

District Review Report

Bourne Public Schools

Review conducted October 20-23, 2014



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Bourne Public Schools District Review Overview	1
Bourne Public Schools District Review Findings	6
Bourne Public Schools District Review Recommendations	27
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule	38
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	40
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	53

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



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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner
Published January 2015

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

© 2015 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper

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



Bourne Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2014-2015 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Bourne Public Schools was conducted from October 20-23, 2014. The site visit included 27.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 127 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 2 focus groups with 25 elementary school teachers, 8 middle school teachers, and 7 high school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 50 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Bourne has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected by members. There are seven members of the school committee (with one vacancy during the team’s visit) and they meet monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2010. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent, three directors of special education and student services, and the director of business services. The central office has seen reductions and movement of staff over the past five years. District administration has experienced reductions and reorganization. For example, assistant principals have been eliminated at the elementary schools and a student services director has been added. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are two other school administrators, a STEAM director and a humanities director, and middle school and high school assistant principals; there are 157 teachers in the district.

In the 2013-2014 school year, 2,046 students were enrolled in the district’s 4 schools:

**Table 1: Bourne Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment,*2013-2014**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Bournedale Elementary School	ES	PK-4	502
Peebles Elementary School	ES	K-4	321
Bourne Middle School	MS	5-8	747
Bourne High School	HS	9-12	476
Totals	4 schools	PK-12	2,046 students]
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2010 and 2014 overall student enrollment decreased by 13.7 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 48 K-12 districts of similar size (2,000-2,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: \$13,911 as compared with \$12,246 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance¹

Bourne is a Level 2 district because all of its schools are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.

- Bournedale Elementary is in the 49th and Peebles Elementary is the 31st percentile of elementary schools with a cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 55 and lower for all students and high needs students; the target is 75.
- Bourne Middle is in the 36th percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 42 for all students and 43 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Bourne High is in the 46th percentile of high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 75 for all students and 71 for high needs students; the target is 75.

The district did not reach its 2014 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets for ELA, math, and science.

- ELA CPI was 87.3 in 2014, below the district's target of 92.3.
- Math CPI was 78.9 in 2014, below the district's target of 86.0.
- Science CPI was 78.9 in 2014, below the district's target of 84.8.

ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades and below the state rate in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. Between 2011 and 2014, there were notable declines in ELA proficiency in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades and at the Bournedale and Peebles elementary schools.

- ELA proficiency for all students in the district declined from 72.0 percent in 2011 to 69.0 percent in 2014, equal to the state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency was above the state rate by 1 to 4 percentage points in the 7th, 8th, and 10th grades, and by 8 percentage points in the 6th grade in 2014. ELA proficiency was below the state rate by 9 percentage points in the 5th grade and by 1 to 3 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency increased by 8 and 4 percentage points in the 6th and 10th grades, respectively. ELA proficiency declined by 16 percentage points in the 3rd grade and by 5 and 6 percentage points in the 4th and 5th grades, respectively.
- ELA proficiency decreased 12 percentage points at Bournedale Elementary, from 71 percent in 2011 to 59 percent in 2014.

¹ See also student performance tables in Appendix B.

- ELA proficiency decreased 9 percentage points at Peebles Elementary, from 60 percent in 2011 to 51 percent in 2014.
 - In the 3rd grade at Peebles students' MCAS scores were below the state for open and short response questions and in the Integration of Knowledge and Ideas under the Reading Anchor Standard.

Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 4th, 5th, 7th, and 8th grades and in the district as a whole. Between 2011 and 2014 there were notable declines in math proficiency in the 4th, 7th, and 8th grades, and at the Bournedale Elementary and Bourne Middle.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district declined 4 percentage points, from 59 percent in 2011 to 55 percent in 2014, below the state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were below the state rate in the 4th, 5th, 7th and 8th grades by 7 to 11 percentage points and above the state rate by 2 to 3 percentage points in the 3rd, 6th, and 10th grades.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates decreased by 9 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 14 percentage points in the 7th grade, and by 10 percentage points in the 8th grade. Math proficiency rates increased by 5 percentage points in the 3rd and 6th grades.
- Math proficiency rates declined 8 percentage points at Bournedale Elementary, from 65 percent in 2011 to 57 percent in 2014.
 - In the 3rd grade at Bournedale students' MCAS scores were below the state for open and short response questions and in the Measurement and Data Standard. In the 4th grade students' MCAS scores were below the state for the Number and Operations-Fractions standard.
- Math proficiency rates declined 5 percentage points at Bourne Middle, from 55 percent in 2011 to 50 percent in 2014.

Science proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 5th grade, approached the state rate in the 8th grade, and exceeded the state proficiency rate in the 10th grade.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates declined from 46 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2014, 10 percentage points below the state rate of 53 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency rates were 42 percent in 2011 and 41 percent in 2014, a percentage point below the state rate of 42 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency rates were 77 percent in 2011 and 79 percent in 2014, 8 percentage points above the state rate of 71 percent.

