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; high school students; visits to the early learning center, the elementary school, and the middle and high schools for classroom observations; district debrief.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Sutton Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	10	0.7%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	22	1.5%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	24	1.6%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	1	0.1%	2,179	0.2%
White	1,343	91.5%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.1%	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	67	4.6%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	1,468	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

**Table B1b: Sutton Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	264	74.8%	17.8%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	113	32.0%	7.7%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	12	3.4%	0.8%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	353	100.0%	23.8%	419,764	100.0%	43.5%

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. 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 1,481; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

**Table B2a: Sutton Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2012–2015**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	109	85.6	85.7	86.8	87.2	83.4	1.6	0.4
	P+	109	63%	58%	63%	69%	60%	6%	6%
4	CPI	131	85.7	73.8	80.1	85.9	78.5	0.2	5.8
	P+	131	64%	43%	52%	65%	53%	1%	13%
	SGP	127	60	44	45	58	50	-2	13
5	CPI	126	87.3	90	84.3	89.7	87.3	2.4	5.4
	P+	126	68%	74%	65%	71%	71%	3%	6%
	SGP	121	51.5	46	52	46	50	-5.5	-6
6	CPI	122	86	91.5	92.8	88.5	86.6	2.5	-4.3
	P+	122	73%	79%	79%	72%	71%	-1%	-7%
	SGP	120	57	57	59	56	50	-1	-3
7	CPI	117	93.1	89.2	92.1	92.1	87	-1	0
	P+	117	81%	73%	84%	81%	70%	0%	-3%
	SGP	115	58	50	52.5	51	50	-7	-1.5
8	CPI	156	95.4	91.6	89	94.2	91.4	-1.2	5.2
	P+	156	90%	80%	77%	91%	80%	1%	14%
	SGP	152	63	51.5	40	53.5	50	-9.5	13.5
10	CPI	101	98.6	98	97.7	98	96.7	-0.6	0.3
	P+	101	97%	93%	93%	94%	91%	-3%	1%
	SGP	97	68	60	49	46	51	-22	-3
All	CPI	862	89.8	88.6	89	90.7	--	0.9	1.7
	P+	862	76%	72%	73%	78%	--	2%	5%
	SGP	732	58	51	49	53	50	-5	4

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.

**Table B2b: Sutton Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2012–2015**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	109	83.3	84.1	90.8	90.1	85.4	6.8	-0.7
	P+	109	68%	65%	75%	77%	70%	9%	2%
4	CPI	130	81.5	74.6	80.9	80.6	77.2	-0.9	-0.3
	P+	130	52%	43%	50%	47%	47%	-5%	-3%
	SGP	127	59.5	38	52	43	49	-16.5	-9
5	CPI	126	81.3	86.1	83.4	81.9	83.6	0.6	-1.5
	P+	126	62%	67%	66%	59%	67%	-3%	-7%
	SGP	122	62	70	59.5	46.5	50	-15.5	-13
6	CPI	121	82.7	83.9	83.4	81.6	81.5	-1.1	-1.8
	P+	121	66%	66%	66%	63%	62%	-3%	-3%
	SGP	118	53.5	47	49	46.5	50	-7	-2.5
7	CPI	117	85.8	79.2	79.6	79.7	73	-6.1	0.1
	P+	117	67%	57%	61%	58%	51%	-9%	-3%
	SGP	115	48	51	55	51	51	3	-4
8	CPI	156	81.8	77.3	70.4	82.2	78.7	0.4	11.8
	P+	156	60%	57%	44%	66%	60%	6%	22%
	SGP	152	46	25	26	49.5	51	3.5	23.5
10	CPI	100	95.6	95.9	94.5	94	89.9	-1.6	-0.5
	P+	100	89%	89%	85%	83%	79%	-6%	-2%
	SGP	96	46.0	52.0	36.0	36.0	50.0	-10.0	0.0
All	CPI	859	84	82.7	82.7	83.9	0	-0.1	1.2
	P+	859	65%	63%	63%	64%	0%	-1%	1%
	SGP	730	53	45	46	45	50	-8	-1

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.

**Table B2c: Sutton Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2012–2015**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	125	83.2	86.1	81.9	83.8	78.2	0.6	1.9
	P+	125	60%	64%	54%	56%	51%	-4%	2%
8	CPI	156	78.9	77.1	74.3	81.1	72.4	2.2	6.8
	P+	156	49%	46%	41%	53%	42%	4%	12%
10	CPI	96	92.4	90.3	92.5	88.3	88.2	-4.1	-4.2
	P+	96	76%	74%	73%	67%	72%	-9%	-6%
All	CPI	377	83.8	84.1	81.9	83.8	79.4	0	1.9
	P+	377	60%	60%	54%	58%	54%	-2%	4%

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE) MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE.

