## Wellesley Public Schools 2014 MCAS Results

School Committee Presentation 9/30/2014

## Guiding Questions

## 2014 MCAS Results

What percentages of our students achieved a proficient or advanced rating on the MCAS?
What progress have we made towards closing gaps in WPS? What can achievement and growth tell us about curriculum, instruction, and learning in WPS?


## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS (ELA)

- High Achievement
- Growth over Time
- Gap Reductions in Early Grades \& ELL
- Area to Support: Writing


## 2014 District Results English Language Arts (ELA)

| Grade | \% Advanced \& Proficient | \% Needs Improvement | \% Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 99 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 | 93 | 4 | 3 |
| 7 | 95 | 4 | 2 |
| 6 | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| 5 | 89 | 8 | 3 |
| 4 | 78 | 17 | 4 |
| 3 | 80 | 18 | 2 |

Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results.

## English Language Arts History of \% Scored at Advanced \& Proficient Levels

| Cr. | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 93 | 93 | 95 | 94 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 |
| 8 |  | 95 | 95 | 96 | 96 | 95 | 95 | 97 | 94 | 93 |
| 7 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 94 | 92 | 93 | 92 | 92 | 91 | 95 |
| 6 |  | 96 | 95 | 86 | 92 | 90 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 87 |
| 5 |  | 89 | 85 | 86 | 89 | 84 | 86 | 83 | 85 | 89 |
| 4 | 73 | 75 | 83 | 81 | 83 | 76 | 81 | 81 | 79 | 78 |
| 3 | 81 | 82 | 86 | 79 | 76 | 84 | 83 | 86 | 81 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## English Language Arts History of \% Scored at Advanced \& Proficient Levels

| Gr. | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 93 | 93 | 95 | 94 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 99 | 99 | 99 |
| 8 |  | 95 | 95 | 96 | 96 | 95 | 95 | 97 | 94 | 93 |
| 7 | 91 | 92 | 96 | 94 | 92 | 93 | 92 | 92 | 91 | 95 |
| 6 |  | 96 | 95 | 86 | 92 | 90 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 87 |
| 5 |  | 89 | 85 | 86 | 89 | 84 | 86 | 83 | 85 | 89 |
| 4 | 73 | 75 | 83 | 81 | 83 | 76 | 81 | 81 | 79 | 78 |
| 3 | 81 | 82 | 86 | 79 | 76 | 84 | 83 | 86 | 81 | 80 |

Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results.

## MCAS Item Samples $8^{\text {th }}$ grade <br> Higher than state average

Value the vista: No window? No problem. Though nothing can truly replace the sounds, fragrances, fresh air and stimulation we get through genuine windows overlooking a glorious nature scene, we can't all live and work in Yosemite. If you don't have an actual view of the horizon, put up photographs, paintings, nature calendars or even postcards that simulate a long view of sky and earth.

What does the word simulate mean as it is used in the last sentence of paragraph 10?
A.
B. imitate
C. encourage
D. recommend

## $4^{\text {th }}$ grade

Lower than state average
Read the words from the article in the box below.

| fortuneteller |
| :--- |
| fingertips |
| doorstep |
| newspaper |

What do the words in the box have in common?


## 2014 District-wide \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in ELA by Subgroup



## 2009-2014 District-wide Change Over Time in Reducing Gaps to Proficiency in ELA



## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in ELA by Subgroup 2013

|  | Grade <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{8}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 81 | 79 | 85 | 88 | 91 | 94 | 99 |
| High Needs | 52 | 45 | 53 | 61 | 66 | 80 | 92 |
| Students w/ disabilities | 47 | 46 | 48 | 55 | 63 | 72 | 89 |
| ELL and Former ELL | 57 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 60 | N/A | N/A |
| Low Income | 45 | 33 | 42 | 60 | 61 | 85 | 95 |
| African American/Black | 40 | 42 | 50 | 41 | 85 | 78 | 100 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 65 | 50 | 78 | 71 | 79 | 88 | 100 |

Subgroups with an gap to Proficiency of 20+ percentage points.

## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in ELA by Subgroup 2014



Subgroups with an gap to Proficiency of 20+ percentage points.

## ELA Composition (Long Writing Prompts) Average \% Correct 2014

| Grade | 4 | 7 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\%$ Correct | 74 | 75 | 79 |

ELA Open Response Average \% Correct 2014

| Crade | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \% <br> Correct | 60 | 56 | 62 | 63 | 70 | 69 | 70 |

## MATHEMATICS

- High Achievement
- Growth over Time
- Overall Gap Reduction in Special Ed, ELL, \& Hispanic/Latino
- Areas to Support: K-5 alignment, Low Income


## 2014 District Results Mathematics

| Grade | \% Advanced and <br> Proficient | \% Needs <br> Improvement | \% Warning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 94 | 4 | 1 |
| 8 | 74 | 19 | 8 |
| 7 | 78 | 16 | 7 |
| 6 | 78 | 13 | 9 |
| 5 | 87 | 9 | 4 |
| 4 | 78 | 18 | 4 |
| 3 | 87 | 9 | 4 |

Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results.

## Mathematics <br> History of \% Scored at <br> Advanced \& Proficient Levels

| Gr. | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 93 | 90 | 94 | 91 | 95 | 98 | 96 | 98 | 96 | 94 |
| 8 | 76 | 66 | 75 | 82 | 73 | 76 | 82 | 81 | 75 | 74 |
| 7 |  | 72 | 79 | 74 | 66 | 76 | 71 | 76 | 74 | 78 |
| 6 | 80 | 81 | 86 | 76 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 76 | 84 | 78 |
| 5 |  | 73 | 74 | 72 | 80 | 77 | 74 | 75 | 80 | 87 |
| 4 | 68 | 59 | 67 | 77 | 67 | 62 | 66 | 67 | 78 | 78 |
| 3 |  | 69 | 81 | 74 | 70 | 75 | 71 | 86 | 83 | 87 |

Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results.

## Mathematics <br> History of \% Scored at <br> Advanced \& Proficient Levels

| Gr. | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 93 | 90 | 94 | 91 | 95 | 98 | 96 | 98 | 96 | 94 |
| 8 | 76 | 66 | 75 | 82 | 73 | 76 | 82 | 81 | 75 | 74 |
| 7 |  | 72 | 79 | 74 | 66 | 76 | 71 | 76 | 74 | 78 |
| 6 | 80 | 81 | 86 | 76 | 79 | 80 | 80 | 76 | 84 | 78 |
| 5 |  | 73 | 74 | 72 | 80 | 77 | 74 | 75 | 80 | 87 |
| 4 | 68 | 59 | 67 | 77 | 67 | 62 | 66 | 67 | 78 | 78 |
| 3 |  | 69 | 81 | 74 | 70 | 75 | 71 | 86 | 83 | 87 |

Grades 3-5 are district results; Grades 6-10 are school results.

## MCAS Item Samples

## 3rd Grade

## Higher than State Average

There are 9 classes at Linda's school. Each class has 30 children. What is the total number of children at Linda's school?


## $10^{\text {th }}$ Grade

## Lower than State Average

What is the total number of unique triangles with side lengths of 4 centimeters, 5 centimeters, and 10 centimeters that can be drawn?


## 2014 District-wide \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Math by Subgroup \&

 Grade Level

## 2009-2014 District-wide Reduction in Gaps Over Time to Proficiency in Math



## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Math by Subgroup 2013

|  | Grade <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{4}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{5}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{6}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{7}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{8}$ | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 83 | 78 | 80 | 84 | 74 | 75 | 96 |
| High Needs | 57 | 43 | 45 | 49 | 28 | 41 | 80 |
| Students w/ disabilities | 50 | 41 | 39 | 38 | 22 | 30 | 75 |
| ELL and Former ELL | 73 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | 40 | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Low Income | 60 | 29 | 48 | 63 | 28 | 38 | 84 |
| African American/Black | 60 | 0 | 20 | 29 | 30 | 25 | 82 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 53 | 35 | 72 | 75 | 47 | 50 | 85 |

Subgroups with an achievement gap of 20+ percentage points.

## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Math by Subgroup 2014



## Math Operations \& Algebraic Thinking \% Correct 2013 vs. 2014

## Grade <br> 2013 <br> 2014 <br> Difference

3
82
86
4
83
7
5
83
78
-5

## SCIENCE

- Moderate Achievement in non-aligned courses
- High Achievement in aligned courses
- Gap Reduction in all Subgroups
- Areas to Support: Continued Alignment \& Upgrades


## 2014 District Results <br> Science and Technology/Engineering (STE)

| Grade | $\%$ Advanced and | Imp Needs <br> Proficient |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 - Chemistry | 82 | 12 | 6 |
| 9 - Physics | 98 | 2 | 0 |
| $9 / 10$ Biology | 40 | 40 | 20 |
| 8 | 59 | 33 | 8 |
| 5 | 69 | 27 | 4 |

Grade 5 are district results; Grades $8 \& 10$ are school results.
Grade 10 assessment is in Science and Technology/Engineering.

Science and Technology/Engineering History of \% Scored at
Advanced \& Proficient Levels

| Gr. 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 C |  |  |  | 74 | 77 | 77 | 79 | 75 | 81 | 82 |  |
| $9 P$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 65 | 56 | 39 | 58 | 44 | 44 | 41 | 65 | 55 | 59 |  |
| 8 | 69 | 64 | 70 | 62 | 58 | 64 | 58 | 63 | 55 | 69 |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Grade 5 are district results; Grades 8 \& 10 are school results.

## 2014 District-wide \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Science by Subgroup \& Grade Level


-All
—High Needs
-Students w/ disabilitites
-ELL and Former ELL
-Low Income
-African
American/Black

## 2009-2014 District-wide Reduction in Gaps Over Time to Proficiency in Science



## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Science by Subgroup 2013

|  | Grade | Grade | Grade |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 54 | 54 | 81 |
| High Needs | 24 | 25 | 45 |
| Students w/ disabilities | 24 | 19 | 37 |
| ELL and Former ELL | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |
| Low Income | 17 | 15 | 44 |
| African American/Black | 5 | 22 | 38 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 33 | 31 | 64 |

Subgroups with an achievement gap of 20+ percentage points.

## \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient in Science by Subgroup 2014



Subgroups with an achievement gap of 20+ percentage points.

## LIKE DISTRICT COMPARISONS

## MCAS 2014 District Comparisons - \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient

| District | Grade 3 |  | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  |  | Grade 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | SE/T | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | SE/T | ELA | Math | SE/T |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lexington | 79 | 87 | 87 | 82 | 92 | 90 | 80 | 90 | 87 | 92 | 87 | 96 | 86 | 79 | 99 | 98 | 95 |
| Natick | 78 | 82 | 78 | 73 | 79 | 75 | 69 | 85 | 73 | 88 | 73 | 89 | 70 | 56 | 97 | 92 | 89 |
| Needham | 79 | 84 | 70 | 72 | 82 | 75 | 63 | 90 | 83 | 88 | 80 | 94 | 74 | 70 | 97 | 95 | 92 |
| Newton | 78 | 86 | 81 | 77 | 84 | 80 | 71 | 83 | 79 | 90 | 74 | 93 | 77 | 63 | 97 | 94 | 89 |
| Wayland | 81 | 86 | 82 | 72 | 88 | 82 | 76 | 86 | 84 | 90 | 77 | 96 | 82 | 78 | 99 | 96 | 91 |
| Wellesley | 80 | 87 | 78 | 78 | 89 | 87 | 69 | 87 | 78 | 95 | 78 | 93 | 74 | 59 | 99 | 94 | 82 |
| Weston | 91 | 92 | 88 | 82 | 82 | 86 | 73 | 87 | 84 | 92 | 69 | 96 | 72 | 76 | 96 | 95 | 81 |
| Westwood | 76 | 88 | 82 | 83 | 91 | 88 | 86 | 87 | 84 | 92 | 74 | 93 | 76 | 54 | 98 | 97 | 93 |
| Winchester | 82 | 91 | 89 | 82 | 86 | 85 | 82 | 91 | 87 | 92 | 77 | 92 | 69 | 69 | 100 | 99 | 95 |
| Hig | , | rce | age | amo | g | comp | aris | n 9 | roup |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## MCAS 2014 District Comparisons - \% of Students Achieving Advanced or Proficient