Bourne reached the 2014 four year cohort graduation target of 80.0 and the five year cohort graduation target of 85.0 percent.²

- The four year cohort graduation rate improved by 7.2 percentage points, from 84.0 percent in 2010 to 91.2 percent in 2013, and was above the state rate of 85 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate improved by 3.9 percentage points, from 86.4 percent in 2009 to 90.3 percent in 2012, and was above the state rate of 87.5 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for Bourne increased from 0.8 percent in 2010 to 3.1 percent in 2013, above the statewide rate of 2.2 percent.

² 2014 graduation targets are 80 percent for the four year and 85 percent for the five year cohort graduation rates and refer to the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rates.

Bourne Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Curriculum and Instruction

1. The Bourne school district has established common K-12 curriculum templates in all subject areas and uses a web-based tool for review and revision of curriculum documents.

- A. A review of documents showed common curriculum templates being used in all grades and subjects as the district works toward aligning curricula with the 2011 Massachusetts English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science Technology/Engineering Frameworks, and other subject areas.
 - 1. Current templates are based on the backwards planning design and include many of the essential components of a comprehensive curriculum document: topic of study and timeline, standards/instructional goals, enduring understandings, essential questions, and knowledge/skills.
 - 2. Curriculum team members in all disciplines participated in backwards planning design training in preparation for Stage 1 curriculum development.
- B. The district has purchased a software program, Atlas, which serves as a curriculum development tool for districtwide curricula.
 - 1. Teachers have access to their grade level and subject curricula in Atlas on the district website as well as to diary maps, which teachers can personalize with strategies, resources, etc.
 - 2. Last spring parents were provided access to the public curriculum documents in Atlas.

Impact: The establishment of common K-12 curriculum templates and a web-based tool with access capacity for review and revision of curriculum documents ensures that all students have equitable access to consistent and high quality content. Additionally, parents' ability to access curriculum expectations strengthens home and school partnerships for improved student achievement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

2. The district has adopted and implemented an educator evaluation system that is closely aligned with the new state model. Throughout the past two years, the district has made a genuine effort to implement the state’s new educator evaluation policy well.

- A.** Interviews and a review of district records confirmed that the district has provided all training hours and modules specified by state law (Chapter 131 of the Acts of 2012) for both teachers and administrators in support of the new evaluation system. Further, the district continues to provide some annual training and targeted assistance for staff through its professional development programming.
- B.** The Educator Evaluation Implementation Team (EEIT) serves as a standing committee to monitor the ongoing implementation of the district’s new educator evaluation system. The EEIT is composed of teachers, administrators (including principals), and a school committee member, and collaborates at least monthly. Interviews with EEIT members and a review of relevant district documents showed that the committee has done and continues to do much to provide timely and targeted information, clarifications, and materials to support, to promote, and to facilitate the successful implementation of the new evaluation system.
- C.** The review team examined the personnel folders of 29 faculty members selected randomly from across the district. Almost without exception, teacher evaluation documentation was both timely and complete. The folders, which are housed in the central office as well as maintained electronically, contained all key documents required by the new educator evaluation regulations, including: teacher self-assessments, goal setting, records of evidence, formative assessments, and summative evaluations.
- D.** The superintendent of schools has received annual summative evaluations from the school committee based on the standards and indicators contained in the new evaluation system.
- E.** All school principals and district administrators received summative evaluations for the 2013-2014 school year, although their folders did not contain the appropriate supporting documentation called for in the regulations (e.g., self-assessments, professional plans, observation reports, formative evaluations, etc.).

Impact: If the superintendent and his leadership team remain fully committed to the collaborative implementation of the new educator evaluation system and to providing needed and ongoing support structures and targeted training for teachers and administrators, continuous and comprehensive improvements in learning opportunities and academic programs and outcomes for students will likely result.

Student Support

3. The district has processes actively used at the elementary, middle, and high schools to identify struggling students and to provide interventions for them. The district also provides opportunities for students ready for accelerated work at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

- A.** The two elementary schools, the middle school, and the high school have processes in place to identify and to support students who are struggling.
1. A review of documents and interviews showed that all schools use the Instructional Support Intervention Process (ISIP), also referred to as the Child Study Team (CST) and the Student Study Team (SST), to provide teachers with early support and intervention suggestions for student academic and non-academic needs. The ISIP team is co-chaired by each principal and the shared school psychologist. Others on the team include the guidance counselor, the adjustment counselor, a special education teacher, and a general education teacher. The ISIP team meets regularly (sometimes weekly; more often monthly).
 2. Interviewees reported that the middle school teachers have weekly grade level meetings with guidance counselors where students' needs are discussed and strategies are suggested. In addition, the middle school holds student service meetings where guidance counselors meet with the school psychologist and other specialists and administrators to talk about student needs.
 3. The review team was told that the high school also has a student study team process where teachers can refer students for academic or social/emotional concerns. At both the middle school and the high school general education teachers funnel student concerns to guidance counselors to present at student study teams. The Child Study Team at the high school is chaired by the principal and includes the school psychologist, two guidance counselors, the 7-12 student services director, and the director of special education and student services.
- B.** Interventions are provided in the elementary, middle, and high schools for students' academic needs.
1. Interviewees reported that both the Peebles and Bournedale elementary schools provide small RTI groups with specialists for short specific interventions. Administrators reported that other interventions include flexible in-class groups, Lexia, Symphony Mathematics, and Read Naturally. In addition, Title I support is provided for students in grades 1 and 2 at Peebles Elementary School.
 2. The middle school has a daily block called seminar where students receive extra support based on needs identified from prior assessments or teacher recommendations. Students are also encouraged to stay after school for help. Teachers are available three days a week for one hour. In addition, late bus transportation is provided. Interviewees told the team

and documents confirmed that middle school students identified from GRADE and GMADE assessment results receive support from Title I for reading and math.

