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Mansfield City School District Review Executive Summary

This review carefully considered the effectiveness of system-wide functions using the Ohio Department of Education’s six district standards: leadership, governance and communication; curriculum and instruction; assessment; human resources and professional development; student support; and fiscal management. The site visit to the Mansfield City School District was conducted from Nov. 16-20, 2015. The following summary highlights some of the strengths, challenges and recommendations, which are further explained in the report.

Strengths

- The district has cultivated partnerships with community organizations in an effort to improve student achievement.
- The district provides professional development aligned to literacy and math academic goals outlined in the district’s Improvement Plan for grades K-8.
- The technology department has implemented a technology plan with short- and long-term goals that are accessible to all stakeholders.
- A balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments is in place in the areas of literacy and mathematics in grades K-6.
- The district employs practices that contribute to attracting and retaining a high-quality professional staff.
- The district conducts ongoing intervention in grades K-12.

Challenges

- The board of education lacks a collaborative process to evaluate the superintendent and to develop assessment strategies for the superintendent’s action plan to improve student achievement.
- The district has not developed a cohesive set of curriculum materials aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards.
- A balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments is not in place at the middle school and high school levels.
- Principals and teachers demonstrated limited knowledge about online access and analysis of value-added data and other forms of student growth measures.
- The district does not have systems and practices in place to ensure that it builds and develops a diverse, high-quality staff.
- The district does not have a comprehensive teachers’ professional development plan for grades 7-12.
- There is a lack of a consistent employee evaluation system in the district.
- The Ohio Improvement Process is not being implemented with consistency and fidelity.
- The district does not have a system to monitor or evaluate the effectiveness of tiered systems of supports for students in grades 9-12.
- The district’s expenditures are higher than comparable districts and the state average.
- The district does not have a comprehensive capital plan.
RECOMMENDATIONS

- Establish a collaborative protocol between the board and superintendent to facilitate the evaluation of the superintendent’s performance. Use district improvement plans and student achievement data to develop the goals and assessment strategies.
- Increase the central office personnel in the areas of curriculum and instruction and develop roles and responsibilities for this position to increase efficiency in district accountability in academics.
- Assemble a team of administrators and teachers across all grade levels to develop a curriculum for grades preK-12 that is aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards.
- Develop and implement a formative and benchmark assessment process at the middle school and high school levels.
- Create a system of operations for the human resources department and an administrative position with a critical role in recruiting, selecting, assigning and managing high-quality teachers and leaders.
- Establish a systematic process for annual evaluations of all employees and provide opportunities for professional growth.
- Develop and implement a high-quality professional development plan that addresses all content areas in grades 7 – 12 supports the district and building improvement plans.
- Ensure that the Ohio Improvement Process drives all district improvement efforts.
- Develop a process to collect and analyze student performance data to assess the impact of all tiered student support programs provided by the district in grades 9-12.
- Engage all stakeholders by hosting a “state of the district” address, which would report district goals and objectives and instructional initiatives and achievements.
- Create a comprehensive long-term capital plan that includes the life span of systems and components and the replacement costs; maintenance cost requirements associated with systems and components; and a summary schedule of estimated annual costs for maintenance and capital replacement.
Mansfield City School District Review Overview

PURPOSE

Conducted under Ohio law, district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of system-wide functions using the Ohio Department of Education’s six district standards: leadership, governance and communication; curriculum and instruction; assessment and effective use of data; human resources and professional development; student supports; and fiscal management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

METHODOLOGY

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

SITE VISIT

The site visit to the Mansfield City School District was conducted from Nov. 16-20, 2015. The site visit included 40 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 65 stakeholders, including board members, district administrators, school staff and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted four focus groups with elementary, middle and high school teachers; middle and high school students representing grades 7 through 12; and approximately 20 parents and community members.

A list of review team members, information about review activities and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A. Appendices B and C provide information about enrollment, expenditures and student performance. The team also conducted building observations and observed classroom instructional practices in 35 classrooms in eight schools. Appendix D contains the instructional inventory tools used to record observed characteristics of standards-based teaching and the building observation form to take note of the climate and culture of the district’s buildings. Appendix E lists the district documents that were reviewed prior to and during the site visit.

1 Ohio Revised Code 3302.10
DISTRICT PROFILE

Mansfield City Schools are located in Richland County. According to the United States Census Bureau, the estimated population of Mansfield City, as of July 1, 2014 was 46,824 which represent a 2.1 percent decrease in population since the 2010 Census. Approximately 82.0 percent of the population graduated from high school. The median household income in Mansfield City is $32,225 with 25.5 percent of the population living below the poverty line. In comparison, the median household income in Ohio is $48,849 with 15.8 percent living below the poverty line.

The average teacher salary in Mansfield City School District for 2013-2014 was $52,923 (see table B-1, Appendix B). However, the average teacher salary in the district has declined between 2010 -2011 and 2013-2014. During the same time period, the percentage of courses taught by highly qualified teachers has fluctuated and the percentage of teachers with Masters or Doctorate degrees has increased. Teacher attendance has also fluctuated over this four-year period. According to the Bureau of Labor and Statistics, the November 2015 unemployment rate (seasonally adjusted) for the Mansfield Ohio metropolitan area was 5.4 percent, compared to 4.5 percent for Ohio.

The racial makeup of the city of Mansfield is 72.0 percent Caucasian, 21.0 percent African American, 2.1 percent Hispanic, 0.4 percent Asian, 0.2 percent American Indian or Alaska Native, 4.6 percent multiracial and 0.1 percent other race. The racial makeup of the school district (2013 – 2014) is 54.1 percent Caucasian, 29.9 percent African American, 2.7 percent Hispanic, and 12.7 percent multiracial (see figure B-1, Appendix B).

According to the data submitted by the district, the number of students choosing to attend a school operated by the Mansfield City School District in on the decline. The district’s 2013-2014 enrollment of 3,339 is the lowest in 6 years (see figure B-2 in Appendix B). The racial makeup between 2008-2009 and 2013-2014 has experienced a slight decline for White students (-1.7 percentage points) and African American students (-4.0 percentage points), but slightly increased for Hispanic students (+1.9 percentage points) and Multiracial students (+3.8 percentage points).

During this same time span, there has been an increase in the percent of students with disabilities (+4.1 percentage points), gifted students (+2.0 percentage points) and economically disadvantaged students (+14.3 percentage points). The percent of students identified as having limited English proficiency remained relatively constant at less than one half of one percent (see figures B-1 and B-3 in Appendix B).

In the 2013-2014 school year, almost four out of every ten children who live in the Mansfield City School District attendance area chose to attend a school outside of the district. Over 8 percent chose to travel to a neighboring district for their education. Almost one in four enrolled in a community school and more than 6 percent took advantage of one of the state’s scholarship opportunities to attend a private school (see figure B-4, Appendix B). The 2013-2014 enrollment numbers by school, race and special population are included in table C-1, Appendix C.

Mansfield is composed of the following eight schools. The Spanish Immersion School has an application requirement.

- Mansfield Integrated Learning Center Hedges Campus
- Malabar Intermediate School
- Mansfield Middle School
- Mansfield Senior High
- Prospect Elementary School

---

2 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
3 Bureau of Labor Statistics
STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Information about student performance includes: (1) the differentiated accountability status\(^4\) of the district; (2) the progress the district is making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the gap closure component; (3) English language arts performance and student growth; (4) mathematics performance and student growth; (5) Performance Index; (6) annual dropout rates and 4- and 5-year cohort graduation rates; (7) suspension/expulsion rates; (8) prepared for success after high school; (9) attendance information and (10) K-3 literacy. Data is reported for the district, its schools and student subgroups that have at least three years of assessment data.

Three-year trend data (or more) are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. In this section, as well as Appendices B and C, the data reported is the most recent available.

1. The district Report Card Summary.
   A. On its 2013 – 2014 report card, the district received a “C” grade in Performance Index, K-3 Literacy and value added for students in the lowest 20 percent in achievement, a “D” grade in value added for students with disabilities and an “F” grade in Indicators Met, Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO), overall value-added, value-added for gifted students, and 4 and 5 year graduation rates.

2. The district is not narrowing the proficiency gaps.
   A. None of the district’s subgroups met the annual measurable objectives (AMO) for reading (84.9 percent), mathematics (80.5 percent) or graduation rate (78.2 percent) in 2013 – 2014 (See figure B-5, Appendix B\(^5\)). The student groups have failure rates of 23.3 percent or more in reading and 26.7 percent or more in math. However, African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Hispanic subgroups show a consistent increase in the percent of students passing the Ohio assessments for at least the past 3 years in reading (see figure B-6, Appendix B). African American students have also shown a consistent 4-year increase in passing rates for math (see figure B-7, Appendix B). All subgroups showed higher passing rates for reading than mathematics in 2013-2014.
   B. Students with disabilities showed the greatest gap in proficiency, with only 36.4 percent and 31.9 percent passing the reading and math assessments respectively. Students with disabilities also showed the lowest graduation rate (55.0 percent) among subgroups (see figures B-5, B-6 and B-7, Appendix B).

3. The district’s English language arts performance and student growth\(^6\).
   A. The district did not meet indicators for performance on the reading Ohio achievement assessment in 2013 – 2014. Approximately 39 percent and 34 percent of the students did not pass their reading test in grades 5 and 7 respectively. Grade 11 met the reading indicator because 91.3 percent of the students passed the reading Ohio Graduation Test. Grade 11 has met the reading indicator for four consecutive years (see

\(^4\) Differentiated accountability defines the roles and expectations of the school district and ODE based upon the performance of the local school district.

\(^5\) The blue dotted line in figure B-5 represents the reading AMO target. The orange dotted line in figure B-5 represents the mathematics target. The gold dotted line in figure B-5 represents the graduation target.

\(^6\) Student growth, or growth standard, represents the minimum amount of progress students in the district should be expected to make in a grade.
Figure B-8 appendix B). Although grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 have not met reading indicators in the past 4 years, they do show a consistent upward trend for at least the past 3 years (see figure B-9, Appendix B).

B. Mansfield City School District outperformed similar districts on the reading assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 in 2013 – 2014. However, no grade level outperformed the state averages in reading (see figure B-8, Appendix B). The greatest proficiency gaps between the state and the district are seen at grade 7 (-17.1 percentage points), grade 8 (-13.5 percentage points), and grade 10 (-12.7 percentage points) (see figure B-8, Appendix B).

C. Only grade 5 made more than one year’s growth in reading for the three year average. Grades 4 and 7 showed below expected growth for the three-year average (see figure B-10, Appendix B).

4. The district’s mathematics performance and student growth.

A. As in the case with reading, Mansfield City School District outperformed similar districts on the mathematics assessments in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 in 2013 – 2014. However, no grade level outperformed the state averages in mathematics (see figure B-11). As the case with reading, the greatest proficiency gaps between the state and Mansfield is seen in grade 7 (-22.4 percentage points), grade 8 (-26.6 percentage points) and 10 (-14.9 percentage points).

B. The district did not meet any mathematics indicators for performance on the mathematics Ohio achievement assessments or the Ohio Graduation Test in 2013 – 2014. More than four in ten students in grades 5, 7 and 8 are failing the math assessments. Although grades 4, 5 and 6 have not met mathematics indicators in the past 4 years, they do show a consistent upward trend for at least the past 3 years. In addition to grades 4, 5, and 6, grades 7, 8 and 10 have not met mathematics indicators in the past 4 years. Math passing rates at grades 3 and 10 also dropped in 2013 – 2014 (see figure B-12, Appendix B).

C. Grades 5 and 6 made more than one year’s growth in mathematics for the three year average. As in the case with reading, grades 4 and 7 showed below expected growth for the three-year average (see figure B-10, Appendix B).

D. When combining math and reading across all grades, the district did not make a year’s growth for the three year average (see figure B-10, Appendix B).

5. The district’s Performance Index7 scores.

A. Mansfield City School District’s Performance Index score for 2013 – 2014 was 84.6. The district has made small gains in the past 4 years (see figure B-13, Appendix B).


