



Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical School District  
Student Opportunity Act  
2024-2027

*Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical School*  
**2024-2027 SOA Plan**

**Section 1: Summarize your District's Plan**

The Student Opportunities Act (SOA) requires each district to create a three-year, evidence-based plan for the Commissioner's review. The Department has asked us to create a plan that addresses how we plan to close opportunity and achievement gaps among student subgroups. The plan must be developed by the superintendent in consultation with the school committee and shall consider input and recommendations from parents/guardians and other relevant community stakeholders.

Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical School (Monty Tech) is committed to ensuring all of our students achieve success in school and after graduation. However, we recognize that not all students have experienced the same level of success to date. Based on a review of our district data, some students are not experiencing the same level of success on state testing as their peers. We plan to develop and enhance the following evidence-based programs to address disparities in performance between student groups in our district, and accelerate the improvement of English Learners (ELs), Former ELs (FELs), and our Students with Disabilities (SWD).

1. **Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health:** Expand the use of student screeners for mental health and drug use, analyze the results, create an action plan, and provide staff support as needed.
2. **Expand Instructional Support for Teachers of EL, Former ELs, and SpEd students:** Strengthen and expand professional development focused on best practices using the WIDA Framework and High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities. In addition, we will launch an EL Instructional Coaching Program and expand our current Co-Teaching Program.
3. **Create "End-of-Term" Common Assessments Aligned to Standards:** Strengthen our curriculum materials by aligning our common assessment practices to statewide curriculum frameworks to capture student progress at the end of each quarter, and to develop more common "best" practices that are more inclusive within each department.

**Explain at a high level the investments you plan to make and what will change in your district because of this plan.** These investments will include a total investment of **\$1,176,574**.

We will continue to support the staff members who work directly on these initiatives. We will also continue to invest in school-wide PD selected to support the professional development of teachers in tiered instruction including co-teaching practices, content knowledge, language proficiency, academic skills, SEI Endorsement, WIDA, and ESL training. As a result, we hope to see an increase in student performance and attendance as well as a decline in out-of-school suspension rates.

**Section 2: Analyze Your Data and Select Student Groups for Focused Support**

**Analyze district data** to identify significant disparities in learning experiences and outcomes among student groups using the [Student Outcomes Comparison tool](#) or other summary data sources. After conducting an initial analysis to identify disparities, use additional sources of data, including other state and local outcomes data; instructional data; student, family, and community perspectives data; and systems-level data, to go deeper in your analysis and uncover why these disparities exist.

Monty Tech is an urban Gateway district in the Commonwealth that serves 1,428 students from 18 different communities (grades 9-12). According to the "Student Outcomes Comparison Tool (also referenced as SOA Data

Dashboard),” our current student population is 73% white, 18% Hispanic or Latino, 4.9% Multi Race Non-Hispanic or Latino, 2.4% Black, and 1.3% Asian. In addition, 39.7% Low Income, 16.2% Students with Disabilities (SWD), .5 English Learner and 4.3% First Language Not English (FLNE reported by School and District Profiles). Based upon our district’s data described below, we are committing to intensive work to close opportunity and achievement gaps for the identified student subgroups. We recognize that this important work includes the efforts of district and school staff, in coordination with families and our community partners.

Examining progress on MCAS achievement and growth metrics over the past five years, it is notable that our EL population district-wide has included a total population of 15 students or less each year (with a percentage range of .5-1.1%). Our former EL (FELs) reporting group is a little higher with a range of 12-44 students each year (with a percentage range of .8-31%). In total, the district is providing support for students in both subgroups - up to 60 students per year. In addition, the Ever ELs is an important subgroup to consider when reviewing this data because it is a broader group of students that includes any student who may have received English language education at any school in their educational history, as well as those who are currently receiving English language services. Since our EL population is below 15 students, it is helpful to use this broader “Ever EL” subgroup to provide even more feedback regarding student performance. With regard to MCAS performance, it is more challenging to discern this data for our ELs since the reporting groups are suppressed for subgroups fewer than 10 and 20 (based upon achievement and growth, respectively). In addition, Former ELs and Ever ELs were not included in the SOA Data Dashboard, so it was difficult for us to identify these students. However, delving deeper, the data reported in DESE’s “DART: English Learner’s Dashboard” provided more clarity. For example, our students’ eighth grade MCAS scores for 2023 showed that just 6% of our EL students (ELs) earned Exemplary and Meeting Expectations in ELA and only 9% scored similarly in math. Although this data reflects scores from students not enrolled at Monty Tech during the time of testing, these percentages are extremely low and require our immediate targeted support.