3. Interviews (including an interview with high school students) and a document review showed that the high school has an enrichment period scheduled daily where students have the option to get help from teachers in different content areas. Interviewees reported that teachers regularly stay after school and students are encouraged to seek help in any content area.

C. The district provides opportunities for accelerated work.

1. Documents showed that flexible grouping is available at the elementary grades.
2. Seminar for grades 5-8 at the middle school gives teachers an opportunity to schedule students according to their needs. In addition, accelerated English, mathematics, and foreign language classes are available for students in grades 7 and 8.
3. The high school recently partnered with Mass Insight's Mass Math Science Initiative (MMSI) in an effort to increase student participation and performance in AP mathematics, science, and English. Students can participate in Saturday AP student sessions with area MMSI schools including those in Barnstable, Wareham, and Martha's Vineyard. Students reported that honors courses are available to eligible students.

Impact: Referral processes for teachers to refer struggling students at the elementary, middle, and high school levels likely ensure that students with academic or non-academic needs get attention and are provided needed services. Flexible groupings, seminar, enrichment, accelerated classes including AP courses ensure that students at either end of the achievement spectrum are getting support and being challenged appropriately. These programs are likely to raise student achievement in the district.

4. The district has taken steps to ensure college and career readiness for its students. The high school provides guidance in the college application process and has an alternative post-secondary and career pathway for high school students.

A. There are some career awareness opportunities at the elementary and middle schools.

1. Interviewees reported and documents confirmed that the fourth graders from both elementary schools participate in a career awareness program called K-Kids. K-Kids is an international, student led organization providing its members with opportunities to perform service, to build character, and to develop leadership.
2. Interviewees told the team that the middle school has convened Career Day, which included community volunteers talking about their skills and expertise.

- B.** The high school has a variety of ways in which students are guided and exposed to post-secondary options.
 - 1. The superintendent reported and students confirmed that guidance counselors make sure that students are taking the appropriate courses for timely graduation and college entrance. Students also said that they can seek help from guidance counselors with the college application process. Documents on the district’s website include a “Senior Year College Admission Process Timeline,” which outlines steps to take every month to complete the application process and be ready for college. Administrators reported that students use Naviance software to help with college planning and career assessment.

The review team learned from multiple interviews and a letter from the superintendent on the Bourne website about the new Early College Experience Program (ECEP) at Bourne High School. This program allows students to enroll at Cape Cod Community College and Bourne High School and to graduate with a diploma and an associate’s degree.

- 2. Multiple interviewees reported that the district has created a new School to Work Program that provides opportunities for juniors and seniors at the high school to work at internships in the community.
- 3. Administrators reported that for the past two years all students in grades 10 and 11 have taken the PSAT during the school day at no cost to the students and their families.

Impact: Deliberate and specific programs aimed at helping students prepare for college and careers will assist in the successful transition from high school to work and college. More importantly early college and career exposure are likely to motivate more students to go to college and to seek additional career opportunities.

Financial and Asset Management

- 5. The district adheres to an annual and transparent budget development process, which provides an opportunity for all affected stakeholders to participate. Elected officials and administrators from both the school district and the town enjoy a positive and trusting relationship with a high level of confidence in managing fiscal affairs, planning for capital improvements, and exerting strong financial controls.**
 - A.** The superintendent characterized the discussions with the principals on budgetary matters as “thorough and rich,” with an emphasis on reviewing data to support student needs.
 - B.** The principals expressed the belief that the budgetary process involved “lots of staff input,” that it represented a collaborative effort among the schools, and that it was an equitable process.

- C. The superintendent is seen as playing a pivotal role in establishing a positive working relationship between the schools and the town.
 - 1. A member of the finance committee described the superintendent as “good at laying out the budget.”
 - 2. A school committee member portrayed the superintendent as “extremely knowledgeable about the budgets.”
- D. Jointly the town and the school district have established what is commonly referred to as the “working group” to review and to discuss fiscal matters. The intent is to avoid any potential conflict at the conclusion of the budgetary process before a public vote.
- E. The school district and the town have engaged in joint efforts to reduce costs when possible, and to plan together for capital improvements.
 - 1. A solar contract was recently signed.
 - 2. A combined phone service for both entities is being considered.
 - 3. A five year capital outlay plan projects costs for roof repairs, abatement of asbestos within the schools, and includes the possible replacement of Peebles School at the end of the decade. At a special town meeting on October 27th, 2014, by a vote of 179 to 7, \$750,000 was approved for a feasibility study—endorsed by school and town representatives.
- F. Under the leadership of the superintendent the school district has introduced tight financial controls on expenditures and revenue.
 - 1. The superintendent reviews invoices each week and communicates any uncertainty to the director of business services.
 - 2. Both Foundation Reserve Funds and School Choice Funds are not spent until the subsequent year—after the money has been received—thus eliminating the possibility of errors in projected revenue.
 - 3. The superintendent, the director of business services, the assistant superintendent, and the special education director meet regularly throughout the year to monitor expenses by engaging in a fiscal review, which the superintendent calls the Reclaim Appropriate Control Program.