A. Four- and five-year graduation rates for the class of 2014 and 2013 respectively are lower than similar districts and the state average (see figure B-14, Appendix B). Almost 40 percent of the district’s students did not graduate on time. However, the district’s increase in percentage points from the 4-year rate to the 5-year rate is +12.6, which is greater than the increase for similar districts (+ 4.6 percentage points) and the state (+2.4 percentage points). Four-year graduation rates have also declined between 2010 – 2011

---

7 The Performance Index score measures the achievement of every student regardless of their levels of proficiency. Schools receive points for every level of achievement, with more points being awarded for higher passing scores. Untested students also are included in the calculation and schools and districts receive zero points for them. For purposes of assigning the letter grades, a Performance Index score of 120 is considered to be a “perfect” score. Districts and schools will receive one of five letter grades from “A” through “F” based on the percentage of total possible points earned.

8 Graduation rate is the percentage of students that received a regular or honors diploma during or before the end of the school year.

9 As defined by the U.S. Department of Education, dropout rate represents the percentage of 16- through 24-year-olds who are not enrolled in school and have not earned a high school credential (either a diploma or an equivalency credential such as a GED certificate.)
These elements show the extent to which a district’s students are prepared for college or a career.

Beginning in 2014, the Ohio Department of Education released additional data about each district’s graduates in a component called Prepared for Success. These elements show the extent to which a district’s students are prepared for college or a career.

### The district’s rates of in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions and expulsions by district and school.

A. Between 2009 – 2010 and 2013 – 2014, disciplinary actions per 100 students for all discipline types have been greater for Mansfield City School District than those of the state and seven of the ten comparison districts. (See figure B-17, Appendix B and figure C-1, Appendix C)

B. The out-of-school suspension rates for Mansfield City school district have steadily decreased in the past 5 years. However, the yearly rates still exceed those of the state (see figure C-2, Appendix C). The most occurrences for out-of-school suspensions for the district between 2011 – 2012 and 2013 – 2014 are due to disobedient/disruptive behavior, fighting/violence, and harassment/ intimidation (see table C-2, Appendix C). Out-of-school suspensions per 100 students for three schools have steadily decreased over three of the past five years. These schools are: Mansfield Middle School, Mansfield Senior High School, and Woodland Elementary School. However, out-of-school suspension rates for Sherman Elementary School have steadily increased over the same time period (see table C-3, Appendix C).

### Prepared for Success

A. ACT participation for the 2013 graduating class was 37.4 percent. Only 5.8 percent received a remediation-free score. (See figure B-18, Appendix B). ACT participation for the 2014 graduating class was 21.9 percent, 15.5 percentage points lower than the previous graduating class. However, 6.4 percent of the 2014 graduating class earned a remediation free score - a slight increase from the class of 2013. The percent of students who took the SAT was lower than ACT participation for both the class of 2013 and 2014. Less than one percent of the class of 2014 earned an SAT score that labeled them to be remediation free. Between 2011 and 2015 the performance of Mansfield Senior High School students on the ACT was lower than the state. The ACT scores for 2015 were also the lowest in all subject areas since 2011. (See figure C-3, Appendix C). The college-readiness gap between the state and the district, based on ACT scores, ranged between 20 and 29 percentage points, with the largest gap seen for college algebra (see figure C-4, Appendix C).

B. Approximately 6.2 percent of the class of 2013 enrolled in an advanced placement course, compared to 0 percent of the class of 2014 (see figure B-18, Appendix B). Only 2.4 percent of the class of 2014 graduated with an honors diploma and no students earned dual enrollment credit or scored 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate exam.

C. Slightly more than one in ten students of the class of 2014 earned an industry recognized credential. The percent of graduating students who obtained industry-recognized credentials was greater for the class of 2014 (10.4 percent) than for the class of 2013 (6.2 percent).

---

10 Beginning in 2014, the Ohio Department of Education released additional data about each district’s graduates in a component called Prepared for Success.

9. Attendance Rates
   A. Mansfield City School District attendance rates were comparable to the state, trailing no more than 0.5 percentage points during 2011 – 2012, 2012 – 2013, and 2013 – 2014 school years (see figure B-19, Appendix B).
   
   B. The district’s chronic absenteeism rate\textsuperscript{12} ranged between 14.9 percent and 17.4 percent during the same time period (see figure B-20, Appendix B). For the 2013 – 2014 school year, approximately 58 percent of the district’s students showed satisfactory attendance. Another 28 percent of the district’s students fell in the at-risk category (see figure B-21, Appendix B).
   
   C. The highest absentee rates for Mansfield City school district occurred at the high school level in the 2012 – 2013 and 2013 – 2014 school years. Figure B-22 in Appendix B shows the percentage of district students in each grade who have missed at least 10 percent of the school year.

10. K-3 Literacy\textsuperscript{13}
   A. Approximately 55 percent of Kindergarten through third grade students who were identified as not-on-track on the 2013 – 2014 report card improved to on-track status in 2014 – 2015 (see figure B-23, Appendix B). However, when comparing 2013 – 2014 and 2014 – 2015 on-track percentages, the 2015 rate is lower by approximately 1.2 percentage points.

11. Financial Data
   A. In 2013 – 2014 Mansfield City School District spent less on classroom instruction than the average of similar districts and the state average. Among the 105 districts in the district’s comparison group, Mansfield City School District ranks 90\textsuperscript{th} lowest in the amount spent in the classroom (see figure B-24, Appendix B).
   
   B. The district had a total budget of $6.5 million for the 2013 – 2014 school year. More than half of its revenue came from the state with local funds making up the second highest percent (see figure B-25, Appendix B).
   
   C. During the 2013 – 2014 school year, Mansfield City School District spent 33 percent more than the state average on its students (see figure B-26, Appendix B).

\textsuperscript{12} Source: Ohio Department of Education; Students who miss less than 5 percent of school days are identified as having satisfactory attendance. Students who miss between 5 percent and 9.9 percent of school days are identified as at-risk. Students who miss between 10 percent and 19.9 percent of school days are identified as moderately chronic. Students who miss 20 percent or more of school days are identified as severely chronic.

\textsuperscript{13} An analysis of Ohio student data found that a student who does not read proficiently by the end of third grade is 3.5 times more likely not to graduate on time than their “on-track” peers. When looking at data from the 2003 – 2004 3\textsuperscript{rd} grade cohort tied to the graduating class of 2013, the study found that only 57 percent of the students who scored in the limited range on their 2004 3\textsuperscript{rd} grade reading test graduated on time, and only two-thirds of those scoring basic graduated on time. Conversely, more than four-fifths of the students scoring proficient or higher graduated on time. In order to address reading deficits early, the K-3 Literacy Improvement Measure is used to determine if more students are learning to read in kindergarten through third grade.
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STRENGTHS

Leadership, Governance and Communication

1. The district has identified and cultivated partnerships with community organizations in an effort to improve student achievement.

   A. Interviews with the superintendent, community members and partners confirmed that the superintendent has vetted external partners and cultivated relationships to increase fiscal support for improved teaching and learning.

   B. Interviews and documents identified some of the external partners directly serving the needs of students in the district through the superintendent's collaborative efforts. One of the partners is the Richland County Foundation, which awarded the district $269,270 from Feb. 1, 2014, through Nov. 16, 2015, to improve teaching and learning and provides funding for:

      • Teacher Assistance Program (TAP) grants to supplement classroom instructional tools for teachers. Individual teacher grants include “Games Forever for Special Needs Kids,” an instructional tool for students with disabilities and “Empowered Against Injustice: By the Lives of Others,” an enhancement program for all grade 6 students at Malabar Intermediate School.

      • Math textbooks for grades 4-6.

      • Educational field trips for high school students to Great Lakes Science Center and field trips for grades K-3 and middle school students in the 2014-2015 school year.

      • The Fran and Warren Rupp Scholarship Fund of $5,000 is awarded annually to a Mansfield High School graduate to attend the college or university of the student’s choice;

      • Two math and literacy nights, family engagement initiatives whereby teachers provide educational activities for parents and students to work on together.

      • Family involvement activities, including a district educational celebration in May.

   C. According to focus group participants and interviewees, the superintendent has advocated for community resources to address student non-academic needs. Resources include:

      • Urban Minority Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Outreach Program, a treatment and outreach center that provides 14 mentors for 60 district students.

      • North Central State College, a two-year institution that provides mentorship for students and college and career plus classes at Mansfield High School. The college also grants a two-year tuition scholarship to North Central State College for students who have completed six college credits by high school graduation.

      • Catalyst Life Services, a behavioral and mental health agency that places staff in classrooms for students who need behavioral, social and mental health supports.

      • National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) local branch members provide voter registration opportunities for staff and students at the high schools.

      • North End Community Improvement Collaborative, through the partnership with Community Connectors, conducts student leadership training for 45 high school students in grades 9-11 who need academic supports to pass the Ohio Graduation Tests. They also provide math and reading mentors and tutors for students in grades 7-12 enrolled in the Real Opportunities for Achievement and
Readiness (ROAR) program, a mentorship program that provides students with role models who can help them set goals, build character and develop the skills that will lead to success in school and the workplace.

**IMPACT:** As a result of the superintendent’s communication and collaboration with external stakeholders, academic and non-academic supports are provided to address the needs of students.

**Curriculum and Instruction**

1. The district provides professional development aligned to literacy and math academic goals outlined in the district’s Improvement Plan for grades K-8.
   
   A. A review of documents, interviews and focus groups revealed the district has a professional development plan for the 2015-2016 school year to aid teachers in increasing their knowledge and skills in effective instructional practices in the classroom that could lead to an increase in student reading scores. Some of the interventions include:
     
     - **Literacy Collaborative.** School-based literacy coaches receive training in this comprehensive literacy model and monthly professional development from The Ohio State University. In this train-the-trainer model, the coaches implement the methods in their classrooms and provide on-site training for teachers in their schools. Teachers learn how to use assessment to differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of students.
     
     - **Leveled Literacy Intervention.** In an effort to bring remedial students up to grade level, The Ohio State University-Mansfield trainers train teachers to implement effective reading intervention strategies within a small group setting.
     
     - **Reading Recovery.** Reading Recovery is individualized instruction for the lowest achieving students in the first grade. District teacher leaders are trained at The Ohio State University to provide training to reading recovery teachers on effective strategies for teaching struggling readers.
     
     - **Intervention specialists** receive training in Literacy Lessons from a reading recovery teacher leader and Ashland University. Literacy Lessons are used with students who have Individualized Education Plans (IEP) and are in the beginning phases of learning to read and write in grades 1-4.
   
   B. According to reviews and documents, the district has a professional development plan for the 2015-2016 year to aid teachers in increasing their knowledge in effective instructional practices that could lead to an increase in mathematic proficiency scores, as measured by student performance on the local and state assessments.
     
     - The district has partnered with The Ohio State University-Mansfield and the Algebra Project math literacy program to provide professional development for grades K-8 math teacher leaders and support them through curriculum alignment, development of formative assessments and strengthening their content knowledge.
     
     - Teacher leaders are supported by The Ohio State University-Mansfield with classroom visits and monthly professional development as they provide on-site training for the classroom teachers.

**IMPACT:** When the district provides high-quality professional development that is based on the identified academic needs and increases the teachers’ content knowledge and instructional skills, there may be an improvement in student academic achievement.

2. The district has a system to identify students in grades K-8 performing below grade level and provides tiered systems of support for these students.
   
   A. According to documents and interviews, the district assessment advisory team, comprised of a representative from each building and across grade levels, meets monthly to review, discuss and analyze district assessment data. The team creates a district assessment timeline annually that aligns with state standards.
and district initiatives. Every teacher is provided an assessment binder for his or her grade level that is updated annually by the team.

B. Teacher-based team minutes, interviews and focus groups indicated weekly meetings are held to analyze student performance data and plan for instruction using the Ohio Improvement Process 5-Step Process. Title I teachers, coaches, intervention specialists and other stakeholders are part of the grade-level teams.