In addition, when comparing data on the “Ever ELs” shared by the Massachusetts Education to Career Research and Data Hub (E2C), the number of grade 10 students who scored Exemplary and Meeting Expectations on the ELA MCAS showed an increase of 21% (from 44% to 65%) from 2019 to 2023 - a significant increase. More importantly, the gap between Ever ELs and the district performance of 66% in 2023 is just 1% - showing evidence of gap-closing. In math, the percentage of Ever ELs who scored Exemplary and Meeting Expectations during the same time period increased by 13% (from 41% to 54%) - a significant increase. More importantly, the gap between Ever ELs and the district performance of 58% in 2023 is just 4% - showing evidence of gap-closing. Similarly, in Biology, this percentage increased by 11% during the same time period (from 50% to 61%). More importantly, the gap between Ever ELs “matches” the district performance of 61% in 2023 - showing evidence of gap-closing. Furthermore, in all 3 subjects, Ever ELs exceeded the state averages in all 3 subject areas by a range of 23-32 percentage points - showing that our programs have had a significant impact on student learning for the Ever ELs. Finally, the number of Ever ELs tested in grade 10 for 2023 included 26 students - a large enough subgroup for us to gain meaningful feedback. Although it can be challenging for us to identify students in the Ever ELs subgroup, especially in other grade levels, we hope to see this subgroup included in the analysis for SOA moving forward, especially for districts like us that serve high school students only. Finally, in the spring of 2023, our ELs took the ACCESS for ELs assessment. Results reported in DESE’s Dart EL Dashboard showed that just 38% of our ELs were making progress in attaining English language proficiency scores and just 11% attained proficiency. Overall, this data continues to show the need for the district to provide additional instructional support, specifically for teachers of ELs and former ELs.

More broadly speaking, when comparing the MCAS districtwide results for “All Students” using the SOA Data Dashboard from 2022-2023, and more specifically, the number of students who scored Meeting/Exceeding Expectations in ELA, “All Students” improved performance from 61% to 66% over the past 2 years - a 5% improvement. In math, the “All Students” subgroup improved performance from 53% to 58% - a 5% improvement. In Science (STE), the number of students who scored Meeting/Exceeding Expectations declined by 5% (from 66% to 61%). Although there is improvement, there are some significant disparities in the subgroup data. For example,

student performance in the “Students with Disabilities” (SWD) - a subgroup that includes a number of students with varied disabilities ranging from 6-26 students in the past 2 years (in grade 10). In ELA, students in the SWD subgroup showed improvement when comparing the past 2 years from 31% to 37% of students scoring Exceeding and Meeting Expectations - an improvement of 6%. Similarly in math, the SWD subgroup improved by 21% (from 11% to 32%) - outstanding results. However, when comparing this SWD subgroup to the results of “All Students”, the disparity is significant as 29% in ELA. Even larger is the disparity between SWD scores and the performance of MultiRace/Non-Hispanic students who scored 83% - a gap of 46% in ELA. Similarly in math, 32% of SWDs Exceeded or Met Expectations in 2023 compared to the 61% for White students - a 29% disparity. In addition, when comparing the SWD scores to the district results for “All Students” at 58% - there is a significant disparity of 26%. Finally, in science (STE), the SWD subgroup declined in student performance from 37% to 31% when comparing annual results from 2022-2023. More notably, when comparing the 2023 subgroup results for the SWD subgroup (31%) to the results of “All Students” at 61%, the disparity is significant at 30%. Although it’s clear that our efforts are yielding results, there is more work to do

In addition, we noticed disparities in our absences and suspension data. More specifically, with regard to Chronic Absenteeism, our annual district rate from 2022-2023 has decreased from 19.5% to 9% - a significant improvement. However, when comparing the results from 2022-2023 for the EL subgroup, the rates continue to rise from 33.3% to 37.5% - a significant and concerning increase. More sobering is the disparity when comparing the EL subgroup scores of 37.5% to the district rate of 9% for 2023 - this percentage is more than quadrupled at a difference of 28.5% - a significant disparity. Although we understand that these numbers are high, the actual number of EL students is below 15 students. When shifting to examine rates for the Students with Disability (SWD) subgroup, the results show a decrease from 23.7% to 11.5% - a decline of 12.2% - a significant improvement. Still, the difference when comparing the SWD rate of 11.5% to the district rate of 9% for 2023 shows a 2.5% disparity in Chronic Absenteeism for our Students with Disabilities. Our procedures to address absenteeism include a daily automatic parent communication system for “daily” attendance. Since we changed our handbook to mirror DESE’s per year limit of absences, we have seen a significant decline. In addition, we are refining our practices to better notify parents with letters when student attendance reaches certain levels. Although our efforts have resulted in some improvements, the disparities in absenteeism are still concerning.

With regard to Out-of-School Suspensions, our overall district results from 2022-2023 have declined from 4.9% to 4.6% - an improvement of .3%. More specifically, we had 195 total incidents and 45 of them were drug related (of those, the same 7 students were suspended multiple times for the same offense). Out-of-school suspensions included a total of 99 students (with 29 students suspended multiple times). In addition, there were less than 20 students with disabilities and 5 of these students were suspended multiple times for the same offense. When compared to white students, the disparity is quite high (numbers are far less than 20). Furthermore, when comparing the “annual” suspension rate for the Students with Disabilities (SWD), this subgroup percentage has increased by 2.1% (from 7.7% to 9.8%). In addition, when comparing this SWD subgroup to the district rate of 4.6%, the percentage is more than double - a 5.2% disparity. Recently, we revised our handbook to include an extended “after school” detention process instead of in-school suspension for select incidents. Although this change has had a positive impact on our suspension percentages, this data highlights the need for targeted interventions to enhance school engagement.