Impact: A forthright budget development process with an emphasis on equity and student needs instills confidence among all stakeholders as well as the broader community. Additionally, a respectful working relationship with strong fiscal controls and thoughtful planning creates an atmosphere of trust and stability in the entire community—certainly a positive environment for achieving the goals of the school district.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

Leadership and Governance

6. At the time of the review, the superintendent and the teachers' association had inadequate communication, and there were issues of trust and cooperation among staff.

- A.** The parties seemed aware of the nature of their relationship, and have taken steps to improve the situation—without success.
1. The superintendent told the review team that he once held monthly meetings with the association leadership, but the meetings became “argumentative and oppositional” so were “not productive or constructive,” and are no longer regularly scheduled.
 - a. Teachers' association representatives said that the superintendent “would only meet to talk about contract issues.”
 2. School committee members said that the school committee created a culture subcommittee to improve school culture, and to create a “voice for teachers.” One school committee member said: “We had all this information [through surveys], and then voices took off in another direction—pointing fingers and [it] got nasty.”
 3. The teachers' association conducted a leadership survey at the end of the 2012-2013 school year. The survey assessed the leadership of the principals, the superintendent, and the assistant superintendent. An identical survey, but broadened to include additional administrators, was conducted again at the conclusion of the 2013-2014 school year. The results of each survey were distributed to teachers, the school committee, and administrators.
 - a. In a letter dated August 20, 2013, and signed by the 7 member school committee and 10 administrators, gratitude was expressed for the information as well as for the expression of willingness to work with the association “as we support our students” and “evolve beyond perceptions of ‘us vs. them’.”
 - i. The letter noted that the survey results indicated serious collegiality issues among the staff in the Bourne Public Schools.
 - ii. The letter from the school committee and administrators also expressed a concern “with statements that appeared to be more personal in nature and [were] addressed toward specific administrators.”
 - a. A central office administrator was called a “bully” in each year of the surveys.
 - b. A school administrator was described as being “in over her head.”
 - c. A school administrator's attire was criticized.

- d. The teachers' association considered the acknowledgement of the surveys to be a positive step.

Impact: Insufficient communication and relationship difficulties in any work environment are barriers to productivity. In a school setting with a negative climate, teacher effectiveness and student achievement are seriously compromised.

7. The district does not have a clearly identifiable and established District Improvement Plan (DIP) with SMART goals that include student outcomes and accompanying professional development.

A. Various planning documents exist with the district.

1. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent jointly authored an Entry Plan Report to the Community in the spring of 2011.
2. The principals reported that the School Improvement Plans at each of their schools were aligned to the three goals of the school committee and to the four power indicators (also referred to as standards) of the district.
 - a. The school committee's goals are expressed as three objectives:
 - i. Create opportunities that foster community engagement experiences for all students at all levels
 - ii. Support all students to demonstrate acquired knowledge, understandings, and skills reflected in PreK-12 curriculum maps in all disciplines
 - iii. Empower students to establish and practice reflective learning habits
 - b. The superintendent's goals are the goals from each of the four SIPs with an added column for a status update from the superintendent.
3. Meetings with teachers from all grade levels showed that there was little working knowledge about the goals of each school, and that there was no practice of reporting on the progress toward goal attainment. More frequently references were made to the goals of the school committee.
4. For the past three years, the school committee has been reading its "Vision, Mission, and Objectives" at the beginning of each meeting. School committee members reported that the superintendent's goals were linked to the objectives of the school committee, and that the schools worked from the superintendent's goals in developing their school improvement plans.

B. The absence of a DIP with a K-12 comprehensive vision and structure has contributed to operational challenges in certain areas.

1. The district does not yet have a comprehensive and well-coordinated data team.
2. An identified and clearly communicated instructional model does not exist.
3. There is no process for continuously developing the K-12 curriculum and monitoring its effectiveness by the standards of student achievement and teacher performance.
4. The district does not have a comprehensive professional development plan, which would create learning opportunities for staff that are aligned with learning standards and contribute to measureable student achievement.

Impact: In the absence of a clearly articulated districtwide improvement plan, which emphasizes improved student learning and with which the school improvement plans are aligned, the district misses an opportunity to monitor the effectiveness of planned initiatives and to keep the community fully informed on the direction of the district.

Curriculum and Instruction

8. The Bourne school district does not have an articulated, documented, and comprehensive process for ensuring a consistently delivered and continuously improving curriculum. Additionally, English language arts, mathematics, science, and ELL curriculum documents are incomplete.