C. Building observations revealed that schools have data rooms where student names are displayed in each of the Response to Intervention tiers of instruction.

- Tier 1 refers to the whole classroom and the instruction all students receive in a core reading and math curriculum aligned to the state standards.
- Tier 2 consists of students who fall below the expected levels of achievement (benchmarks) and are at some risk for academic failure. These students perform above levels considered high risk for failure and their needs are determined through the assessment process. In smaller groups than tier 1, these students are provided with instructional programs that focus on their specific needs.
- Tier 3 instruction is for students who are at high risk for failure. These students receive additional intensified and individualized instruction to target the deficits in their skills.

D. The literacy team teachers for grades K-8 stated in interviews that the Literacy Collaborative supports all students at the Tier 1 level. Differentiated instruction occurs during guided reading, writing workshops and literacy centers.

E. The math literacy team for grades K-8 stated in interviews that the Algebra Project math literacy program is provided for all students at the Tier 1 level. Differentiated instruction occurs during guided math groups.

F. Based on document reviews and interviews, Tier 2 interventions include Reading Recovery, Leveled Literacy Intervention and Literacy Lessons for students in grades K-8.

G. Document review and interviews revealed tutoring is available for students at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels in some schools. Tutoring is available before, during and after school depending on the school building’s schedule.

H. Tier 3 interventions are individualized to meet student needs.

IMPACT: By using a data-driven approach to identify students performing below grade level, schools in the district have the opportunity to plan appropriate academic interventions and monitor the progress of student achievement. As a result of a tiered system of support, the district can ensure student academic needs are diagnosed, addressed early and progress can be monitored for students in grades K-8.

Assessment and Effective Use of Data

1. The technology department has implemented a technology plan with short- and long-term goals that are accessible to all stakeholders.

A. Documents and interviews confirmed that the technology department was restructured during the 2014-2015 school year and entered into a three-year contract with City Mills Technology to oversee all technology services.

- The district technology staff includes a director of technology, a network services administrator, a technology integration specialist and three full-time technicians. Interviews with the director of technology and district personnel indicated that the department has been responsive to the technology needs of the district.
- Interviews, classroom observations and a review of the technology plan indicated that classroom technology has been updated throughout the district since the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. Examples of technology that were observed across the district include:
  - Interactive white board technology and document projectors used in classrooms;
Multiple computer labs in schools replaced throughout the district;
- Eight mobile laptops installed at the middle school and high school;
- Career and technical education programs using current and up-to-date technology equipment and software;
- Classroom teachers using updated laptop computers; and
- The PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations) Learning Lab at the high school providing individualized online credit recovery programs to students.

B. According to the technology plan and interviews, there are timelines and schedules for fiscal years 2016, 2017 and 2018 for updating hardware, software and technology infrastructure, along with plans for technology-based professional development.

C. A review of the district technology plan indicated descriptions and overviews of the following areas:
   - The technology vision;
   - Technology infrastructure goals.
   - Technology integration initiatives.
   - Technology professional development — including the purpose, observable teacher and student behaviors.
   - The online learning initiative — including the purpose, observable teacher and student behaviors.
   - The electronic resources to support a 21st century teaching and learning environment; and

D. Comments from staff regarding the new district technology plan and the level of customer service and responsiveness of the technology department include:
   - “Technology in the district was in shambles. We brought in new technologies and we take pride in upgrading the labs and computers.”
   - “Issues are taken care of immediately.”
   - “I’ve worked in a number of places and this is the most responsive technology team I’ve ever worked with.”

E. The district test coordinator and technology staff indicated that the technology requirements of the new state tests were met in spring 2015.
   - There were no reported issues regarding the technology infrastructure for online state tests.
   - Principals facilitated test security meetings in each building, resulting in a testing process with no reported breaches in security.
   - Students in the focus groups also indicated that they did not experience technology issues during the state assessments.

F. Interview and focus group participants indicated that the student information system is accessible to administrators, teachers, parents and students.
   - District personnel indicated that the use of Progress Book for attendance and grading purposes is mandatory for all staff.
   - Middle school and high school students commented that their parents access Progress Book regularly and can see accurate information about their students’ performances.

IMPACT: As a result of implementing a new technology plan with a focus on customer service, technology services can meet the instructional needs of students and staff and provide parents with access to student performance data.

2. A balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments is in place in the areas of literacy and mathematics in grades K-6.
   A. A review of documents, interviews and classroom visitations indicated evidence of fluency probes, running records and formative and benchmark assessments being used in grades K-6 in literacy, math and writing.
• Assessments are aligned with The Ohio State University Literacy Collaborative and the Algebra Project for Mathematics Literacy through The Ohio State University-Mansfield.

• Teacher focus group participants indicated that the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessments provide literacy performance data for their students and informs their literacy instruction. These assessments are given three times per year, and writing assessments are given quarterly in grades K-6.

B. According to interviews and reviewed documents, the district assessment advisory team has been in place for three years and meetings are held monthly to gather and review student performance data.

C. Assessment binders that contain student performance data have been developed for each teacher in grades K-6. These binders include current copies of formative and benchmark assessments and current student performance data.

• Classroom observations revealed that assessments are aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards and are being used to inform instruction.

• Interviews confirmed that the math teacher leaders are responsible for creating fluency and quarterly assessments.
  o Math fluency assessments have 10 questions each and are given monthly in kindergarten through sixth grade.
  o This process is facilitated by math consultants through the Algebra Project for Mathematics Literacy through The Ohio State University-Mansfield.

**IMPACT:** As a result of implementing formative and benchmark assessments with fidelity to guide instruction, students in grades K-6 may demonstrate growth in academic achievement.

3. The district has implemented the Ohio Improvement Process.

A. The Ohio Improvement Process is a shared leadership process designed to align the mission, vision and actions of the school district in order to improve student achievement.

B. Interviews with district personnel and a review of district leadership team minutes indicated that the district employed an internal Ohio Improvement Process facilitator at the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year. The purpose of the facilitator is to align the Ohio Improvement Process across the district and to assist the director of state and federal programs.

C. Interviews, focus groups and a review of meeting minutes showed the district leadership team, building leadership teams and teacher-based teams meet regularly throughout the district.

• The district leadership team meets monthly, and minutes are shared with all certificated and classified staff through the Google Drive.
• Building leadership teams meet monthly and “are up and running this year at all schools.”
• Interviews and focus group comments confirmed that there is a diverse representation of staff on all building leadership teams.
• District personnel indicated that teacher-based teams typically meet on a weekly basis.

D. District leadership team meeting minutes showed that the district Ohio Improvement Process document was updated in November 2015. This is an updated, two-page version of the district focused plan. The plan includes a summary of the four district goals focused on leadership, reading, math and school climate. The plan also includes strategies, action steps and timelines to collect data and review targets for each goal.

E. Documents and interviews corroborated that the district leadership team has completed the Ohio Improvement Process Implementation Rubric annually over the last three years. The purpose of this rubric
is to increase awareness of the quality of implementation and alignment of the Ohio Improvement Process by judging continuous improvement based on clearly articulated criteria.

F. A full day of professional development on the Ohio Improvement Process was facilitated by State Support Team 7 in August 2015. All building leadership teams were represented and all principals attended.

- District staff and State Support Team 7 members acknowledge the collaborative working relationship.
- Members of the state support team stated that the district teams are “working hard to follow through on issues that are facing them — they are on a good path.”

G. A review of teacher-based team minutes reflected the following observations:

- Teacher-based teams at several buildings are using Google Docs to submit and disaggregate student performance data prior to their meetings.
- A teacher-based team in an elementary building updated its protocol with guiding questions. Data is disaggregated by students who are “below, approaching, meeting, or above the standard.” Teachers are discussing differentiated instruction, “what students will be doing,” and “what teachers will be doing.”
- The intermediate school is using an updated teacher-based team protocol created in conjunction with the state support team. Teams are disaggregating data for all subgroups and teachers are discussing the implementation of differentiated instructional strategies.

**IMPACT:** When the district implements the Ohio Improvement Process at the district, building and teacher levels, this can encourage ownership for student academic success throughout the district. In this collaborative environment, the district staff can work to ensure improved learning for the students that they serve.

**Human Resources and Professional Development**

1. **The district has established a team structure for district level collaboration and shared leadership that provides opportunities for the development of teacher professional growth.**

   A. According to teacher and administrator interviews, as well as a review of the district plan execution document, the district has established key committees at the district level. These committees provide an opportunity for team based collaboration and shared leadership in the execution of district improvement efforts. The committees and purposes are as follows:

   - The educator support team guides district work with licensure, induction and peer assistance review.
   - The local professional development committee guides the licensure or certificate renewal of professional staff.
   - The curriculum advisory committee maintains an ongoing study of district philosophy, the evaluation and establishment of curriculum goals.
   - The district leadership team, building leadership teams, and teacher-based teams guide the implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process.
   - The math teacher leaders’ team develops baseline or quarterly assessments, works with student learning objectives development and informs teachers about Math Literacy and the work done by teacher leaders.
   - The evaluation team establishes evaluation policy, procedure and process as well as evaluates the effectiveness of the evaluation process.
   - The district assessment advisory team reviews and analyzes district assessment data.
The program audit compliance tracking system team oversees the collection of Title I compliance documents in the district buildings.

The Title 1 networking team provides Title 1 professional development.

The literacy team leads and supports all literacy efforts within the district.

B. Based on interviews, review of team and committee meeting minutes, agendas and negotiated agreements, district level teams are seen as opportunities for teacher professional growth and leadership skills. Teachers have the ability to serve in diverse roles both at the district and building levels such as committee and sub-committee members, team leaders, teacher leaders, coaches and mentors.

**IMPACT:** By establishing a formal structure that supports collaboration and shared leadership, the district is positioned to maximize the effectiveness of the Ohio Improvement Process and the leadership framework developed and supported by the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC).

2. **A focused professional development plan exists and is being implemented in grades K-8.**

   A. The district professional development plan and calendar reflects that the district is engaged in a focused program of professional development for its staff in grades K-8 in the areas of literacy and math. Partnering with The Ohio State University main and Mansfield campuses, the program is research based and involves ongoing and job embedded professional development components including:

   - Algebra Project Math Literacy (training of building level math coaches).
   - Literacy Collaborative.
   - Leveled Literacy Intervention.
   - Reading Recovery.
   - Literacy Lessons.

   B. Based on interviews with administrators, coaches and teachers as well as classroom observations, there was evidence of the professional development plan implementation. During classroom observations, the instructional components of the Literacy Collaborative were observed in action including language and word study, reading workshop, writing workshop and embedded coaching for teachers. There also were visual cues for components of the program placed in the classroom for use by the students in the classrooms that were visited.

   C. Interviews with teachers, administrators and coaches indicated support for the staffs’ capacity to implement the professional development program. This includes support from the district literacy team in providing services such as coaching, push-in support for staff new to the Literacy Collaborative and a Principals Academy designed to strengthen the leadership of the program. The support provided is focused on the differentiation of support based on staff needs.

   **IMPACT:** The development and implementation of a high-quality, research-based professional development program has the potential to increase the depth of knowledge of the teaching staff in teaching and learning strategies to help all students learn.

3. **The district employs practices that contribute to attracting and retaining a highly qualified professional staff.**

   A. Based on a comparison of district salary and fringe benefit offerings with surrounding school districts as well as interviews with teachers, administrators and new hires, the district’s benefit package is competitive, including paying 100 percent of the medical premium for its employees.

   B. In interviews with teachers and administrators, the district’s encouragement and implementation of staff professional development and growth was cited as an incentive to attract and retain a high-quality
professional staff. Early release time for professional development for administrators and teachers is readily provided by the district for needs related to the professional development plan.

C. According to interviews with teachers, administrators and the superintendent, district personnel attended a job fair in spring 2015 in an effort to recruit new staff members.

**IMPACT:** The ability to employ and retain a high-quality staff is essential to district improvement efforts. There is a growing body of research available that indicates that a high-quality teacher in the classroom is the number one factor in improving student achievement. The efforts that the district has undertaken have the potential to make an impact on the achievement of its students.