|  | Grade 3 |  | Grade 4 |  | Grade 5 |  |  | Grade 6 |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  |  | Grade 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | SE/T | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | ELA | Math | SE/T | ELA | Math | SE/T |
| Wellesley | 80 | 87 | 78 | 78 | 89 | 87 | 69 | 87 | 78 | 95 | 78 | 93 | 74 | 59 | 99 | 94 | 82 |

Highest percentage among comparison group
Lowest percentage among comparison group

## Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) 2014 MCAS Results

To what degree are our students learning a year's worth of content in a year's time as measured by MCAS?
What can that tell us about teaching and learning in WPS?


## Student Growth Percentiles (SGP)

A measure of growth relative to a state-wide peer group with similar historical performance.

A student in the $60^{\text {th }}$ percentile for Grade 5 Math, showed stronger growth than $60 \%$ of students who had similar scores on the Grades 3 \& 4 assessments.

ELA \& Math only.
Subgroups reported only when $\mathrm{N}>=20$.

## Why Is SGP Important?

We believe the growth of EVERY student is an essential part of our mission.

When a student reaches "Advanced" or "Proficient" they are not done learning.

SGP gives us a look at how all students at all proficiency levels are growing.

SGP shows us progress in closing achievement gaps.

Growth tends to be more strongly correlated with the quality of instruction than attainment.

## Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Growth Percentile Ranges

| $<20^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Very Low Growth |
| :--- | :--- |
| $20^{\text {th }}-40^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Low Growth |
| $40^{\text {th }}-60^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Typical Growth |
| $60^{\text {th }}-80^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | High Growth |
| $>80^{\text {th }}$ Percentile | Very High Growth |

## 2014 District Median SGP by Grade

|  | ELA SGP | + /- CHANGE <br> FROM 2013 | Math SCP | +/- CHANGE <br> FROM 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Grade 4
Grade 5
Grade 6
Grade 7
Grade 8
Grade 10
All Grades
High Growth (SGP of 60+)

## Student Growth Percentiles 2014 MCAS Parent/Guardian Report Sample

Lower Growth


English Language Arts
$40 \begin{array}{cc}\text { Percentile } \\ 50\end{array} \quad 60$
60
70
Higher Growth


Lower Growth


## Progress and Performance Index (PPI) 2014 MCAS Results

How has the district fared on the state accountability system? What can that tell us about curriculum, instruction, and learning at WPS?


## Progress and Performance Index (PPI)

Progress and Performance Index, or PPI, includes data on narrowing proficiency gaps, growth (SGP), MCAS participation, graduation rates and dropout rates.

## Measure <br> Overall Goal <br> Annual Target

| PPI | Schools/Districts must <br> narrow achievement gaps <br> by 50\% over a six-year | Level 1: PPI of 75+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| period (2011-2017) | Level 2: PPI $<75$ or low- |  |
|  | MCAS participation |  |

## Progress and Performance Index (PPI)

Cumulative PPI includes weighted annual PPI data for the most recent four years.

Schools and districts placed into Levels 1-5 based on the PPI of its lowest level school. For a district to be Level 1, all schools in the district must be show a PPI score of 75 .

Considers all students in a school and the high needs subgroup (low-income students, students with disabilities, ELL and former ELL students).