- A. The district has not established comprehensive and documented processes for ensuring the regular and timely review and revision of curricula including instructional materials.
 1. While there may be an internal plan for completion of curricula, it is not consistently shared with the full educational community.
 - a. Administrators stated that Stage 1 of the process was complete; consensus maps were posted on Atlas. Stage 2, common assessment development, has begun. Teachers stated that they were aware only of curriculum development plans for teams they participated on, not for other subjects they were responsible for.
 - b. One day per year in June is dedicated to curriculum review. All teachers participate and all disciplines are reviewed. Teachers said that this in-service day has been devoted to curriculum review since June 2013, but were uncertain whether this process would recur in June 2015. Beyond this day there is no formal process for curriculum review and revision. Administrators reported that the in-service day for curriculum review began in 2014 and would continue in 2015.
 - c. Teachers reported that a system for curriculum review had begun but now has stalled. Teachers said that the district focus changes with each new initiative or district need without the completion or plans for the completion of previously begun district work.

2. The district has not clearly articulated dedicated time for the completion of curriculum maps or vertical and horizontal articulation of curricula. Collaborative time is limited or inconsistent by level.
 - a. Curriculum teams have been disbanded. Administrators reported that curriculum teams “met their goals/purposes and were intentionally transitioned from committees to instructional practice in classrooms so that teachers took ownership of practices.” Administrators stated that curriculum review work does not come with a calendar and teachers discuss curriculum during in-service, department meetings, common planning time, and with learning coaches.
 - b. Dedicated time for curriculum articulation meetings for transition grades is limited.
 - c. Elementary teachers have limited dedicated time for curriculum work. Once a month common planning time is used for current initiatives and is scheduled on different days offering no opportunity for Bournedale/Peebles grade-alike curriculum meetings. The loss of an instructional coach further limits teachers’ opportunity for curriculum discussions.
 - d. The middle school schedule provides ample opportunity for teachers to collaborate on content during after-school content meetings and monthly meetings with 7-12 directors. While high school teachers have team leader meetings after school, they reported that they had more time last year to do this work.
 - e. Administrators reported that school-based teacher leadership teams also discuss curriculum work.
 3. There is little evidence of a regular and timely review and update of instructional materials and textbooks to support instructional changes and interviewees told the team that their adequacy varies by school.
 - a. Reports of textbook and instructional material purchases suggested the district does not use a cyclical process for K-12 content-specific textbook/materials review or purchase.
 - b. In interviews, K-4 teachers expressed the opinion that the district needed math, science, and ELA resources, and materials to differentiate instruction. Teachers at other levels affirmed this need.
 - c. Teachers said that an insufficient number of math textbooks were purchased for the middle school.
- B.** At least 80 percent of K-12 ELA, mathematics, and science consensus maps are aligned with current frameworks and available in Atlas. However, they are incomplete and do not include essential components such as assessments, resources, key/common vocabulary, and instructional strategies. The ELL curriculum development is in its initial stages.

1. Teachers stated that the district needed to finish the curriculum development and mapping and the degree of curriculum completion varied by level and discipline.
2. Currently, 80-85 percent of the mathematics curriculum is aligned with the 2011 mathematics frameworks but there are mathematics courses at the high school not mapped on Atlas. Teacher leaders reported and a document review confirmed that the K-8 science curriculum is a work in progress; grades 6-8 are complete, grades K-5 are 90 percent complete. A formal ELL curriculum has not been completed.
3. Administrators said that teachers “routinely add information to diary maps.”
4. Administrators reported that the district is currently working on common assessments/DDMs (Stage 2) that will be added to district consensus maps when this work is completed. Once the assessments have been added, teachers will be expected to add missing elements to their diary maps.

Impact: Without fully aligned curricula, a clearly documented and articulated process for curriculum development and review, and regular and timely opportunities for horizontal and vertical collaboration at each level, the district cannot ensure that all students have access to a current and high quality curriculum.

9. The district has not established a clearly articulated model for effective instructional practice. Teachers within and across levels do not share a common understanding of districtwide instructional expectations and support.

- A. Administrators agreed on districtwide instructional expectations and resources. However, these expectations and resources have not been clearly communicated to teachers.
 1. Administrators identified teaching expectations and resources that define the district’s instructional model.
 - a. The district purchased *Instructional Practices that Maximize Student Achievement*---also referred to as the green book – to complement the educator evaluation system. Administrators said that all teachers received a copy of this resource, which is used to guide instructional best practice and professional development efforts.
 - b. Administrators noted that all teachers are expected to post enduring understandings and essential questions for their unit of study in their classrooms.
 - c. Administrators referenced district power indicators (also referred to as power standards) as a component of the district’s instructional model. These indicators are aligned with standards from the educator evaluation rubric. A curriculum and planning indicator (well-structured lessons) and an instruction indicator (student engagement) are considered district non-negotiables for instructional practice. The administrative

team is working on schemata for aligning the power indicators with the educator evaluation rubric in all areas.