**Student Supports**

1. **The district offers academic interventions for students in grades K-12.**

   A. Based on interviews, documents and observations, academic interventions are provided through the following programs:

   - Reading Recovery is a one-on-one daily intervention program for students in grade 1 who are performing below grade level expectations;
   - Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is small group reading instruction for students in grades K-8;
   - Algebra Project is a math literacy initiative for students in grades K-8 to achieve proficiency in math;
   - Extended Learning Opportunities are tutoring sessions for identified at-risk students in grades K-8;
   - Title I is a federally funded program that provides financial assistance to schools with high numbers of children from low-income families. The district uses these funds to provide reading and math intervention in order to improve student academic achievement;
   - Study Tables are voluntary after school academic assistance sessions for high school students, provided by certified teachers; and
   - PLATO and A+ are online credit recovery programs.

   B. The Response to Intervention process is in place in grades K-6. It is a tiered support system that identifies and provides intervention for students performing below grade level.

   C. According to the high school principal, the high school teachers are being trained for the implementation of *High Schools That Work*, a framework that provides direction for schools to improve academic and career-technical instruction.

   **IMPACT:** When the district provides academic interventions that are based on student needs, barriers to academic success can be reduced.

2. **The district has partnered with multiple community organizations to provide academic and non-academic support, according to focus group participants and interviewees.**

   A. The North End Community Improvement Collaborative (NECIC) secured the Community Connectors Grant to train 16 mentors to assist students in grades 7-8 in preparation for college and career readiness.

   B. North Central State College offers courses to high school students. A Tuition Freedom Scholarship is offered to students who earn 6 college credits toward an associate degree while in high school.

---
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C. The Ohio State University, Ashland University and North Central State College offer the College Credit Plus Program to provide additional educational opportunities to high school students who are academically capable of successfully completing college-level work.

D. The Richland Foundation awarded mini grants to teachers and has paid for educational field trips.

E. Members of the local branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People educates students on the history and process of voting and registers students to vote.

**IMPACT:** When the district partners with external community organizations, additional support services may be provided to meet the academic and social needs of the students.

**Fiscal Management**

1. The district has begun the process of moving out of fiscal emergency and expects to be released from the Financial Planning and Supervision Commission oversight.

   A. According to board minutes from 2013 and 2014 and newspaper articles, the district declared a state of fiscal emergency on Dec. 17, 2013, due to a pending deficit as of June 30, 2014. At that time, the district borrowed approximately $3.6 million from the School District Solvency Assistance Fund. As a result of the fiscal emergency, a Financial Planning and Supervision Commission was appointed to provide oversight in order to help the district return to a fiscally stable state.

   B. The district made reductions in expenditures, tightened fiscal control and expects to be released from the Financial Planning and Supervision Commission oversight, after the final loan payment is made to the School District Solvency Assistance Fund.

   C. The district’s five-year forecast shows the following:
   
   
   - A $1.8 million balance of the state loan, to be paid in fiscal year 2016. After the loan is paid in full, $1.8 million per year in resources will be available, which can be used for staffing, services, supplies and other purposes at the beginning of the 2017 fiscal year.
   
   - A positive cash balance throughout the forecasted period of fiscal years 2016 to 2020. The Government Finance Officers Association recommends that governmental entities carry a minimum of 60 days of operational cash in its ending cash balance to start the new fiscal year. Currently the district demonstrates a range from a minimum of 67.6 days of operations to a maximum of 72 days of operational cash.

   **IMPACT:** When the district moves out of fiscal emergency and external fiscal oversight is ended, the district can resume control of the General Fund cash balance and may make decisions on how to use the funds to improve education and educator effectiveness.

2. A comparison of the five-year financial forecast notes from the 2014 and 2015 fiscal years shows the 2015 notes provide detailed financial information that can enable the board, superintendent and other stakeholders to understand the forecast assumptions and their impact upon the district.

   **IMPACT:** Using detailed financial information, the board, superintendent and other stakeholders can make informed fiscal decisions that may contribute to improved financial stability and student performance.

3. The district has formed partnerships with local and state organizations to address the needs of its students.

   A. A review of board minutes and interviews with community members and district partners indicate that the district has partnered with various stakeholders, such as foundations, colleges, universities and service providers.
B. Partners provide drug and alcohol prevention programs and mentors; voter registration and political engagement; program and curriculum support; police radios in schools for direct communication; college classes offered in high school and at college campuses; the opportunity to attend college tuition-free for two years; medical and mental health services offered in schools; opportunity grants, field trips and scholarships.

**IMPACT:** Through the creation of community partnerships, the district can align and leverage its resources to provide enhanced support and services to its students.
CHALLENGES AND AREAS FOR GROWTH

Leadership, Governance and Communication

1. The board of education does not collectively communicate with the superintendent and does not adhere to the adopted and approved bylaws and policies nor follow the guidelines for their roles and responsibilities as board members.

   A. In interviews with the superintendent, he mentioned that there is a lack of two-way communication between two members of the board and himself. Documents reviewed and interviews revealed that the superintendent uses an automated call system known as the “Leader Alert System” to update board members on district concerns. Furthermore, the superintendent presents his reports at monthly board meetings and has board updates delivered to board members’ homes via postal mail.

   - The superintendent stated in an interview that he has continued the one-way communication with two of the board members because they refuse to talk to him and will not return his phone calls concerning district issues. Yet, as he shared, he continues to keep them informed concerning district issues by the Leader Alert System and by leaving phone messages.

   B. Although the board updates and approves policy, there is a lack of accountability measures taken when members do not adhere to policy and bylaws.

      - Mansfield Board of Education Bylaw 0166 states “In keeping with the confidential nature of executive sessions, no member of the board, committee or subcommittee shall disclose the content of discussion that takes place during such sessions.”

      - The Mansfield Journal reported that a board member confirmed the name of a candidate for the treasurer position, which was discussed only in executive session\textsuperscript{16}. Before the special meeting, the board member revealed the intent to vote against the resolution to hire the candidate. At the time of the site visit, the district has not hired a full-time treasurer.

      - Under bylaw 0148 entitled Public Expression of Members, “The board president functions as the official spokesperson for the Board.” However, documents reviewed reveal that other board members are quoted in the media.

      - According to interviews, there were no consequences for the executive session violation.

**IMPACT:** When board members do not follow the bylaws and policies adopted by the board of education or communicate with the superintendent concerning the operational leadership of the district, the board may not provide clear direction for district improvement.

2. The board of education lacks a collaborative process to evaluate the superintendent and to develop assessment strategies for the superintendent’s action plan to improve student achievement.

   A. According to interviews conducted and documents reviewed, the board met on Nov.18, 2015, to vote on the superintendent’s evaluation and his contract renewal. Two board members did not attend the meeting and the board was unable to vote on the renewal of the superintendent’s contract.

   B. A review of the superintendent’s evaluations from 2014 and 2015 included summative assessment worksheets that addressed three areas of concentration: the improvement of student achievement, an increase of technology usage, and the reutilization of Springmill Learning Center. However, there was no indication of goals or evaluation measures to track the progress of these goals.

\textsuperscript{16} Bylaw 0123 entitled Code of Ethics/Code of Conduct states that “while serving as a member of the Board of Education each member is expected to agree to abide by the following code of ethics promulgated by the Ohio School Boards Association and will respect the confidentiality of privileged information.”
C. All five board members submitted evaluation worksheets of the superintendent’s work performance. Using a rating scale of 1 (unacceptable) to 5 (outstanding), the superintendent was rated on 16 categories of his position.

- An inconsistency among the five board members’ ratings was evident. One board member rated the superintendent “unacceptable” in 15 of 16 categories. Three board members rated the superintendent 3 (good), 4 (excellent) or 5 (outstanding) in all 16 categories.

**IMPACT:** When the board does not collaborate with the superintendent to develop evaluation measures for district goals, it may not fulfill its responsibility of monitoring the superintendent’s performance to ensure that the district is making progress toward its improvement goals. Furthermore, the superintendent may be unaware of the specific expectations of the board concerning his performance.

3. According to the district’s organizational chart and interviews, the superintendent is the only full-time central office administrator.
   A. The superintendent shared that he was unable to complete the Ohio Principals Evaluation System (OPES) evaluations because of other critical needs of the district including working with the interim treasurer to ensure that the district gets out of fiscal emergency and he was the only full-time central office administrator.
   B. During an interview, it was revealed that there were principals in the district who did not complete the Ohio Teacher Evaluation Systems (OTES) during the 2014-2015 school year because the district lacked oversight from central office.
   C. One board member shared a concern that the district lacked a full-time central office administrator in charge of curriculum. It was stated that “There need to be someone in central to address all areas of curriculum at the district level.”

**IMPACT:** When the district lacks key central office administrative personnel, it can be difficult to provide district accountability for improved student achievement and staff accountability in all areas of curriculum implementation.

**Curriculum and Instruction**

1. The district has not developed a cohesive set of curriculum materials aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards.
   A. Document reviews, interviews and focus groups indicate core curriculum materials have not been fully aligned to the standards across all grade levels.
   B. The current pacing guides have not been aligned across grade levels, buildings or transitions from building to building (i.e., elementary to middle school; middle school to high school) according to interviews with teachers and staff.
   C. A review of sample English language arts and mathematics pacing guides provided by the district showed inconsistent formatting across grade levels and subjects.

**IMPACT:** Without the consistent use of curricula that is aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards, teachers cannot align instruction with learning goals and assessments. If assessments are misaligned with learning objectives or instructional strategies, the district may be unable to properly assess the student learning.

2. The current system of district teams\(^\text{17}\) is ineffective in guiding the development, implementation and monitoring of a cohesive curriculum across the district.

   A. The system consists of the following committees: Curriculum Advisory Committee, Literacy Team, Math Teacher Leaders, District Assessment Advisory Team and the Evaluation Team.

---

\(^{17}\) Roles and Responsibilities of District Teams (document provided by Mansfield City Schools)
B. A review of the curriculum advisory committee’s 2014 monthly meeting minutes lacked evidence of action plans for the committee to fulfill its duties noted in the negotiated contract18, which are as follows:

- Direct a continuous and comprehensive evaluation of the curriculum;
- Review and modify the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan for the district;
- Approve all building Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plans for consistency with the district’s Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan;
- Maintain a continued study of the district’s philosophy; and
- Establish curriculum goals based on community needs and test data.
- Teachers in a focus group agreed that they were “on their own” to create pacing guides, either as a grade-level team in a building or with other buildings.
- A principal mentioned that there is no district support for curriculum.
- Interviews and documents indicated most of the committee’s action plans were in the area of creating and approving Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) for evaluation in the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES).

C. The math teacher leaders are responsible for creating baseline and quarterly assessments, reviewing and analyzing student performance data in math periodically, and assisting with ideas for improvement. Interviews and documents revealed that the math curriculum was developed by the math teacher leaders and The Ohio State University Algebra Project.

D. The District Assessment Advisory Team creates the district’s annual assessment timeline aligned with state and district initiatives.

- The advisory team also reviews, discusses and analyzes the district assessment binder and creates and updates a user’s guide to the assessment binder.
- According to interviews, the math teacher leaders, and not the assessment advisory team, created the math fluency assessments.

E. A joint evaluation committee is comprised of the teacher’s union and the board of education for the purposes of establishing the policies, procedures and processes of evaluation as well as the instrument used for evaluating teachers.

- The evaluation team’s responsibility is to determine those conditions that likely would impact student growth measures as they relate to the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.

F. During interviews with the district teams, English language arts coaches and math teacher leaders for grades K-8 were the only representatives. High school English language arts and math teachers were not represented at the interviews; neither were teachers of other subject areas represented.

**IMPACT:** When responsibilities are divided for curriculum across the curriculum teams and each team does not fulfill its duties, the district is unable to develop or monitor a cohesive curriculum. This system dysfunction creates a void in the completion of the goals and may hinder the academic progress of students.