80\% of Massachusetts schools are classified Level 1 or Level 2.

## Framework for Accountability and Assistance Levels 1 \& 2

|  | Accountability |  |  | Assistiance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^0]
## 2013 School PPI and Accountability Level

| School | PPI All | PPI High <br> Needs |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bates | 100 | N/A | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Fiske | 96 | 69 | Level 2 | All: Met Target; High Needs: Did Not |
| Hardy | 86 | 86 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Hunnewell | 82 | 79 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Schofield | 73 | 73 | Level 2 | Math: Above Target; ELA: No Change |
| Sprague | 100 | 89 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Upham | 83 | N/A | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| WMS | 89 | 75 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| WHS | 100 | 85 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |

## 2014 School PPI and Accountability Level

| School | PPI All | PPI High Needs | Level | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bates | 100 | N/A | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Fiske | 100 | N/A | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Hardy | 100 | 86 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Hunnewell | 100 | 100 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Schofield | 92 | 90 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Sprague | 100 | 84 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |
| Upham | 74 | N/A | Level 2 | Math: Above Target; ELA/Sci: Declined |
| WMS | 95 | 71 | Level 2 | All: Met Target; High Needs: Did Not |
| WHS | 95 | 82 | Level 1 | Meeting gap narrowing goals |

N/A - subgroup less than 20

## 2013 District PPI and Accountability Level by Subgroups identified for gap reduction

| Student Group | PPI (1-100) | Progress Toward Target |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| All students | 95 | Met Target |
| High needs | 63 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Low income | 75 | Met Target |
| ELL and Former ELL | 77 | Met Target |
| Students w/ disabilities | 66 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Asian | 700 | Met Target |
| Afr. Amer./Black | 78 | Did Not Meet Target |
| Hispanic/Latino | 86 | Met Target |
| Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat. | 95 | Met Target |
| White |  |  |

## 2014 District PPI and Accountability Level by Subgroups identified for gap reduction



## What can we learn from our 2014 MCAS results?

- Overall High Achievement
- Curricula Alignments in recent years are paying off
- Student Achievement among subgroups is on the rise, but requires continuing focus and support.
- ELA
- Successes: Gap Reductions in Early Grades \& ELL
- Area to Support: Writing, High Needs
- Math
- Successes: Overall Gap Reduction in Special Ed, ELL, \& Race/Ethnicity
- Areas to Support: Grade 5 curriculum, MS Open Response
- Science
- Successes: Alignments are working, especially in Physics 9
- Areas to Support: Continued alignments, Hands-on Approach


## Implications

What supports can we put in place?
What are our next steps?

## Teaching \& Learning District Initiatives

- Instructional Data, Professional Development, and Materials Coordinators provide targeted guidance and support
- Support for Common Assessments developed by teacher teams
- Literacy Specialists \& Math Coaches
- Year 2 of 5 in New Science curriculum PK-12
- Title I funding focused on Math interventions
- RETELL course training for teachers and administrators on ELL
- Special Ed Literacy Interventions in early grades aligned w/Reg Ed Curriculum with additional supports for individual students
- Response to Intervention (RTI) supports for students


## Content-based Initiatives

## English Language Arts Support for Students

- ES: New Writing Curriculum in K-5; Literacy Specialists at every school; Streamlined \& upgraded literacy assessments
- WMS: Reading Specialist \& Interventionists
- WHS: Common writing assessments


## Mathematics Support for Students

- ES: Common assessments in all grades inform instruction
- WMS: Math Intervention Specialist, increased focus on open response
- WHS: Math Plus course, Co-taught math classes


## Science and Tech/Engineering (STE) Support for Students

- Grades 4 \& 5 newly-aligned lessons \& explorations
- WMS Science new curriculum aligned with Mass Frameworks \& NGSS
- WHS Physics \& Advanced Electives


## Questions?


[^0]:    Source: DESE Framework for District Accountability and Assistance