- d. Evidence to support the application of power indicator I.A.4 (well-structured lessons) however, was inconsistent across the district as indicated in observed lessons (see the Instructional Inventory, Appendix C).
 - i. Lessons clearly and consistently reflected rigor and high expectations in 50 percent of all observed classrooms. While this characteristic (#7) was most evident at the middle school (in 73 percent of classes), it was noted in 47 percent and 35 percent, respectively, of the high school and elementary lessons observed.
 - ii. Enduring understandings and essential questions were observed in many classrooms. However, in only 38 percent of classrooms districtwide were clear learning objectives (#8) clearly and consistently communicated to students (in 47 percent of the middle school classes, in 35 percent of the elementary school classrooms, and in 33 percent of the high school classes).
2. Teachers' understanding of a district instructional model, related resource (the green book), and non-negotiable instructional expectations vary across the district.
 - a. Many teachers identified the power indicators as districtwide evaluation expectations but some were not of the opinion that they were "instructional" or clearly articulated at all levels. Some teachers indicated that the educator evaluation rubric dominated and influenced instructional practice. Representatives of the teachers' association recognized the power standards as an evaluation focus for this year but did not link it directly to instructional practice.
 - b. Some teachers cited the green book and the Bloom Taxonomy Flip Chart as resources and reported that evaluators referenced the green book when having observation discussions with teachers. Teachers also reported that some teachers have not received the book and new staff members have not participated in green book presentations at faculty meetings. They noted that formal use of the book varies by level with the most consistent use at the middle school. Some teachers referenced *The Skillful Teacher* as a preferred resource.
 - c. When teachers at all levels were asked to describe the district instructional model, they listed a variety of practices including higher order thinking skills, student-centered instruction, Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD), elements of a well-structured lesson, essential understandings, essential questions, and agendas posted on the board. Teachers reported that, beyond these practices, instruction was an autonomous process.

- B.** Resources for instructional support for teachers, including personnel, opportunities to collaborate, modeling of lessons, and discussions of best practice, vary by school and level.
 1. Teachers noted the loss of an elementary instructional coach, which limited opportunities for regular instructional support, and expressed the need for two instructional coaches at this level to support articulation and modeling of best practice. Administrators reported that principals have had to assume more responsibility as instructional leaders.
 2. Teacher leaders said they meet with many teachers during a dedicated time every cycle but that not all teachers have this time built into their schedules and often use personal time to meet. Administrators reported that common planning time was needed at both the elementary and high schools.
 3. Middle school teachers have one content meeting per month. Grade 5 and 6 teachers have time to work with content leaders twice in a six-day cycle. In addition, teachers at the middle school have multiple opportunities to meet by grade level during team meetings, common planning time, and seminar.
 4. High school teachers referenced the reorganization of disciplines into teams, STEAM and Humanities, and the elimination of department heads. They noted the need for an instructional coach at the high school. Teacher leaders stated that common planning time at the high school for content and discussions of best practice was inconsistent; some teachers have this time and teachers of a single course do not.

Impact: Without a shared instructional model for teaching and learning there is an absence of clarity in district expectations between administrators and teachers. Without equity of resources and a consistent message of expectations for teachers, the district cannot guarantee equitable and high quality instruction for all students.

10. In observed classrooms the quality of instruction was inconsistent by standard and level.

The team observed 50 classes throughout the district: 15 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 20 at the 2 elementary schools. The team observed 23 ELA classes, 15 mathematics classes, and 12 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- A.** In observed classrooms, instructional practices were reflective of an optimal learning environment in three of five instructional characteristics.
 1. Interactions between teachers and students and among students were clearly and consistently positive and respectful (#1) in 90 percent of all classrooms. And 84 percent of

classrooms reflected routines that promoted transitions with minimal instructional loss and provided all students with access to learning activities (#4).

2. Clear, consistent and effective and equitable management of behavior (#2) was noted in 87 percent of middle school classrooms, in 70 percent of elementary classes, and in 47 percent of high school classrooms.
 3. Use of multiple resources such as media, technology, primary source documents, materials for creating multiplication arrays, listening stations, computers and manipulatives was noted in observed classrooms. This characteristic (#5) was most evident at the middle school (in 67 percent of classrooms), followed by the elementary school (in 45 percent of classes) and the high school (in 27 percent of classrooms).
- B.** Observed practices that included communication of clear objectives, appropriate instructional materials and design, and a range of strategies to meet diverse student needs were inconsistent across grade levels.
1. Lessons of rigor and high expectations were noted in 73 percent of middle school classrooms; this characteristic (#7) was observed in 47 percent and 35 percent of classes, respectively, at the high school and elementary schools.
 - a. Some observed lessons did not reflect high student engagement or accountability for students' own learning. Passive learning and participation were observed---students answered questions then waited for the next activity or opportunity to share ideas. During other activities, elementary students were kept busy by drawing and then coloring pictures related to the assignment while the teacher worked with a small group. Some observed lessons were teacher centered with lecture, Q&A, and note-taking.
 - b. Conversely, many lessons engaged all students, were relevant and interconnected, and were appropriately student centered. For example, in one classroom small groups of students analyzed passages from literature, while students in another classroom created mathematical models of numbers (arrays to represent all factors).
 2. Teachers clearly and consistently communicated clear learning objectives aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (#8) in 38 percent of all observed classrooms. While most classrooms posted a unit's essential understandings and essential questions, teachers did not regularly share with students' specific learning objectives for that day/lesson, for example, "Today we will At the end of the lesson you will...." Lesson objectives were shared with students in 47 percent of middle, 35 percent of elementary, and 33 percent of observed high school classrooms.
 3. Use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objectives and content (#9) were clearly and consistently noted in 42 percent of all observed classrooms.