Despite the hard working efforts of the teachers of ELs and SWDs as well as the students themselves, we believe there can be further improvement. In summary, our deeper analysis has revealed three critical areas requiring attention.

1. **Chronic Absenteeism and Out-of School Suspensions:** Disparities in the rate of chronic absenteeism and suspensions among the EL and SWD subgroups emphasize the need to identify the root causes in order to explore resources and proactive solutions. Moving forward, we plan to increase the use of social emotional

screeners for mental health and drug use. In addition, we will analyze the attendance and suspension data more routinely, explore our internal procedures for bias, and share best practices with staff. We will also continue to support substantial investments in staff that are aligned with the identified factors that have contributed to these disparities.

2. **Student Performance on MCAS / Instructional Practice:** Disparities in performance between student groups are apparent in all MCAS subjects among ELs, former ELs, and SWD subgroups emphasizing the need to strengthen and expand instructional support provided to our teachers and staff. We plan to expand our Co-Teaching Program. We also need to examine the way we assign co-teachers during the master build process, using reports in our new student information system to help identify and re-distribute the SpEd students more effectively within all classes. This will allow us to provide more teachers with the co-teaching training and experience needed to have a broader impact on student learning. In addition, we plan to start an EL Instructional Coaching Program focused on mentoring teachers, providing instructional feedback directly to teachers based upon the WIDA Framework and High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities.
3. **Student Performance on MCAS / Common Assessment Alignment:** Disparities in performance between student subgroups are apparent in all MCAS subjects among ELs, Former ELs and SWD subgroups emphasizing the need for improved curriculum alignment and assessment practices. We plan to strengthen our curriculum materials by reviewing our system of assessment practices. This will include a meaningful review of the design of each common assessment to ensure we are evaluating students with culturally and linguistically sustaining assessment practices. First, we plan to verify that each common assessment is fully aligned to the grade-level expectations identified in the statewide standards. In addition, we will review assessments for inclusivity and bias to ensure that all students are evaluated equitably. With regard to student performance, we need to evaluate student progress more routinely providing quarterly feedback in preparation for final course assessments. As a result, students will have access to a stronger assessment system that provides them with quarterly feedback. This new assessment system will help us to provide more proactive communication to our students and families about our support systems. Finally, professional development time will be provided to complete this meaningful work.

As a result of our data analysis findings, the following student subgroups will receive focused support within our SOA Plan: **Students with Disabilities (SWDs), EL Students (ELs), and former ELs (FELs)**

### Submission Questions

In conducting your data analysis, where did you observe the **most significant disparities** in student learning experiences and outcomes? On which measures and for which student groups?

After reviewing all of the data, it seems clear that the most significant disparities in student learning experiences and outcomes was most notable in the following subgroups: Students with Disabilities, EL students (ELs), and Hispanic students. More specifically, Students with Disabilities (SWD) had the widest disparity when compared to the MultiRace NonHispanic Students with a difference of 46% on the ELA MCAS in 2023. Similarly in math, Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored far lower than students in the White subgroup with a disparity of 29% of students earning Exceeding/Meeting Expectations on the Math MCAS.

Secondly, the chronic absenteeism category impacted 5 of the 8 subgroups for our school. Most notably, the EL subgroup with a percentage rate of 37.5% of students with Chronic Absenteeism compared to 9% district-wide - a 28% disparity.

Note: The “Pathways” category impacted all subgroups at our school and initially indicated a serious disparity. It is

concerning that this category did not seem to include students enrolled in any of our chapter 74 programs or advanced courses. The Commonwealth's description of Innovative Pathways includes "coursework and experience in a specific high-demand industry, such as information technology, engineering, healthcare, life sciences and advanced manufacturing." These are provided to all of our students in their vocational programs. In addition, the description provided from DESE's Student Outcomes Comparison Tool states, "The percent of students enrolled in any Pathways program." We are confident that our advanced courses and our vocational programs meet this criteria and are not accurately reflected in the data. We acknowledge that it is possible that our districtwide shift to a new student information system could have impacted this data and that these pathways may not have been accurately captured, but we are reviewing this data now for corrections. At the very least, it should match the advanced courses data collected by DESE for the annual accountability system. Currently, this data does not match. We have chosen not to write a goal around this information because it may not be accurate.