**Assessment and Effective Use of Data**

1. A balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments is not in place at the middle school and high school levels.

A. A review of the District Assessment Matrix, interviews and focus group discussions indicated the following:

---

18 Article VIII; section 801; 6. Functions and Procedures of the Mansfield City Schools negotiated contract
There is a lack of evidence of formative and benchmark assessments in seventh and eighth grade, other than the administration of the Scholastic Reading Inventory twice per year in these grades.

There is a lack of evidence of formative and benchmark assessments at the high school level.
  o An administrator stated that “there is not a framework for using data to inform instruction at the high school.”
  o It was also stated that a barrier for this process is time and structure at the high school, as the current schedule does not support professional learning communities.

B. There is a district assessment advisory team. However, at the time of the review, there was no evidence of participation or the development of assessments by teachers at the middle or high schools.

C. The middle school and high school principals shared plans to provide professional development on formative instructional practices over the next year, including the Formative Instructional Practices (FIP Modules) that have been provided by the Ohio Department of Education.

IMPACT: Without a system of formative and benchmark assessments to guide instruction, teachers may be unable to provide differentiated instruction, intervention and enrichment strategies for students.

2. Accountability for and use of the Ohio Improvement Process 5-Step Process is inconsistent during district leadership team, building leadership team and teacher-based team meetings.

A. A review of district leadership team agendas and minutes from the 2014-2015 school year indicated that meetings were based upon district goals, but discussion often focused on summarizing building issues rather than engaging in formal discussions on student performance and behavioral data based on the Ohio Improvement Process 5-Step Process.

  Minutes from the three district leadership team meetings during the 2015-2016 school year showed that the team is now using the Ohio Improvement Process 5-Step Process.

B. A review of individual school improvement plans revealed that most of these documents have not been recently updated and do not include updated strategies, action steps, nor data timelines to collect data and review targets based on the goals in the recently revised district focused plan.

  District administrators shared that the greatest challenge for the success of building leadership teams is to ensure that each team’s work is focused on the district goals.

C. A review of the district leadership team roster and interviews indicated that the district leadership team is comprised mainly of administrators.

  The current team membership includes four central office administrators, nine building administrators, one preschool teacher, one high school teacher, one high school guidance counselor, one district test coordinator, two representatives from the state support team and one representative from the Ohio Department of Education.

  There is not an elementary or middle school classroom teacher representative on the team.

  Members of the state support team also indicated that teacher representation is not proportional.

  District personnel offered that the 6:30 a.m. starting time “may preclude teachers from getting involved.”

D. Interviews, focus group discussions and a review of building leadership team and teacher-based team minutes indicated an inconsistent use of the Ohio 5-Step Process during these team meetings. A review of these minutes reflected the following observations:

  Some building leadership team minutes did not show evidence of using the Ohio 5-Step Process.

  Teacher-based teams are not disaggregating and reviewing student performance data by subgroup on a consistent basis.
• Teacher-based team minutes from the high school report discussions focused on instructional issues but not on student performance data. Examples did not indicate use of the Ohio 5-Step Process.

• Interviews with members of State Support Team 7 indicated that while there are some examples of teacher-based teams working well in the district, “many teacher-based teams are getting stuck in Step 1 and Step 2 and are spending a lot of time discussing barriers.” Step 1 focuses on “collecting and charting assessment data to identify how students are performing and progressing,” and Step 2 focuses on “analyzing student work specific to the data.”

• Elementary teacher-based teams often only have 20 to 30 minutes per week for their meetings, and there is not a consistent meeting process across the buildings.

• A monitoring process and feedback tool for providing suggestions and two-way communication between the district leadership team and building leadership teams was not evident during the district review.

**IMPACT:** As a result of the inconsistent use of the Ohio Improvement Process, the district may be unable to effectively use student performance and behavioral data to make decisions about instruction, intervention and enrichment strategies that could lead to student growth.

3. **Principals and teachers demonstrated limited knowledge about online access and analysis of value-added data and other forms of student growth measures.**

   A. The district test coordinator reported that paper copies of achievement test data are distributed to the principals and they are responsible for determining the process for distributing this data to their staff members. While principals confirmed they have been trained on how to access online achievement test data, they also shared that teachers have not had online access to achievement test data.

   B. Comments during interviews and focus group meetings indicated that teachers do not have access or are not aware of their access to online state assessment and value-added platforms to review student achievement and growth data.

   C. Principal and teacher focus group participants shared that the high school staff does not understand the concept of growth versus achievement as it relates to the new high school end-of-course assessments. Also, middle school and high school staff have not had formal professional development on value-added and student growth measures.

   D. The Student Learning Objectives (SLO) process is inconsistent across the district. As defined by the Ohio Department of Education, “a Student Learning Objective (SLO) is “a measurable, long-term academic growth target that a teacher sets at the beginning of the year for all students or for subgroups of students. Student Learning Objectives demonstrate a teacher’s impact on student learning within a given interval of instruction based upon baseline data gathered at the beginning of the course.”

   • Comments by teachers during focus group interviews indicated teachers are leading the Student Learning Objectives process and that the process for reviewing and evaluating these documents varies by grade level or department.

   • Principals expressed the concern that contract language in the negotiated agreement with the teachers association prevents their abilities to provide leadership in the Student Learning Objectives process and to choose instructional experts from their buildings to serve on the Student Learning Objectives review teams.

**IMPACT:** Without professional development in value-added, teachers may not be aware of their impact on student growth or able to identify subgroups of students not making progress. Also, without a standardized process for creating Student Learning Objectives, the expectations for student growth may lead to inequities for students across the district.
Human Resources and Professional Development

1. The district does not have systems and practices in place to ensure that it builds and develops a diverse, high-quality staff.

   A. According to interviews and a review of district employment processes documents, the human resources office is involved in the employment process primarily from a clerical and compliance standpoint.

   B. Based on a random review of both teacher and administrator personnel files, it was found that 25 percent did not contain copies of current licenses or certificates and there were no copies of staff evaluations past or present. The current negotiated agreement states that employee evaluations for the past five years were to be kept in the files.

   C. According to interviews with new hires to the district, there is a lack of an effective orientation and communication process for new employees.

   D. According to interviews with teachers and administrators, the district does not utilize a consistent tool to assess the talents and skills of candidates for administrative and teaching positions based on established district criteria.

   E. Based on interviews with staff, it was stated that employment decisions are not driven by district improvement plans.

   F. Currently, the district does not have a certificated administrator with human resources as a primary responsibility.

   IMPACT: The absence of effective human resource practices that are aligned to district improvement efforts can negatively impact student achievement by reducing the opportunity to assemble and retain a staff that possesses the skills and expertise that address the specific needs of the district.

2. The district does not have a consistent employee evaluation system.

   A. The district has aligned the teacher and principal evaluation process to the Ohio Teacher and Principal Evaluation Systems. However, based on interviews and personnel file reviews, it is noted that evaluations of all staff members have not been completed.

   B. Based on the review of a sampling of evaluation documents for the current school year, the evaluation process has begun in the district. The samples reviewed were inconsistent with respect to format, forms used and completion statuses.

   C. According to interviews with administrators, current language in the negotiated agreement restricts the ability of principals to effectively use the OTES system as it was intended. This also was verified by a review of the current negotiated agreement. The language in the agreement allows for only five of ten standards to be addressed during each cycle of the evaluation. This approach to its use is contrary to the intent of the OTES system. The intent of the OTES system is that all of the standards be considered during the entire evaluation process.

   IMPACT: When the district does not employ a consistent systematic approach to staff evaluation, opportunities for the professional growth and development of administrators and teachers may be missed.

3. The district lacks a comprehensive teachers’ professional development plan for grades 7-12.

   A. Based upon reviews of the district professional development plan, Ohio Improvement Process plans, agendas and minutes, there is a lack of evidence of a focused professional development plan for grades 7-12 in the district. Although the district literacy and math professional development plan provided in grades K-6 includes the seventh and eighth grades, it does not address the other content areas in those grade levels. High school professional development is not addressed at all in the plan.

   B. According to interviews with teachers and administrators and a review of the district professional development plan, the current plan does not adequately provide for the professional development needs of the district in grades 7-12.
C. Interviews with staff members from these grade levels indicated that, except for those involved in the literacy and math projects, staff members were on their own for selecting professional development opportunities.

**IMPACT:** When the district does not develop and implement a focused, comprehensive professional development plan for teachers of grades 7-12, improvements in student achievement may be hampered.

4. **The Ohio Improvement Process is not being implemented with consistency and fidelity.**

   A. Based on a review of district and building Ohio Improvement Plan documents, agendas and minutes, there was a lack of evidence of a focused improvement plan being implemented with fidelity throughout the district.

   B. Interviews with teachers and administrators revealed a deficit in knowledge about the district and building plans. The functioning of the Ohio Improvement Process and how it works with all of the district committees was unclear. Interviews also suggested a need to review and revise the function, roles and responsibilities of the Curriculum Advisory Committee to better meet district needs.

**IMPACT:** Without consistency and fidelity in the implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process by district committees, targeted efforts to address district goals may not be realized.

**Student Supports**

1. **There is no evidence that the district has a system to monitor or evaluate the effectiveness of tiered systems of supports for students in grades 9-12.**

   A. According to interviews, the high school staff have access to students’ academic performance data and behavior reports, but there is no evidence of the use of this data in identifying students for intervention and acceleration opportunities.

   B. At the time of the review, no evidence was presented to show the monitoring or evaluation of the effectiveness of the academic support programs.

   - Study Tables is an after school study and tutor program facilitated by certified middle and high school teachers. According to interviews, there was no record of student or teacher attendance or an established process to monitor student progress. There was no evaluation tool presented to determine the impact of this program on student achievement.

   - PLATO and A+ are two credit recovery programs offered in the summer to students who have failed core courses. There was no data presented on the number of students who have taken these courses nor the passing rate.

**IMPACT:** When the district does not evaluate academic support programs, it is unable to measure the programs’ impact on student achievement. Without information from the evaluations, the district may not make data-based decisions on how to direct limited resources to improve student achievement.

2. **The district's graduation rate is below the rate for similar districts and the state average.**

   A. According to the state report card, the four-year graduation rate for the class of 2013 was 68.1 percent. Mansfield's four-year graduation rate dropped from 68.1 percent in 2013-2014 to 60.6 percent in 2014-2015.

   B. The district's five-year graduation rate dropped from approximately 78 percent in 2013-2014 to 73.2 percent in 2014-2015.
C. According to the state report card, in 2014-2015, only 14.8 percent of Hedges Campus students graduated in four years and 25.7 percent graduated in five years, compared to 73.1 percent and 80.9 percent at Mansfield Senior High School.

**IMPACT:** When the district has low graduation rates, this may translate into economic and social consequences for the community. Drop-outs may be unable to successfully compete in the workforce.

**Fiscal Management**

1. **The district does not include all appropriate stakeholders in the process of developing a clear, current and comprehensive budget.**
   
   A. A review of the budget/appropriation document and board minutes revealed that budget amounts were set at the district level and lacked specificity by building and/or department.
   
   - Interviews of the district administration revealed that the budget process did not provide for inclusive communication and/or dialogue with administrators, teachers and other staff members on the needs of the district to meet improvement goals.
   
   - Budgets for services, supplies and equipment were determined and set by the superintendent and treasurer and given to the administrators and principals. Administrators and principals are allowed to move funds within their budgets as necessary.
   
   - The superintendent shared that he thought that the building and department budgets available to spend were very limited and thus, this process of assigning budgets was efficient.
   
   - The budget/appropriation document did not include an explanation of goals and objectives to be achieved through the budget at the department and building levels.
   
   - A review of the district’s budget presentation did not reflect district-, department- and building-level budgets, goals and priorities, changes in programs and/or operations, nor costs associated with those changes.
   
   - At the time of the site review, no evidence was presented to show what performance data was used to make budget decisions at the department and building levels.