Additionally, only 28 percent of observed district classrooms differentiated instruction or used appropriate modifications to meet diverse student learning needs (#10).

- a. Examples of observed diverse strategies included small group instruction, learning centers that provided different perspectives on a common topic/theme, connections to prior learning, differentiated processes and products (learning centers, variety of primary sources around a common theme, and planned distribution of numbers to ensure student participation and exploration of arrays based on student need). This practice was most evident at the middle school (in 60 percent of visited classes).
 - b. Only 40 percent of elementary and 27 percent of high school classrooms clearly and consistently demonstrated appropriate instructional strategies that were well matched to learning objectives and content (#9). Many lessons observed were whole class with no differentiation of content, process or product and generally consisted of teacher-directed activities with limited student engagement (paper/pencil activities, use of the Smart Board as a projector, lecture, teacher-directed instruction, and passive student learning).
 - c. Teachers and administrators in several interviews said that professional development on differentiating instruction and best practice were needed.
4. The frequent use of formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction declined by level. This characteristic (#15) was clearly and consistently observed in 55 percent of visited elementary, in 47 percent of middle school, and in 20 percent of high school classrooms. The most frequent formative assessment observed was teacher check-ins with individuals and groups of students.
 5. Across the district in 60 percent of observed classrooms teachers clearly and consistently provided multiple opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking skills such as the use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge of concepts. At the middle school, 80 percent of observed lessons reflected this characteristic (#11); 53 percent of high school and 50 percent of elementary lessons provided this opportunity.
 - a. In observed classrooms, teachers asked students to explore and to analyze content, topics, and graphs; to share or to explain their thinking; and to apply knowledge to solve problems and to connect events.
 - b. Clear and consistent evidence of teacher use of effective questioning techniques to promote thoughtful student responses and promote deeper understanding (#12) was evident in 64 percent of observed classrooms; in 73 percent at the middle level and in 60 percent at the elementary and high schools.

- c. In 28 percent of classrooms observed districtwide, the team found clear and consistent evidence of students elaborating about content and ideas when responding to questions. This characteristic (#20) was observed in 47 percent of middle school classes, in 25 percent of elementary school classrooms, and in 13 percent of high school classrooms. Examples include students relating a story that they read to the lesson's theme of "defend your thinking," explaining how they know that they have found all the arrays of a given number (factors), responding to questions in French, relating events of today with events surrounding the Holocaust, and explaining the implications of a problem in the real world.

Impact: Without an articulated and shared instructional model, the district cannot ensure that teachers will consistently deliver effective, research-based instruction that meets students' diverse learning needs and optimizes their college and career readiness.

Assessment

11. The district is in the very beginning stages of developing a comprehensive and coordinated set of structures and processes needed to generate, analyze, and use multiple sources of data.

- A. The district does not possess a formal, unified, and comprehensive K-12 assessment system capable of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating student performance data in all grade levels and subject areas and using it to monitor student educational progress, to measure academic achievement, and to make timely modifications to classroom instruction and the curriculum.
 1. The district and its schools make relatively limited use of common assessments. Interviewees said that the only standardized assessment currently used at the elementary schools is DIBELS, which is administered K-3 three times each year (fall, winter, and spring). The GMADE assessment is given only to 4th graders in the spring in order to identify Title I service eligibility as students transition to middle school. Administrators reported that GRADE assessments are also administered.
 2. At the middle school, teachers indicated that GRADE and GMADE assessments are administered in the spring and fall for students in grades 5-8 and that the data is used primarily for Title I purposes. Additionally, they reported that a common writing assessment has recently been developed and is used three times each year and some common tests in math and science are given at the beginning and end of the year.
 3. Interviewees told the review team that the high school currently administers both midterm and final examinations in most content areas but that no formal or systematic collection of data or analysis of results is conducted.
 4. Teachers and administrators acknowledged that the common assessments currently in place are essentially summative assessments and are used primarily for purposes of ability

grouping or determining eligibility for special education or Title I services. No true benchmark assessments or DDMs and very few common formative grade level or content area assessments have been developed.