What does your deeper analysis (including the triangulation of multiple types of data) suggest are the best ways to address these disparities across student groups? *open response*

- **Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health:** We plan to expand the use of student screeners for mental health and drug use, analyze the results, create an action plan, and provide staff support as needed. Last year, we piloted 2 screeners in grade 9: Bimas-2 and Sbert and it had effective results. Implementing an early detection process that expands student access to the screener, and increases the frequency of screening during the school year, will help to assist students who struggle with social and emotional learning and mental health issues. To curb suspensions related to drug violations, we plan to select and/or create educational media opportunities focused on the dangers of vaping and drug use as a potential alternative to suspensions for select handbook violations. We hope to better inform students, especially as these incidents become progressively worse. In addition, we will analyze our data on chronic absenteeism and suspensions more routinely, explore our internal procedures for bias, and share best practices with staff. We will also continue to support substantial investments in staff that are aligned with the identified factors that have contributed to these disparities.
- **Expand Instructional Support for Teachers of EL, Former ELs, and SpEd students:** We will provide more professional development focused on the WIDA Framework as well as High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities. We also plan to expand access to training within our current Co-Teaching Program. To date, this program has had a direct impact on our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup. By providing even more teachers with co-teacher training, and expanding access to these trained teachers, we hope to have a direct impact on student performance. In addition, to better address the instructional needs of our EL and former EL students (ELs), we will launch an EL Instructional Coaching Program focused on providing direct feedback to teachers of ELs and FELs based upon best practices and the WIDA Framework.
- **Create "End-of-Term" Common Assessments Aligned to Standards:** We plan to strengthen our curriculum materials by reviewing the alignment of our common assessments to statewide curriculum frameworks, to ensure we are evaluating students with culturally and linguistically sustaining assessment practices. To better capture student progress, we will implement common assessments at the end of each quarter, providing a more proactive and more routine system of identification for "at risk" students. We will work directly with the Title Data Team to analyze the results of these assessments to develop and adopt common "best" instructional and assessment practices for each department based upon the results. In addition, the district will provide continued professional development that focuses on developing these meaningful and appropriate assessments.

Based on your identification of the greatest disparities in outcomes, which student groups will require focused support for rapid improvement as you implement your evidence-based programs over the next three years?

|   |
|---|
| <b>Students with Disabilities (SWDs), English Learners (ELs), Former English Learners (FELs)</b>  |
| <b>Section 3: Set Ambitious Three-Year Targets for Improving Student Achievement</b>  |
| <p><b>Commit to adopting the three-year improvement target established by DESE with the option to develop additional three-year accelerated improvement targets.</b> DESE has established a three-year improvement target for each district to include in their SOA plans that focuses on rapidly improving the performance of the “Lowest Performing Students” group. This group, by definition, includes the students who currently have the lowest academic performance, and therefore need the most significant levels of support to reduce the disparities between their performance and that of their peers.</p> <p>Yes, we will adopt the three-year improvement targets established by DESE for the “lowest performing student” group as our district’s SOA plan improvement targets.</p>   |
| <b>Section 4: Engage Families/Caregivers and other Stakeholders</b>   |
| <p><b>Describe your district’s ongoing efforts</b> to engage families/caregivers, particularly those representing the student groups you have identified for targeted support, about how to best address their students’ needs</p>  |
| <b>Submission Questions</b>   |
| <p><b>Describe the approaches your district uses to regularly engage with families/caregivers. In your response, please be sure to address what steps you will be taking to meaningfully engage with families/caregivers of student groups you are targeting for accelerated improvement as this plan is implemented.</b></p> <p>In terms of student and family engagement, as well as accessing stakeholder feedback, Monty Tech remains committed to sustaining a long tradition of school-to-community and community-to-school connections. In the past 3 years, we have conducted surveys around a variety of issues.</p> <p>Schoolwide Surveys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Transition to In-Person Learning Survey – March, 2021</li> <li>● Superintendent's Entry Plan Survey - Fall, 2022</li> <li>● School Culture Survey - December, 2023</li> </ul> <p>Select Populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● EL Parent Surveys - May, 2023 (annual)</li> <li>● Title I Parent &amp; Families Survey - June, 2023 (annual)</li> <li>● Special Education PAC Survey - 2023 (annual)</li> <li>● Graduation Follow Up Survey (1-year out) – May, 2023</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of these surveys varied, but each contained similarities as they sought feedback from families regarding their personal sentiments to potential school policies and procedures. In support of promoting full participation and engagement, each of these surveys was provided via the Google form platform so it was accessible in multiple languages. Furthermore, relative to our primary non-English speaking population, our EL families received a recorded message with a summary of the purpose of the survey in Spanish as well as the phone extension of one of our school-based native speaker staff members.</p> <p>Following the collection of our stakeholders’ feedback, Monty Tech utilized that data to implement a wide variety of targeted student supports to specifically address the needs of all students, but particularly those students belonging</p> |

to the various special populations including students with disabilities, those from economically disadvantaged families and English Learners.

Based on this community survey data, it has become clear that the District must make an effort to explore the satisfaction discrepancy between those students/parents/guardians who identify as members of a special population and those who do not. While the District has offered opportunities to promote a sense of inclusion and equity such as our Multicultural Club, such offerings are only accessed by a limited number of students. It is important to explore how the district can recognize and support students from all of our special populations in such a way that every student and staff member feels supported by, and representative of, the Monty Tech community.