   B. The district does not effectively communicate essential financial information and data with all stakeholders.
   
   - Through interviews and a review of board minutes, it was revealed that prior to October 2015, financial information was primarily limited to computer-generated reports and little explanatory information or presentations of financial information was given to the board and other stakeholders.
   
   - In focus groups with staff, parents and community members, it was noted that communication regarding the district's financial information, such as budgets, financial forecasts, etc., was shared indirectly through the local newspaper and the district newsletter.
   
   - Parents that participated in the focus group shared that they were uninformed about the renewal levies that were on the 2012 and 2013 voting ballots.

**IMPACT:** When the district does not include administrators, teachers and staff in developing the budget, there is a lack of transparency regarding the rationale behind allocation of resources and the alignment of funds to support district and school improvement goals. The lack of explicit disclosure of the district's fiscal information can hinder stakeholders' understanding of the district's financial position and subsequent support.

4. **According to the 2014 fiscal year district profile report, also called the Cupp Report, the district’s expenditures are higher than comparable districts and the state average.**
A. According to the 2014 Cupp Report, the district spent more money per student in four of five comparative expenditure categories when compared to comparable districts and the state average expenditures (see table C-4).

- In 2014, the district spending per pupil for administration was $2,231.13 compared to $1,716.18 for comparable districts and $1,426.39 for state averages.
- Building operation spending was $3,124.34 compared to $2,340.24 in comparable districts and $2,098.81 for state averages.
- District spending per pupil for instruction was $8,827.54 compared to $6,645.48 in comparable districts and $6,362.35 for state averages.
- At the time of the district review, comparative expenditure data for fiscal year 2015 was not available.

B. The district spends a larger percentage of its budget on employee benefits as compared to comparable districts and the state average expenditure, per the 2014 Cupp Report.

- A review of the 2014 Cupp report showed that, for fiscal year 2014, the district spent 21.67 percent of its operating budget on employee benefits as compared to 19.37 percent for comparable districts and 21.5 percent for the state. (see table C-5).
- In fiscal year 2015, the district spent 22.23 percent of its General Fund operating costs on employee benefits, per the district’s five-year financial forecast adopted in October 2015. The General Fund is an operating account used to account for items that are not specifically required to be reported in another area of the budget (see table C-6).
- Per the October 2015 financial forecast, benefits as a percentage of salary rose 5.51 percent from Fiscal Year 2014 levels. For example, the Fiscal Year 2014 percentages went from 45.49 percent of salary to 51 percent in Fiscal Year 2015.
- On page 9 of the district’s five-year forecast notes, as adopted in October 2015, an expected 10 percent increase in employee health insurance costs will begin in January 2016. The forecast notes report that employee health insurance cost increases alone represent the equivalent of a 4.2 percent base salary increase in 2014, 4.3 percent in 2015 and an expected 3.8 percent in 2016.
- The forecast notes (p. 9) also explain that the district pays 100 percent of the “health only” insurance and that employee obligations for insurance are limited to $90 per month for prescription and dental coverage.

**IMPACT:** When the district's comparative expenditures are higher than comparable districts and the state average, and no explanation is provided in the district’s budget presentation, the results may indicate the inefficient use of fiscal resources. When higher funds are allotted for employee benefits, the district might not be able to maximize its resources to get the best return on investment for student achievement.

3. The district does not have a comprehensive capital plan.

A. An interview with the facilities manager and a document review revealed that the district has a capital plan but it is limited to five years and is not comprehensive.

B. The contents of the capital plan reflect spending over the next five years rather than showing maintenance and replacement plans for buildings and equipment.

C. Information and details regarding plant and equipment life expectancies and maintenance requirements were not included in the capital plan that was presented for review.

**IMPACT:** When the district does not have a long-term comprehensive capital plan in place, the ability to meet reasonable changes and unanticipated events may be compromised.
Mansfield City School District Review Recommendations

Leadership, Governance and Communication

1. Provide training for the board of education and the superintendent to set measurable goals in the areas of team building, communication techniques, strategic planning, and roles and responsibilities.
   - Use the Ohio School Boards Association to conduct workshops that can facilitate an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of board members and can aid board members to customize, implement and monitor a strategic plan that meets the specific needs of the district for school improvement.

**BENEFIT:** When the superintendent and board of education receive training in strategic planning, team building and communication strategies, they can collaborate to set measurable goals and assessment strategies for the district’s academic improvement.

2. Establish a collaborative protocol between the board and superintendent to facilitate the evaluation of the superintendent’s performance.
   - Use district improvement plans and student achievement data to develop the goals and assessment strategies.

**BENEFIT:** When the board of education and the superintendent collaborate to develop goals and assessment strategies for the superintendent’s evaluation, the superintendent will have guidance on the expectations and evaluation measures that will track improvement in student achievement.

3. Increase the central office personnel in the areas of curriculum and instruction and develop roles and responsibilities for this position to increase efficiency in district accountability in academics.

**BENEFIT:** With the addition of a central office administrator responsible for the oversight in curriculum, the district may increase accountability at the district and school levels.

Curriculum and Instruction

1. Assemble a team of administrators and teachers across all grade levels to develop a curriculum for grades preK-12 that is aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards.
   - Create a template for the pacing guides that can be used districtwide across grade levels and subjects.

**BENEFIT:** By crafting and using a curriculum that is aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards, teachers in the district will have the necessary tools to set learning targets, deliver instruction and monitor the progress of student learning.

2. Create an administrative position that will be directly responsible for the oversight of curriculum and instruction in the district.
   - Identify the needs and goals of the district and evaluate the effectiveness of the current district teams in meeting the goals.
   - Broaden the grade level representation on the district teams to include preK-12 teachers, special area teachers, Title I teachers and instructional coaches.

**BENEFIT:** By creating an administrative position to oversee the curriculum and instruction in the district, the district can promote the coordination and communication of district goals and expectations for administrators and teachers. This also can provide an opportunity to monitor the consistent use an effective delivery of a preK-12 curriculum.

Assessment and the Use of Data

1. Develop and implement a formative and benchmark assessment process at the middle school and high school levels.
• Create a district assessment advisory team for grades 7-12, similar to the process currently in place for kindergarten through sixth grade, to coordinate the development of these assessments.

• Construct a plan to provide professional development on the implementation of formative instructional practices at the middle school and high school.

• Work with the building leadership teams to develop the schedule and framework for teacher teams to create, administer and review common assessments within their respective departments.

**BENEFIT:** By using a balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments and making decisions based on timely common assessment data, the diversity of instructional practices and the implementation of intervention strategies may affect the academic growth of all students.

2. **Continue to enhance the implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process throughout the school district.**

• Use the newly updated district plan as a framework for communication and team discussions to ensure district and building goals, strategies, adult implementation indicators and student performance indicators are consistent across the school district.

• Provide annual professional development on the implementation of the Ohio 5-Step Process for all teacher-based teams.

• Utilize successful teacher-based teams that are currently functioning effectively within the district as models and exemplars for all teacher-based teams across the district.

• Create a meeting schedule for teacher-based teams in all buildings that provides a framework for weekly meetings with sufficient meeting time.

3. **Modify the structure for district leadership team meetings to encourage classroom teacher representation from all levels.**

**BENEFIT:** Effective implementation of the Ohio Improvement Process will promote a shared leadership philosophy and team process in all buildings. A clear vision, consistent message, regular communication and focused feedback can ensure aligned acts of improvement across the school district.

4. **Provide teachers online access, yearly professional development and multiple follow-up sessions during the school year to examine value-added data, other student growth measures data and results from Ohio’s new American Institutes for Research (AIR) state assessments.**

**BENEFIT:** By giving teachers full access to online data tools, value-added data, state reports and other student growth measures data, a culture and foundation of data literacy can be established in the school district. With the implementation of the new AIR testing throughout the district and the expansion of value-added measures into the high school, teachers will be able to use technology to access and regularly review student performance data to inform their instruction. Teachers can become “students of data.”

**Human Resources and Professional Development**

1. **Create a system of operations for the human resources department and an administrative position with a critical role in recruiting, selecting, assigning and managing high-quality teachers and leaders.**

• Establish a consistent and systematic approach to personnel files in order to ensure compliance with negotiated agreements and district documentation needs.

• Develop a new employee orientation plan that provides the necessary communication and follow-up support during the period between hiring date and the work start date.

• Develop an employee selection process that provides a means to assess talent and select the most qualified candidates based on district-established criteria, requirements and instructional needs.
• Establish a certified administrative position to lead the human resources office.

**BENEFIT:** Dedicated administrative leadership in human resources can be an important investment towards improved student achievement as the district increases its focus on recruiting and selecting the highest quality staff available.

2. **Establish a systematic process for annual evaluations of all employees and provide opportunities for professional growth.**
   • Implement and monitor an annual evaluation process for all staff.
   • Work with the teachers’ union to revise any contract language does not support the intent of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.
   • Provide the necessary professional development for all administrators to effectively implement an evaluation system.
   • Utilize improvement plans to assist teachers and or administrators with their professional growth where needed.

**BENEFIT:** A systematic employee evaluation system provides structure that can benefit the district by improving the process of observation, supervision, coaching, feedback and reflection. This can improve performances throughout the district to meet the needs of the students through the growth and development of all staff.

3. **Develop and implement a high-quality professional development plan that addresses all content areas in grades 7 – 12 supports the district and building improvement plans.**
   • Leverage support from the state support team to assist in developing the plan to address professional development needs.
   • Integrate all aspects of the plan, including monitoring strategies, into the district and building improvement plans.

**BENEFIT:** Implementing a high-quality professional development plan would assist the district in targeting professional development based on the needs identified from their own data analysis.

4. **Employ the Ohio Improvement Process to drive all district improvement efforts.**
   • Work with the internal Ohio Improvement Process facilitator and district leadership team to ensure that focused district and building plans accurately address the most critical needs of the district.
   • Identify the role and function of the district committee structure as it relates to the Ohio Improvement Process and determine any changes that might need to be made to the structure or function in order to support the district plan.
   • Ensure that the implementation and monitoring components of district and building improvement plans are used to adjust or revise action plans as needed.

**BENEFIT:** The Ohio Improvement Process, when implemented with fidelity, can assist the district in focusing on one plan and can include a system of communication and monitoring.

**Student Supports**

1. **Develop or adopt a process to collect and analyze student performance data to assess the impact of all tiered student support programs provided by the district in grades 9-12.**
   • Identify strengths and challenges in the level of implementation and effectiveness of all support programs related to student achievement through surveys, observations, interviews, etc.
Frequently adjust tiered systems of support based on data analyses to meet the predetermined objectives and academic needs of students.

**BENEFIT:** By collecting and analyzing student performance data, school staff are able to make immediate, data-based decisions about the implementation and delivery of tiered systems of support.

2. **Provide middle school students with the required foundational skills in literacy, mathematics and science to be prepared for rigorous high school studies.**

   - Encourage middle and high school principals to jointly plan and conduct a summer school session aimed at helping identify students in grades 7 and 8 who need additional instruction to meet high school readiness standards.
   - Select, recruit and/or train principals who can lead instruction and promote student achievement in low-performing high schools.
   - Select highly qualified teachers to lead ninth-grade teams of teachers in creating a challenging and engaging learning experience for students.
   - Provide training for teachers on how to align their classroom assignments and assessments to career-and college-ready standards as well as analyze data to improve instruction and student learning.

**BENEFIT:** When the district engages students in learning, monitors their academic performance as they transition to high school, and provides supports and intervention when necessary, it increases the likelihood that the graduation rates will improve.

### Fiscal Management

1. **Create and implement a budgeting and financial communication plans that include staff participation at all levels and input from external stakeholders in district operations.**

   - Provide "easy-to-read" financial information through various formats such as PowerPoint presentations, graphs or narrative summaries.
   - Encourage transparency regarding the district’s financial information by including district’s goals, objectives, budgeting decision criteria (e.g., performance data), and detailed budget information at the building and department levels in the district’s annual budget document and budget presentation.
   - Engage all stakeholders by hosting a “state of the district” address, which would report district goals and objectives and instructional initiatives and achievements.
   - Establish a treasurer’s financial advisory committee to include board members, the superintendent or a designee, a building administrator and community members.