**Table B3a: Sutton Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	217	75.4	73	73.6	72.9	-2.5	-0.7
		P+	217	49.0%	42.0%	45.0%	41.0%	-8.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	174	52	45	40	50	-2	10
	State	CPI	93,277	76.5	76.8	77.1	79.5	3	2.4
		P+	93,277	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	55.0%	7.0%	5.0%
		SGP	68,746	46	47	47	47	1	0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	78	--	--	--	81.4	81.4	81.4
		P+	78	--	--	--	60.0%	60.0%	60.0%
		SGP	61	--	--	--	54	54	54
	State	CPI	63,124	--	--	--	80.9	80.9	80.9
		P+	63,124	--	--	--	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%
		SGP	47,064	--	--	--	47	47	47
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	163	69.4	67.6	67.4	68.1	-1.3	0.7
		P+	163	39.0%	34.0%	33.0%	33.0%	-6.0%	0.0%
		SGP	131	45	43	40	50	5	10
	State	CPI	39,117	67.3	66.8	66.6	71.6	4.3	5
		P+	39,117	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	39.0%	8.0%	8.0%
		SGP	28,234	43	43	43	44	1	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,541	66.2	67.4	67.8	70.1	3.9	2.3
		P+	18,541	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	41.0%	7.0%	5.0%
		SGP	11,589	51	53	54	54	3	0
All students	District	CPI	862	89.8	88.6	89	90.7	0.9	1.7
		P+	862	76.0%	72.0%	73.0%	78.0%	2.0%	5.0%
		SGP	732	58	51	49	53	-5	4
	State	CPI	216,396	86.7	86.8	86.7	89.3	2.6	2.6
		P+	216,396	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	75.0%	6.0%	6.0%
		SGP	172,652	50	51	50	50	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 B3b: Sutton Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	216	65.8	64.6	64.8	63.4	-2.4	-1.4
		P+	216	36.0%	32.0%	33.0%	29.0%	-7.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	174	53	42	38	43	-10	5
	State	CPI	93,295	67	68.6	68.4	70.2	3.2	1.8
		P+	93,295	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	43.0%	6.0%	3.0%
		SGP	69,106	46	46	47	47	1	0
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	77	--	--	--	68.8	68.8	68.8
		P+	77	--	--	--	38.0%	38.0%	38.0%
		SGP	62	--	--	--	35	35	35
	State	CPI	63,076	--	--	--	71.9	71.9	71.9
		P+	63,076	--	--	--	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%
		SGP	47,295	--	--	--	46	46	46
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	162	61.8	61.9	60.1	59.6	-2.2	-0.5
		P+	162	32.0%	27.0%	26.0%	24.0%	-8.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	130	51	43.5	37	45	-6	8
	State	CPI	39,181	56.9	57.4	57.1	60	3.1	2.9
		P+	39,181	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	27.0%	6.0%	5.0%
		SGP	28,451	43	42	43	44	1	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,625	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.4	2.8	0.6
		P+	18,625	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	37.0%	5.0%	1.0%
		SGP	11,735	52	53	52	50	-2	-2
All students	District	CPI	859	84	82.7	82.7	83.9	-0.1	1.2
		P+	859	65.0%	63.0%	63.0%	64.0%	-1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	730	53	45	46	45	-8	-1
	State	CPI	216,363	79.9	80.8	80.3	83.1	3.2	2.8
		P+	216,363	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	66.0%	7.0%	6.0%
		SGP	173,217	50	51	50	50	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 B3c: Sutton Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	84	68.1	69.2	66	66.7	-1.4	0.7
		P+	84	33%	30%	26%	27%	-6%	1%
	State	CPI	91,013	65	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	-1
		P+	91,013	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	32.0%	1.0%	-1.0%
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	33	--	--	--	71.2	71.2	71.2
		P+	33	--	--	--	30%	30%	30%
	State	CPI	62,345	--	--	--	67.1	67.1	67.1
		P+	62,345	--	--	--	33.0%	33.0%	33.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	61	62.8	67.8	57.8	64.3	1.5	6.5
		P+	61	25%	27%	11%	28%	3%	17%
	State	CPI	38,520	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	0.1
		P+	38,520	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	22.0%	2.0%	0.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	17,516	51.4	54	54	53.9	2.5	-0.1
		P+	17,516	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	18.0%	1.0%	0.0%
All students	District	CPI	377	83.8	84.1	81.9	83.8	0	1.9
		P+	377	60%	60%	54%	58%	-2%	4%
	State	CPI	210,454	78.6	79	79.6	79.4	0.8	-0.2
		P+	210,454	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	54.0%	0.0%	-1.0%

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

**Table B4: Sutton Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High Needs	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	2.7%	2.7	--	-0.2	-6.9%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	0.0%	0.0	--	--	--	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	0.0%	0%	3.2%	3.8%	3.8	--	0.6	18.8%	3.5%
ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4	133.3%	0.0	0.0%	1.9%