Finally, an additional finding of this effort to engage and receive feedback from our special populations including English Learners yielded clear results that speak to our district's ongoing objective of supporting those students. When asked to indicate what core values should the district adopt as it moves forward, the stakeholder's indicated *"Respect for one another"* as their priority core value. Based on the recommendation of our school community, it is essential that Monty Tech continues to engage with all stakeholders in our school community to identify methods to further develop and embed this belief into our daily practice, program offerings, core values and district-wide policies.

**Moving forward, we plan to continue similar outreach to parents and families/caregivers.** As we proceed, we will reference the SOA plan in these communications and seek feedback, whenever appropriate. We will use the following methods of outreach to strengthen our messaging to families.

- Written communication to parents/caregivers (e.g. parent letters, emails and surveys)
- Phone calls and School Messenger to help provide reminders and additional information
- In-person communications for parents and families (e.g. Open House, Parents' Nights, Welcome Freshmen Night, Freshman Parent Orientation, Back to School Night, Career Awareness, and more)
- The Special Education Advisory Committee meets 3 times per year and completes an annual parent survey
- We provide at least 2 annual meetings for parents and families of EL and Title I students. We also share annual feedback surveys in June.
- Title I Teacher Coaches provide additional parent communications to these families to share information about student performance after select common assessments (e.g. tutoring services).
- Our Vocational Parent Advisory Committee group coordinates workshops and information sessions for parents across several vocational schools. Topics range from information on college applications and programs for disabilities, to anxiety, functional academics, etc. We also have a 99% parent engagement in our IEP meetings.
- A variety of informal and formal engagement opportunities are provided throughout the year to help remove known barriers to help increase parent/family engagement including a more common practice of providing Spanish translation in phone communications and written materials, shifting meeting times to accommodate parent schedules, and offering opportunities to meet via Zoom.
- As a district, we prioritize family engagement in all professional learning and cultures districtwide. Through these efforts, we have set a districtwide expectation that school staff should proactively engage with families regarding the specific needs of students. We will continue to re-enforce this message to staff and parents.

How do you plan to measure increased family engagement with parents/caregivers of students in targeted groups in your district over the next three years? ***We plan to use the following strategies to measure family engagement in our district over the next 3 years:***

- Schoolwide Surveys: District-wide Family Engagement Survey; School Culture Survey
- Select Population Surveys: EL Parent Surveys, Title I Parent & Families Survey, Special Education PAC Survey



**Describe the ways in which you engaged different stakeholder groups in the development of your three-year SOA Plan. How have you integrated the perspectives of those groups into the three-year plan? How will you continue to engage stakeholders throughout the implementation of your plan?**

Throughout the year, we have had a variety of conversations, meetings, and written communications between stakeholders relevant to various key issues stemming from the data used to create this plan.

- We conducted meetings with staff to share the MCAS and Accountability Data with teachers and staff. As a result, we have ongoing conversations with teachers and staff about improving performance in all of our subgroups. This information was taken into consideration when writing the plan.
- The Principal met with the School Council to discuss a variety of initiatives including student performance on MCAS.
- The Title I Data Team Coordinator, administrators, liaisons, and the lead teacher of the Joint Labor Committee shared their feedback on the plan.
- The ESL Team discussed a variety of ideas that might impact EL students (ELs), Former ELs (FELs) and provided feedback on the plan.
- We collected feedback from the Deans' Office, Nurses' Office, school counselors, Special Education staff, and more.

Monty Tech continues to provide outreach to collect feedback on our plan. As we proceed with the final development and communication of this plan, we will continue to share the key elements of the plan and collect feedback to help us shape the implementation process.

Confirm you engaged with the following stakeholder groups in the development of this plan: parents/caregivers, special education and English learner parent advisory councils, school improvement councils, and educators in the school district.

Confirm that your school committee voted to approve this plan and provide the date of the vote.  
***checkbox and date, April 3, 2024***

#### **Section 5: Select Evidence Based Programs to Address Disparities in Outcomes - Goal #1**

**Review the [Strategic Objectives](#) table** on pages 9-12 of this document. Select one to three Focus Areas your district will prioritize to improve student learning experiences and outcomes for student groups identified in your data analysis. For each Focus Area, select one or more Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) from the DESE-provided EBPs list. Answer additional questions about each EBP you select, including questions about resource allocation.