**BENEFIT:** Formal inclusion of staff at all budgeting levels can lead to meaningful communication and efficient and effective use of resources and the delivery of student services to meet the needs of students. As the district solicits the input of stakeholders, increases budget transparency and improves reporting format and content, the stakeholders may have clarity on the criteria for allocating resources and support the district’s improvement goals.

2. **Analyze and research the 2015 fiscal year Cupp Report to determine significant variances compared to similar districts and the state average.**

   - Research the cause or causes of the differences.
   - Verify that expenditures are coded properly and reflect the purpose of the expenditures.
   - Take appropriate corrective action annually on operational spending to conserve resources.
   - Reduce expected future benefit plan costs.
• When appropriate, negotiate changes with bargaining units regarding plan design and/or the portion of the cost that the employer pays for health insurance.

**BENEFIT:** When the district conducts a comparative analysis to other similar districts, it can be a useful tool to generate inquiry and may lead to improved decision making. Reductions in rising health care cost trends could positively alter the long-term financial position of the district and create stability and resources to improve student learning and the delivery of student services.

3. **Create a comprehensive long term capital plan.**
   • Include the following in the capital plan:
     o the life span of systems and components and the replacement costs;
     o maintenance cost requirements associated with systems and components; and
     o a summary schedule of estimated annual costs for maintenance and capital replacement.
   • Update the plan annually.
   • Include a component of the five-year financial forecast in the summary schedule.

**BENEFIT:** A comprehensive capital plan can provide information on the district’s preventative maintenance program to prolong the use of the district’s capital and major facility assets. Proper planning could help ensure stability of resources for student learning and the delivery of student services in the event of unforeseen capital needs.
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit

The review was conducted November 16-20, 2015 by the following team of Ohio Department of Education staff members and independent consultants.

1. Claire Huff-Franklin, Director, Academic Distress Commissions and Education Reform
2. Lucille Esposito, Leadership Governance and Communication
3. Bonnie Sickinger, Curriculum and Instruction
4. Dr. Craig Phillips, Assessment and Effective Use of Data
5. Jeff Royalty, Human Resources and Professional Development
6. Judith Roby, Student Supports

District Review Activities
The following activities were conducted during the review:

Interviews
- District Superintendent
- Director of special education
- Technology coordinator
- Testing supervisor
- Director of State and Federal Programs
- Executive assistant of personnel
- Facilities maintenance supervisor
- Interim treasurer
- Executive assistant to the treasurer
- Accounting clerks
- Payroll clerks
- President of the board of education
- Representatives of the teacher’s association and non-certified association: both presidents and four other representatives
- District leadership team
- Building leadership teams
- Teacher based teams
- English language arts instructional coaches
- State Support Team 7
- District assessment team
- Director of career tech
- Educator support program coordinator
- Newly hired teachers

Focus Groups
- Elementary, middle and high school teachers
- Building principals and assistant principals
- Parents
- External partners of the district that included behavior and mental health partners, county foundation, local community college dean, local business partners, and government officials

Onsite Visits
- Building Observations
  - Mansfield Integrated Learning Center Hedges Campus
  - Malabar Intermediate School
- Mansfield Middle School
- Mansfield Senior High
- Prospect Elementary School
- John Sherman Elementary School
- Spanish Immersion School
- Woodland Elementary School

- 35 classroom observations at all school levels
Appendix B: Figures and Tables Related to Accountability

Figure B-1: Mansfield City School District Enrollment by Subgroup (Race)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B-1 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-2: Mansfield City School District Enrollment Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>3,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>3,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>3,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>3,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>3,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B-2 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure B-3: Mansfield City School District Enrollment by Subgroup (Special Populations)

Figure B-3 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-4: 2013 - 2014 Enrollment Location for Students Who Live in the Mansfield City School District Attendance Area

Figure B-4 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure B-5: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Annual Measureable Objectives by Subgroup

Figure B-5 Source: Mansfield City School District Ohio School Report Card, Ohio Department of Education

Figure B-6: Mansfield City School District Reading OAA and OGT Passing Rate Trends by Subgroup

Figure B-6 Source: Mansfield City School District Ohio School Report Card; Archived Report Cards
Figure B-7: Mansfield City School District Mathematics Passing Rate Trends by Subgroup

Figure B-8: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Reading Performance Comparisons by Grade Level
Figure B-9: Mansfield City School District Reading OAA and OGT Passing Rates by Grade Level

Figure B-9 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (ILRC)

Figure B-10: Mansfield City School District Fall 2014 Overall Value-Added Report

Figure B-10 Source: SAS® EVAAS web application, SAS Institute Inc.
Figure B-11: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Mathematics Performance Comparisons by Grade Level

Figure B-11 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-12: Mansfield City School District Mathematics OAA and OGT Passing Rates by Grade Level

Figure B-12 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC)
Figure B-13: Mansfield City School District Performance Index Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Untested</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accelerated</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Advanced Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score = 82.6  Total Score = 83.4  Total Score = 84.0  Total Score = 84.6

Figure B-13 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-14: Mansfield City School District Graduation Rate Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mansfield City</th>
<th>Similar Districts</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Year (Class of 2014)</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year (Class of 2013)</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B-14 Source: Mansfield City School District Ohio School Report Card
Figure B-15: Mansfield City School District Graduation Cohort Rates

Figure B-15 Source: Mansfield City School District Ohio School Report

Figure B-16: Mansfield City School District Number of Dropouts Grades 7 - 12

Figure B-16 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of
Figure B-17: Mansfield City School District Disciplinary Actions Per 100 Students Compared to the State - All Discipline Types

Figure B-17 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-18: Mansfield City School District Prepared for Success 2-Year Comparison

Figure B-18 Source: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 and 2014-2015
Figure B-19: Mansfield City School District Attendance Rates

2011-2012: 94.2% District, 94.5% State
2012-2013: 93.7% District, 94.2% State
2013-2014: 94.1% District, 94.3% State

Figure B-19 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-20: Mansfield School District Chronic Absenteeism Rate

2011-2012: 14.9%
2012-2013: 17.4%
2013-2014: 14.9%

Figure B-20 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure B-21: Mansfield City School District 2013 - 2014 Absenteeism Rate

Figure B-21 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-22: Mansfield City School District Absenteeism Rate By Grade Level

Figure B-22 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure B-23: Mansfield City School District Percent of On-Track Students – Kindergarten through Third Grade 2-Year Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Your District...</td>
<td>In Your District...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRADE C</td>
<td>GRADE C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K-3 Literacy Improvement</td>
<td>K-3 Literacy Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136 out of 242</td>
<td>77 out of 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten students were not on-track last year.</td>
<td>Kindergarten students were not on-track last year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of those students improved to on-track in 1st grade.</td>
<td>of those students improved to on-track in 1st grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not On-Track at Point A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten Reading Diagnostic School Year 2012 - 2013</th>
<th>1st Grade Reading Diagnostic School Year 2013 - 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 to &lt; 10</td>
<td>72 to &lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade Reading Diagnostic School Year 2012 - 2013\n 2nd Grade Reading Diagnostic School Year 2012 - 2013\n 3rd Grade Reading Diagnostic School Year 2012 - 2013</td>
<td>56 to &lt; 10 75 to &lt; 10 21 to &lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 to &lt; 10</td>
<td>30 to &lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade Reading OAA School Year 2014 - 2015\n Deduction for 3rd graders who did not pass OAA and were not on a Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>24 to &lt; 10 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduction for 3rd graders who did not pass OAA and were not on a Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plan</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 242 136

Figure B-23: Source: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 Ohio School Report Card
Figure B-24: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Percent of Funds Spent on Classroom Instruction Compared to Similar Districts and the State Average

- **Mansfield City School District**
  - Classroom: 34.9%
  - Non-Classroom: 65.1%

- **Comparison Group**
  - Classroom: 31.8%
  - Non-Classroom: 68.2%

- **State Average**
  - Classroom: 32.6%
  - Non-Classroom: 67.4%

Figure B-24 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure B-25: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Source of Revenue

- State: 56.3%
- Local: 22.8%
- Federal: 9.8%
- Other Non-tax: 11.1%

Figure B-25 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure B-26: Mansfield City School District 2013-2014 Operating Spending Per Pupil Compared to the State

- Mansfield City School District: $12,222
- State Average: $9,189

Figure B-26 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
## Table B-1: Mansfield City School District Teacher Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher Salary Average</th>
<th>Percent of Core Courses Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers</th>
<th>Teacher Attendance</th>
<th>Percent of Teachers with Masters or Doctorate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$54,994</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$53,910</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$53,826</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$52,923</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-1 Source: Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability
Figure C-1: Mansfield City School District Disciplinary Actions Per 100 Students Compared to Similar Districts - All Discipline Types

Figure C-1 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC); Ohio Department of Education Similar District Methodology; Ohio Department of Education Office of Accountability

Figure C-2: Mansfield City School District Disciplinary Actions Per 100 Students Compared to Similar Districts - Out of School Suspensions

Figure C-2 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC); Ohio Department of Education Similar District Methodology
Figure C-3: Mansfield City School District ACT Data

Figure C-3 Source: Mansfield City School District
Figure C-4: Percent of Students Ready for College-Level Course Work Based on 2015 ACT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College English Composition</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Social Sciences</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Biology</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting all four</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure C-4 Source: Mansfield City School District
Table C-1: 2013-2014 Mansfield City School District Enrollment by Race and Special Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Building</th>
<th>Total Number of Students by Race</th>
<th>Total Number of Students by Special Populations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar Intermediate School</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Integrated Learning Center, Hedges Campus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Middle School</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Senior High School</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Spanish Immersion School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Elementary School</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Elementary School</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Elementary School</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-1 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC)

Table C-2: Mansfield City School District Discipline Occurrences (District Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Reason</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of School Suspension</td>
<td>In-School Suspension</td>
<td>Out of School Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting/Violence</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/ Possession of weapon other than gun/ explosive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/ Possession of tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/ Possession of other drugs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobedient/ Disruptive Behavior</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/ Intimidation</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwelcome Sexual Conduct</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC)
Table C-3: Mansfield City School District Out of School Suspensions per 100 Students (Building Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malabar Intermediate School</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Integrated Learning Center, Hedges Campus</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Middle School</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Senior High School</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Spanish Immersion School</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Elementary School</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Elementary School</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Elementary School</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-3 Source: Ohio Department of Education Interactive Local Report Card (iLRC)

Table C-4: Mansfield City School District-FY 2014 Profile Report/Cupp Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Mansfield City SD Expenditure per Student</th>
<th>Comparable District Average</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$2,231.13</td>
<td>$1,716.18</td>
<td>$1,426.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations</td>
<td>$3,124.34</td>
<td>$2,340.24</td>
<td>$2,098.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$8,827.54</td>
<td>$6,645.48</td>
<td>$6,362.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Support</td>
<td>$987.63</td>
<td>$743.83</td>
<td>$624.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>$201.63</td>
<td>$568.45</td>
<td>$400.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-4 Source: FY 2014 CUPP Report

Expenditure Data (Adapted from ODE District Profile explanation)

Administration Expenditure per Pupil covers all expenditures associated with the day to day operation of the school buildings and the central offices as far as the administrative personnel and functions are concerned. Items of expenditure in this category include salaries and benefits provided to all administrative staff as well as other associated administrative costs. Data Source: Report Card 2014.

Building Operation Expenditure per Pupil covers all items of expenditure relating to the operation of the school buildings and the central offices. These include the costs of utilities and the maintenance and the upkeep of physical buildings. Data Source: Report Card 2014.

Instructional Expenditure per Pupil includes all the costs associated with the actual service of instructional delivery to the students. These items strictly apply to the school buildings and do not include costs associated with the central office. They include the salaries and benefits of the teaching personnel and the other instructional expenses. Data Source: Report Card 2014.