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

**Table B5: Sutton Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2012–2015**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	96.6%	96.3%	96.1%	96.4%	-0.2	-0.2%	0.3	0.3%	94.7%

Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B6: Sutton Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$12,903,973	\$12,904,081	\$12,936,495	\$12,997,372	\$13,560,696	\$13,560,992
By municipality	\$19,815,978	\$11,596,457	\$13,605,474	\$15,129,386	\$9,505,246	\$9,501,511
Total from local appropriations	\$32,719,951	\$24,500,538	\$26,541,969	\$28,126,758	\$23,065,942	\$23,062,503
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$2,665,081	--	\$2,343,030	--	\$2,288,636
Total expenditures	--	\$27,165,619	--	\$30,469,788	--	\$25,351,138
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$5,102,475	--	\$5,163,355	--	\$5,201,455
Required local contribution	--	\$8,832,665	--	\$9,081,755	--	\$9,456,038
Required net school spending**	--	\$13,935,140	--	\$14,245,110	--	\$14,657,493
Actual net school spending	--	\$14,913,672	--	\$15,011,252	--	\$15,368,649
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$978,532	--	\$766,142	--	\$711,156
Over/under required (%)	--	7.0%	--	5.4%	--	4.9%

*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: FY12, FY13, and FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved 11/20/15

**Table B7: Sutton Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	\$424	\$424	\$439
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$609	\$652	\$687
Teachers	\$4,600	\$4,422	\$4,595
Other teaching services	\$932	\$1,042	\$1,101
Professional development	\$41	\$48	\$51
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$185	\$171	\$243
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$424	\$441	\$470
Pupil services	\$1,129	\$1,039	\$1,179
Operations and maintenance	\$1,144	\$1,016	\$966
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,557	\$1,583	\$1,515
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$11,044	\$10,837	\$11,248

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg. Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction						
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	ES	9%	4%	26%	61%	2.4
	MS	0%	7%	33%	60%	2.5
	HS	0%	18%	27%	55%	2.4
	Total #	2	6	17	35	2.4
	Total %	3%	10%	28%	58%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	ES	17%	13%	35%	35%	1.9
	MS	7%	33%	27%	33%	1.9
	HS	23%	23%	36%	18%	1.5
	Total #	10	13	20	17	1.7
	Total %	17%	22%	33%	28%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	ES	9%	9%	52%	30%	2.0
	MS	0%	20%	67%	13%	1.9
	HS	5%	41%	50%	5%	1.5
	Total #	3	14	33	10	1.8
	Total %	5%	23%	55%	17%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	ES	4%	17%	39%	39%	2.1
	MS	0%	13%	60%	27%	2.1
	HS	0%	36%	50%	14%	1.8
	Total #	1	14	29	16	2.0
	Total %	2%	23%	48%	27%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	ES	0	10	70	114	8.4
	MS	0	11	56	60	8.5
	HS	0	26	72	60	7.2
	Total	0	47	198	234	8.0

		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg. Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking						
5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.	ES	0%	26%	26%	48%	2.2
	MS	0%	13%	53%	33%	2.2
	HS	0%	32%	41%	27%	2.0
	Total #	0	15	23	22	2.1
	Total %	0%	25%	38%	37%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	ES	0%	39%	265	35%	2.0
	MS	7%	27%	47%	20%	1.8
	HS	5%	27%	50%	18%	1.8
	Total #	2	19	24	15	1.9
	Total %	3%	32%	40%	25%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	13%	43%	26%	17%	1.5
	MS	0%	20%	47%	33%	2.1
	HS	5%	27%	64%	5%	1.7
	Total #	4	19	27	10	1.7
	Total %	7%	32%	45%	17%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	ES	0	25	36	69	5.7
	MS	0	9	44	39	6.1
	HS	0	19	68	33	5.5
	Total	0	53	148	141	5.7

		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points (0 to 3)
Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	
8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.	ES	22%	26%	26%	26%	1.6
	MS	33%	27%	13%	27%	1.3
	HS	41%	27%	32%	0%	0.9
	Total #	19	16	15	10	1.3
	Total %	32%	27%	25%	17%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	ES	13%	22%	39%	26%	1.8
	MS	0%	20%	47%	33%	2.1
	HS	0%	32%	55%	14%	1.8
	Total #	3	15	28	14	1.9
	Total %	5%	25%	47%	23%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	ES	0%	9%	13%	78%	2.7
	MS	0%	7%	53%	40%	2.3
	HS	0%	9%	55%	36%	2.3
	Total #	0	5	23	32	2.5
	Total %	0%	8%	38%	53%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	ES	9%	26%	30%	35%	1.9
	MS	7%	20%	60%	13%	1.8
	HS	23%	27%	36%	14%	1.4
	Total #	8	15	24	13	1.7
	Total %	13%	25%	40%	22%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	ES	0	19	50	114	8.0
	MS	0	11	52	51	7.6
	HS	0	21	78	42	6.4
	Total	0	51	180	207	7.3