***As noted earlier in this document, selected priority districts will be required to submit more detailed information.*** For each Focus Area as a whole, select metrics you will use to monitor implementation progress using the suggested metrics in this document (these metrics will serve as leading indicators; districts will also measure progress each year through the lowest-performing student group target).

|  |
|--|
| <b>Submission Questions</b>  |
| <p><b>Select the Focus Area(s) that your district will prioritize over the next three years to address the academic disparities identified in your data analysis. <i>checkbox</i></b></p> <p>FOCUS AREA 1.1 Promote students' physical and mental health and wellness in welcoming, affirming, &amp; safe spaces</p>   |
| <p><b>Which Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) will your district implement within this Focus Area? <i>checkbox</i></b></p> <p>EBP 1.1B Enhanced Support for SEL and Mental Health</p>   |
| <p><b>Provide a short description of what your district has in place now related to this EBP and what you anticipate will be in place by the conclusion of the plan's implementation (by June 2027). Include details such as the specific programs that will be in place, staff that will be hired, and/or PD that will be offered. Explain how this EBP will improve learning experiences and outcomes for the student groups identified in Section 1. This could include how support for these groups may differ from district-wide implementation efforts.</b></p> <p>Our district will continue to focus our support for the whole child by prioritizing the importance of social emotional competencies. Recently, we implemented the Stay re-entry program that has had a tremendous impact on our increase in attendance and has had direct correlation to our low drop out rates. This year alone, we have had 32 referrals (18 for mental health based reasons). We have also implemented the use of Care Solace. The analytics of this service identify 56 total cases this school year alone and 32 successful appointments into care already. We are connecting students and families with services without the wait and reducing the challenges of accessing services. Although this has a financial cost to the district, it has been a huge benefit for our students. We also have partnered with LUK and DPH to offer success coaches for "at risk" behaviors. They target 30 students respectively. Finally, our school counselors and adjustment counselors have had a significant impact in their efforts to support students in learning/using the SEL skills they need to be successful in the school environment.</p> <p>Moving forward, we plan to expand the use of student screeners for mental health and drug use, analyze the results, create an action plan, and provide staff support as needed. Last year, we piloted the Bimas-2 screener and the Sbirt for grade 9 only. All Massachusetts public schools must include a verbal substance use preventive screening as part of their yearly mandated universal health screening programs. Monty Tech used the Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) protocol. Students were asked 4 questions in private followed by a one-on-one conversation between each student and a school nurse or counselor. The purpose of this effort is to prevent, or at least delay, alcohol, marijuana, or other drug use. The SBIRT program reinforces healthy decisions and addresses concerns about substance use to improve health, safety, and success in school. All screenings were conducted using the CRAFFT II screening tool which is the most commonly used substance use screening tool for adolescents. Last year's data showed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 278/368 student participants</li> <li>● 27 admitted to little to no use</li> <li>● 0 reports of chronic or daily use</li> <li>● 0 referrals</li> </ul> <p>While we had effective results, we have not had the opportunity to expand our implementation. As one of our goals, we plan to implement a SEL screener to one additional grade level each year, for the next 3 years. The frequency of this implementation during the school year will depend on the results. In addition, implementation will require high quality training for staff to support the administration and interpretation of the screener. Professional development on the screener implementation will be conducted through the lens of cultural and linguistically sustaining practices ensuring that all staff have the common language and approach. Implementing an effective early detection process will help to assist students who struggle with social and emotional learning and mental health issues.</p> |

Additionally, we plan to evaluate, select and/or create educational materials that could help to decrease drug-related out-of-school suspensions rates. We will focus our efforts on educational materials focused on the dangers of vaping and drug use. Our implementation will include the requirement of reading/viewing the materials, writing a journal response that reflects on their specific violation (e.g. facts they learned, how they might change their behavior moving forward, etc).

SEL & Deans' Office

- Training & Materials: \$5,000
- Staff: Adjustment Counselor (1), School Social Worker (1), School Psychologist (1.5), Speech Pathologist (1) School Counselors (6), Nurses (3), ESL Teacher, Hope Matters Advisors (2), Deans, Assistant Principal (1): \$674,695
- Total Cost: \$679,695

Which schools will be impacted by these efforts (answer can be district-wide)?

District-wide

What is the anticipated amount of funding that will be allocated to this EBP over the next three years (FY25 + FY26 + FY27), across all funding sources? Total allocation should be cumulative. **numerical response ONLY**  
\$679,695

Describe the anticipated allocation of funds to this EBP in more detail. **open response**

- Instructional Materials: 5,000
- Instructional Leadership: 120,073
- Classroom & Specialist Teachers: 46,858
- Other Teaching Services: 45,384
- Guidance & Psychological: 423,905
- Pupil Services: 38,475

Which budget foundation categories (G.L. c. 70) will be included in this anticipated annual allocation? **dropdown**

- *Instructional Leadership, Classroom & Specialist Teachers, Instructional Materials,*
- *Guidance & Psychological, Pupil Services, and Other Teaching Services*

**In addition to the lowest-performing student group target, what metrics will your district use to monitor progress on this EBP? Please keep in mind that you will be asked to report on progress on the target and metrics in your annual update to DESE starting next year.**

***We plan to use the following metrics:*** Change in select indicators from local student surveys that measure school culture/climate and student mental health and wellbeing.

## Section 5: Select Evidence Based Programs to Address Disparities in Outcomes - Goal #2

Review the [Strategic Objectives](#) table on pages 9-12 of this document. Select one to three Focus Areas your district will prioritize to improve student learning experiences and outcomes for student groups identified in your data analysis. For each Focus Area, select one or more Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) from the DESE-provided EBPs list. Answer additional questions about each EBP you select, including questions about resource allocation.