Pupil Support Expenditure per Pupil includes the expenses associated with the provision of services other than instructional that tend to enhance the developmental processes of the students. These cover a range of activities such as student counseling, psychological services, health services, social work services etc. Data Source: Report Card 2014.

Staff Support Expenditure per Pupil includes all the costs associated with the provision of support services to school districts’ staff. These include in-service programs, instructional improvement services, meetings, payments for additional trainings and courses to improve staff effectiveness and productivity. Data Source: Report Card 2014.
Table C-5: Mansfield City School District-FY 2014 Profile Report/Cupp Report
District Financial Status from Five-Year Forecast Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Mansfield City SD</th>
<th>Comparable District Average</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>47.64%</td>
<td>48.93%</td>
<td>54.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Services</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
<td>28.06%</td>
<td>19.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditures</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-5 Source: FY 2014 CUPP Report

District Financial Status from Five Year Forecast Data (Adapted from ODE District Profile explanation)

Salaries as Percent of Operating Expenditures indicates the percent of the total operating expenditure of the districts that goes to personnel salaries. Source: Fiscal year 2014 Five Year Forecast file.

Fringe Benefits as Percent of Operating Expenditures shows the percent of the total operating expenditure of the districts that goes to provision of fringe benefits such as health insurance and retirement benefits. Source: Fiscal year 2014 Five Year Forecast file.

Purchased Services as Percent of Operating Expenditures shows the percent of the total operating expenditure devoted to the purchase of various services such as food services. Source: Fiscal year 2014 Five Year Forecast file.

Supplies and Materials as Percent of Operating Expenditures shows the percent of the operating expenditures devoted to the purchase of supplies and materials. Source: Fiscal year 2014 Five Year Forecast file.

Other Expenses as Percent of Operating Expenditures shows the percent of the total operating expenditures devoted to other expenses not categorized above. Source: Fiscal year 2014 Five Year Forecast file.

Table C-6: Mansfield City School District-October 2015 Five-Year Financial Forecast
District Financial Status from Five-Year Forecast Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Mansfield City SD</th>
<th>Comparable District Average</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>43.58%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>22.23%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Services</td>
<td>31.45%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenditures</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-6 Source: FY 2014 CUPP Report

Note: The district’s October 2015 forecast was used to calculate the information above. Further, debt payments to repay the state for advances to cover the district’s 2014 deficit, other debt payments and capital expenditures were not included in the calculation, as they are not part of 2015 fiscal year operations, per state calculations.
Appendix D: Inventory Forms and Building Observation Form

6 Point Scale of Evidence for the Diagnostic Profile
Taken from the School Improvement Diagnostic Review

Diagnostic indicators describe effective practices that are critical to improving engagement for all students. Each profile question asks the reviewer to indicate the degree to which a school or district demonstrates a specific practice. In particular, the reviewer is determining the frequency and quality of the specific practice and the level of evidence in data sources reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No evidence found to indicate the specific practice is occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rarely found evidence of adult practice and/or is of poor quality as it engages a limited number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insufficient evidence of adult practice; quality demonstrates preliminary stages of implementation in few settings; impact for some students’ engagement; evidence can be found in some sources of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acceptable evidence of adult practice; quality demonstrates adequate level of implementation in more than half of the settings; impact for many students’ engagement; evidence can be observed in many sources of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong evidence of adult practice; quality demonstrates good levels of implementation in at least 75 percent of the settings; impact for most students’ engagement; evidence can be observed in most sources of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exemplary evidence of adult practice; quality demonstrates superior levels of implementation in at least 90 percent of the settings; impact for most students’ engagement; evidence can be triangulated across multiple sources of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data Collected</td>
<td></td>
<td>The reviewer did not collect evidence on this practice or practice does not apply to this school, and therefore reviewer is unable to select a score for this particular practice. Selecting &quot;No Data Collected&quot; will not reduce the school or district’s profile score.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standards I, II & V: Instructional Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Inventory Items</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom procedures are established and maintained to create a safe physical environment and promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Classroom lessons, instructional delivery and assessments reflect instructional shifts demanded by Ohio’s Learning Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The teacher applies Webb’s Depth of Knowledge to design and implement curricular activities, instruction, and assessments. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in discussion and activities aligned to higher levels of thinking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Inventory Items</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> The teacher implements appropriate and varied strategies that meet all students’ (including, but not limited to ELL, SPED and Gifted) diverse learning needs that would address differentiation of content, process, and/or products.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a learning environment where students can take risks such as make predictions, judgments and investigate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> The teacher uses available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Students recall, reproduce knowledge or skills, apply multiple concepts, analyze, evaluate, investigate concepts and/or think creatively or critically to solve real-world problems. (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge) [Please circle all that apply and provide examples.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. [Please provide examples.]</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as examples.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. Students are engaged in productive learning outcomes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard III: Assessment and Effective Use of Data Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time in:</th>
<th>Total time:</th>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Grade Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District IRN: | School: | Building: | ES | MS | HS |
|--------------|---------|-----------|----|----|----|

# Students: | #Teachers: | #Assistants: |
|-------------|------------|--------------|

Class: | Gen ED | ELL | Special ED | Self Contained | Title I |
|-------|--------|-----|------------|----------------|---------|

Part of Lesson Observed: | Beginning | Middle | End | Observer: |
|-------------------------|----------|-------|-----|-----------|

Observer: ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NDC</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA AWARENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aggregated performance data is displayed for stakeholders to view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA ACCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Working technology (i.e. smart boards, laptops, desktops, or tablets) are available for students to use on a frequent basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students show competency in using available technology to conduct research, display their work, and take assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers integrate the use of technology in instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standard VI: Fiscal Management Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NDC</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Textbooks and supplemental curriculum materials are available in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching aids (e.g. handouts, flash cards, blackboard, pictures, audio CDs, video tapes, DVDs, etc.) are available in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Technology (e.g. computers, laptops, tablets, calculators, whiteboards, etc.) are available for use in classroom instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is sufficient seating for students (e.g. desks and chairs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classroom is in generally good condition (i.e. no water leaks, no exposed wires, no broken glass, lightbulbs or equipment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lighting in the classroom is adequate to provide appropriate learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Building Observation Report

**Date(s):** 

**Time In:** 

**District:** 

**Time Out:**

**Building:** 

**Reviewer:**

### Six Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership, Governance and Communication</th>
<th>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</th>
<th>Assessment/ Use of Data</th>
<th>Human Resources &amp; Professional Development</th>
<th>Student Support</th>
<th>Fiscal Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITEM</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Description and Layout of Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Entrance - Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Groupings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Description of Hallway Space: (Displays of:)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recognitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Directional Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Description of Library Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelved Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Description of Special Space (Cafeteria, Gym, Music, Art):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships to regular classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Class Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement in hallways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of hallways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors and volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Practices posted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground (Elementary Schools ONLY)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of Grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Students to Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attentiveness to Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Students to Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attentiveness to Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of External Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer(s) (activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Guardians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interruptions to Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Drill/Actual Incident (Please include details in “Additional Comments section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls for Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight/Security Issues (Please include details in “Additional Comments section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: List of Documents Reviewed

2013 Audit Management Letter-Auditor of State
2014 Audit Management Letter-Auditor of State
2016 Budget documents
5-year Curriculum Plan
Accounting Methods Report 2015 – Auditor of State
Algebra Project Math Literacy Resource Book and data
Annual Financial Audit-2013 Fiscal Year-Auditor of State
Annual Financial Audit-2014 Fiscal Year-Auditor of State
Assessment Matrix
Assessment Timeline
Board Minutes 2014, 2015
Board of Education Agendas and Minutes, including special board meetings 2014-15
Board of Education Update Reports 2015
Cupp Report Fiscal Year 2014
Curriculum Guide Overview
Curriculum Maps (samples)
Curriculum Summary
Decision Framework Needs Assessment and Grant Application (CCIP)
Diagnostic Test data
District expense reports – 2016
District Family Survey
District Leadership Team minutes
District Newsletters
District Ohio Improvement Plan
District Plan Execution
District Scholastic Reading Inventory-2015
District website- Treasurer’s Operations
Electronic evaluation documents
English Language Arts Pacing Guide
Extended Learning Opportunities
Fall Ohio Achievement Assessment data
Financial Forecast May 2015
Financial Forecast October 2015
Fiscal Year 2015 Similar District Groupings
Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Data
Hedges Campus – attendance, discipline, and communication logs
Hedges Campus Student Handbook
Hedges School Ohio Improvement Plan
High Schools That Work information
Job descriptions – certified and non-certified staff
Leveled Literacy Intervention data
Lists of district cuts in 2013, 2014, 2015
Literacy Collaboration Implementation Audit
Mansfield Board of Education Bylaws/Policies
Mansfield City Schools Building Professional Development Plan
Mansfield City Schools Certified Employees Association Negotiated Agreement through June 2015
Mansfield City Schools Crisis Plan
Mansfield City Schools district report card 2011-2012; 2012-2013; 2013-2014
Mansfield City Schools district staff survey
Mansfield City Schools Execution Flowchart roles and responsibilities
Mansfield City Schools Family Survey-summary
Mansfield City Schools Gifted policy and plan
Mansfield City Schools Hiring procedures
Mansfield City Schools hiring procedures for new employees
Mansfield City Schools Local Professional Development Committee Handbook
Mansfield City Schools Local Professional Development Committee Minutes 2014-2015; 2015
Mansfield City Schools Local Report Card for all district buildings including:
Mansfield City Schools Mentor Handbook
Mansfield City Schools multi-year data concerning teacher demographics, district enrollment by race and special populations, district discipline, out of school suspensions,
Mansfield City Schools News Articles 2015
Mansfield City Schools Newsletters
Mansfield City Schools Non-Certified Employees Association Negotiated Agreement through June 2015
Mansfield City Schools Ohio Improvement Process Implementation criteria and rubric
Mansfield City Schools Organizational Chart
Mansfield City Schools Primary and Intermediate Comprehensive Literacy Model
Mansfield City Schools professional development calendar
Mansfield City Schools Safety Plan
Mansfield City Schools staff recruiting brochure
Mansfield City Schools Student Handbook
Mansfield City Schools three-year technology plan
Mansfield City Schools Value-Added Reports
Mansfield City Schools website
Mansfield High School Career Tech Programs
Mansfield High School Course of Study
Mansfield News Journal –August 3, 2015 and October 17, 2015
Mansfield Senior High School Ohio Improvement Action Plan from August 2015-June 2017
Math Fluency assessments
NaviGate Prepared –a School Safety Emergency Response System
NECIC Community Connectors ROAR Programming for Mansfield City School 2015-2016
Ohio Improvement Process Implementation Criteria and Rubric
P.A.C.T.S. Team Data Analysis and recommendations
Permanent Improvement Plan 2014-2018
Pioneer Career and Technology Center overview and programs
Professional Development Plan
Prospect Elementary, Sherman Elementary, Woodland Elementary, Mansfield Spanish Immersion, Malabar Intermediate, Mansfield Middle, Mansfield Integrated Learning Center—Hedges Campus, Mansfield Senior High School
Randomly selected personnel files
Reading Recover Implementation data
Report of Instructional Staff Attendance
Richland Community Foundation Program/Project Budget Sheet
Richland Community Foundation Scholarship Student Scholarship Application
Richland Community Foundation Teacher Assistance Program Application(s)
Roles and Responsibilities of District Teams
Scholastic Reading Inventory Data
School Improvement Diagnostic Summary Report
School Improvement District Review
School Improvement Guide Walk Through Form
School-wide Evaluation tool (SET) results 2015
Select newspaper articles
Sherman Elementary School Project MORE Program
Six Individual Building Ohio Improvement Plans
Student Achievement through Family Engagement Plan (S.A.F.E.)
Student Support Programs
Students At-Risk Data three year history
Summary Report of Textbook Surveys
Superintendent’s Evaluations 2013-2015
Teaching Schedules
Textbook survey
The Algebra Project’s 5 step curricular process
Tyger Notes – Nov. 2015
Walkthrough Form Formal used as a component of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System