***As noted earlier in this document, selected priority districts will be required to submit more detailed information.***

For each Focus Area as a whole, select metrics you will use to monitor implementation progress using the suggested metrics in this document (these metrics will serve as leading indicators; districts will also measure progress each year through the lowest-performing student group target).

### Submission Questions

**Select the Focus Area(s) that your district will prioritize over the next three years to address the academic disparities identified in your data analysis. *checkbox***

**FOCUS AREA 2.2:** Use the MTSS process to implement academic supports and interventions that provide all students, particularly students with disabilities and multilingual learners, equitable access to deeper learning.

**Which Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) will your district implement within this Focus Area? *checkbox***

EBP 2.2A: Effective Use of WIDA Framework

EBP 2.2B: High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities

EBP 2.2C: Collaborative Teaching Models

**Provide a short description of what your district has in place now related to this EBP and what you anticipate will be in place by the conclusion of the plan's implementation (by June 2027). *Include details such as the specific programs that will be in place, staff that will be hired, and/or PD that will be offered. Explain how this EBP will improve learning experiences and outcomes for the student groups identified in Section 1. This could include how support for these groups may differ from district-wide implementation efforts.***

The district will train more staff to effectively employ the WIDA framework, so they can expand their use of effective scaffolds and support for multilingual learners. Professional development focused on the WIDA Framework will be conducted through the lens of cultural and linguistically sustaining practices ensuring that all staff have the common language and approach. Providing teachers with more training focused on best practices and the WIDA Framework will help to assist EL and former ELs who struggle with academic performance. For those EL students who are also struggling with a learning disability, we have added a second ESL/SPED licensed teacher to the master schedule. This provides better access for these students who qualify for both services. In addition, to better support the needs of instructors who teach EL and former EL students, the district will also launch an EL Instructional Coaching Program focused on providing direct feedback to teachers of ELs and FELs based upon best practices and the WIDA Framework. Recently, the district supported the new position of Instructional Coach and Assessment Coordinator and part of this role will include instructional coaching. We will also continue to support funding for the full time ESL teacher position as well as the newly developed ESL Teacher Coach position to help provide instructional support for teachers. By the end of 2026-2027 school year, we hope to have provided at least 3 staff trainings per year focused on strategies to support multilingual learners.

The district is committed to providing more training for staff in high-leverage instructional practices designed for students with disabilities (e.g., providing scaffolded support, explicit instruction, flexible grouping, and adapting curriculum and tasks based on students' specific learning goals), so they can provide effective scaffolds and support for all students, especially students with disabilities and multilingual learners who struggle with academic

performance. By the end of 2026-2027 school year, we hope to have provided at least 3 staff training per year focused on strategies to support students with disabilities.

The district will also expand access to our current Co-Teaching Program. To date, this program has had a direct impact on our students with disabilities subgroup. Expanding access to the program will provide more teachers with the necessary instructional strategies to impact student performance. As a district, we will provide training for more teachers and an increase in newly trained co-teachers during the school year. Part of this initiative will include a review of the percentages of students with disabilities assigned to each classroom prior to launching the master schedule for the school year. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, we hope to have provided at least 3 staff trainings per year focused on co-teaching practices.

**ESL: WIDA**

- Training (3 per year): \$4,500
- Staff: ESL Teacher (1), Para-educator (1), SpEd/ESL Teacher (1), Instructional Coach & Assessment Coordinator (1), ELE Director (.33%): \$27,965
- Total Cost: \$32,465

**SpEd: High Leverage Practices for Students with Disabilities**

- Staff Training (3 per year): \$13,500
- SpEd Teachers (3 per year), Content Teachers (2 ELA, 2 MA, 2 Bio per year), IEP Team Leader (1), SpEd Director (.5%), Para-Educator (1): \$129,512
- Total Cost: \$143,012

**SpEd: Co-teaching Program**

- Staff Training (3 per year): \$4,500
- Para-educator (1), SpEd Teachers (3 per year), Content Teachers (1 ELA, 1 MA, 1 Bio per year), IEP Team Leader (1), SpEd Director (.5%): \$100,409
- Total Cost: \$104,909

Which schools will be impacted by these efforts (answer can be district-wide)? District-wide

What is the anticipated amount of funding that will be allocated to this EBP over the next three years (FY25 + FY26 + FY27), across all funding sources? Total allocation should be cumulative. **numerical response ONLY**  
\$280,387

Describe the anticipated allocation of funds to this EBP in more detail. **open response**

- Instructional Leadership: 5,142
- Professional Development: 22,500
- Classroom & Specialist Teachers: 252,745

Which budget foundation categories (G.L. c. 70) will be included in this anticipated annual allocation? **dropdown**

- *Instructional Leadership, Classroom & Specialist Teachers, Professional Development*

**In addition to the lowest-performing student group target, what metrics will your district use to monitor progress on this EBP? Please keep in mind that you will be asked to report on progress on the target and metrics in your annual update to DESE starting next year.**

**We plan to use the following metrics:** Decrease in students requiring Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports as measured by local data

### Section 5: Select Evidence Based Programs to Address Disparities in Outcomes - Goal #3

Review the [Strategic Objectives](#) table on pages 9-12 of this document. Select one to three Focus Areas your district will prioritize to improve student learning experiences and outcomes for student groups identified in your data analysis. For each Focus Area, select one or more Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) from the DESE-provided EBPs list. Answer additional questions about each EBP you select, including questions about resource allocation.

***As noted earlier in this document, selected priority districts will be required to submit more detailed information.*** For each Focus Area as a whole, select metrics you will use to monitor implementation progress using the suggested metrics in this document (these metrics will serve as leading indicators; districts will also measure progress each year through the lowest-performing student group target).

#### Submission Questions

**Select the Focus Area(s) that your district will prioritize over the next three years to address the academic disparities identified in your data analysis. *checkbox***

FOCUS AREA 2.1 Select and skillfully implement high-quality and engaging instructional materials that support culturally and linguistically sustaining practices and foster deeper learning.

**Which Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs) will your district implement within this Focus Area? *checkbox***

EBP 2.1B Supporting Curriculum Implementation

**Provide a short description of what your district has in place now related to this EBP and what you anticipate will be in place by the conclusion of the plan's implementation (by June 2027). *Include details such as the specific programs that will be in place, staff that will be hired, and/or PD that will be offered. Explain how this EBP will improve learning experiences and outcomes for the student groups identified in Section 1. This could include how support for these groups may differ from district-wide implementation efforts.***

Our district will continue to focus our work on the alignment of our common assessments to the Massachusetts Frameworks. One of the initiatives in our current District Improvement Plan includes the shift in our efforts to evaluate student progress with one common assessment per quarter. To build on this meaningful work, we will create “end-of quarter” assessments that are common for all courses. The style of each assessment will vary depending on the students enrolled and the course demands (e.g. traditional test, project, etc). Teachers will work with the Director of Academic Programs to coordinate their work which will include the assessment design, alignment to “grade level” standards, and the tool used to measure progress. Included in each assessment will be a review of best practices for developing assessments for students with disabilities and multilingual learners.

To support this work, our Title I Data Team will analyze the results of common assessments for Title I courses and meet with departments to provide feedback. This feedback will include data analysis on student performance related to subgroup performance. It will also include recommendations related to the design of the assessment and inclusive instructional practices. Each department will review and discuss effective strategies of instruction as well as the effectiveness of each assessment for all students, especially those with disabilities and multilingual learners. After the Data Team shares the results, departments will review the data and select and/or adopt new practices that have been proven effective for a more inclusive student learning experience. In addition, teachers can use these recommendations as part of their student learning or professional goals in the fall. To support parent communication, after each end-of-quarter assessment, the Title I Teacher Coaches will work directly with the Title I

|  |
|--|
| <p>Director to assist in identifying “at risk” students and to provide written communication to families based upon these results with information about recommended supports for their students.</p> <p>With regard to professional development, training will focus on how to strengthen our assessment tools with a keen focus on improving disparities in student performance. Additional professional development time will be provided to complete this meaningful work. Implementing an aligned, “end-of-quarter” common assessment practice will help provide more feedback on student learning more routinely. We hope this will have an impact on all students, especially those who struggle with disabilities and language barriers. By the end of 2026-2027 school year, we hope to have developed “end-of-quarter” common assessments for most courses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PD (<i>Independent sessions &amp; designing assessments for students with disabilities &amp; multilingual learners</i>): \$6,500</li> <li>• Staff: Data Teams (5 per year), Teacher Coaches (3 per year), Liaisons (3 liaisons, 4 times per year), Sub Coverage (5 per year): \$209,993</li> <li>• Total Cost: \$216,493</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Which schools will be impacted by these efforts (answer can be district-wide)?</b></p> <p>District-wide</p>  |
| <p>What is the anticipated amount of funding that will be allocated to this EBP over the next three years (FY25 + FY26 + FY27), across all funding sources? Total allocation should be cumulative. <b>numerical response ONLY</b></p> <p>\$216,493</p>   |
| <p>Describe the anticipated allocation of funds to this EBP in more detail. <b>open response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Leadership: \$2,385</li> <li>• Professional Development: \$44,600</li> <li>• Classroom &amp; Specialist Teachers: \$169,508</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Which budget foundation categories (G.L. c. 70) will be included in this anticipated annual allocation? <b>dropdown</b></p> <p>Instructional Leadership, Classroom &amp; Specialist Teachers, Professional Development</p>  |
| <p><b>In addition to the lowest-performing student group target, what metrics will your district use to monitor progress on this EBP? Please keep in mind that you will be asked to report on progress on the target and metrics in your annual update to DESE starting next year.</b></p> <p><b><i>We plan to use the following metrics:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in % of students meeting or exceeding on Math, ELA, and Science MCAS</li> <li>• Increase in % of English learners making progress on the ACCESS</li> </ul>   |