5. Interviewees said that the quantity and quality of data collection, analysis, and dissemination currently varies greatly across the district. Processes and procedures range widely from formal to informal, are primarily school based, and are inconsistent among the four schools, including the district's two elementary schools. Additionally, teachers in general reported possessing very limited data collection and analysis skills and said that little appropriate PD training had been provided by the district.
- B.** In recognition and response to its limited capacity to collect and to use multiple sources of data, during the second half of the 2013-2014 school year the district established both a district data team and a DDM committee. Both groups have created appropriately ambitious goals and well defined objectives and are only at the initial stages of developing and implementing them.
1. A district data team was formed in January 2014 and convened its first monthly meeting in February 2014. This joint team consists of two administrators, three learning coaches, and four teachers, both regular and special education. The team was initially funded by grant monies; its ultimate goal is to create a comprehensive and integrated K-12 data system for the district. Interviews with team members and a review of relevant documents, including the initial grant proposal and subsequent team meeting minutes, showed that the primary objectives of the data team include: (a) building the capacity for data-informed decision making across all grade levels and disciplines in the district; (b) providing training and PD that will enable staff to create and use assessments formatively in order to guide instruction and enhance progress monitoring; and (c) creating a districtwide action plan outlining how data is to be collected, presented, and analyzed across the school district.
 2. A DDM working group composed of educators (representing all grade levels and academic disciplines), administrators, and school committee representatives began meeting in January 2014 and by the spring had become a fully formed 20 member joint committee whose goal was the development of an action plan for full DDM implementation during the 2014-2015 school year. DDM committee members said that their group meets regularly and also collaborates with regularity with the Educator Evaluation Implementation Team (EEIT) in order to coordinate efforts and to report on progress throughout the year. Although much has been done to promote the goals of the DDM committee, including in-service presentations and work sessions, committee members indicated that progress in meeting targets has been slowed by a number of factors, including the need for: additional PD supports, aligned and expanded common planning time, increased resources and internal and external expertise, the active involvement of more classroom/content area teachers, and clearer guidelines to direct and support current DDM initiatives.

Impact: Without a comprehensive and unified structure or process to collect and systematically examine multiple sources of data, at both school and district levels, the district’s ability to make appropriate judgments and timely revisions to its academic programs, classroom instruction, PD programming, assessment practices, and goal and policy development is seriously compromised. The formation and initial efforts of the district data team and DDM committee, however, represent encouraging evidence that the district is moving to effectively address these issues.

Human Resources and Professional Development

12. The district’s supervisory practices and procedures have not adequately promoted a culture of growth oriented, collegial supervision or significantly enhanced the effectiveness of staff, as envisioned by the state’s new educator evaluation policy.

- A. According to the district’s collective bargaining agreement (CBA), the basic purpose of evaluation is “to promote student learning, growth, and achievement by providing Educators with feedback for improvement... Evaluators are expected to make frequent unannounced visits to classrooms ... [and] to give targeted constructive feedback to Educators based on their observations of practice...” Interviews with teacher groups and a review of relevant district documentation showed, however, that current evaluative policies, practices, and procedures do not adequately support this core goal.
1. Although the district’s CBA is, in general, closely aligned with the language contained in the state’s model collective bargaining contract language, there are some significant differences. Among them are discrepancies in the minimum number of required unannounced classroom observations. For example, for teachers in their first year of practice the model contract language calls for a minimum of four unannounced observations, while the Bourne CBA requires only two. Further, for teachers in their second and third years of practice, the model contract language target is a minimum of three unannounced classroom observations, compared to the district’s policy of only two.
 2. Evidence from teacher interviews, as well as data contained in systemwide faculty surveys conducted by the MTA in 2013 and 2014, and acknowledged in the superintendent’s August 2013 letter to the Bourne Educators’ Association (BEA), identified relevant areas of considerable teacher dissatisfaction. For example, the results of the Leadership Survey indicated serious teacher concerns with what was perceived as the absence of shared decision making opportunities, the level of administrative visibility, the quality and quantity of conversations and feedback from supervisors, as well as overall concerns with communication and collegiality across the district. Although there were some variations among the results from the district’s four schools, there was a prevailing sentiment that the implementation of the new educator evaluation system had not had much positive impact on these concerns.

3. The review team reviewed the folders of 29 staff members selected randomly from across the school district. Although evaluative documentation was generally timely and complete, it was rarely instructive. Formative and summative assessments/evaluations did not clearly commit to improvement strategies and seldom contained specific comments, suggestions, or recommendations that pertained directly to professional practice, classroom instruction, student learning opportunities, or academic outcomes. Nor did they typically provide the sort of targeted feedback that encourages educators to engage in meaningful dialogue or continuous professional development and growth.
- B.** Administrators reported that the assistant superintendent holds monthly evaluation calibration meetings with new evaluators. They also said that all principals and central office administrators have attended both RBT and Rebas evaluation trainings.
- C.** The next stage in the implementation of the new state educator evaluation framework requires that districts establish patterns and trends using multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement to establish a valid Student Impact Rating. In June 2014 the district submitted to ESE's Office of Educator Preparation, Policy, and Leadership a DDM Implementation Plan for the 2014-2015 school year; Bourne sought and was approved for a small number of extensions for some grades/subjects. The plan put the district in good standing with respect to implementation expectations. At the time of the review, however, interviews with administrators and teachers, as well as a review of district documents, showed that the school district was unable to effectively meet this obligation.
1. The district has a limited number of common summative or benchmark assessments in place, and does not have a coordinated, consistent, and comprehensive system for collecting, analyzing, or disseminating the student achievement data that it does collect. In addition, the district has developed few common formative student assessments and, therefore, cannot generate continuous, timely, and reliable information about student academic progress or learning needs.
 2. Bourne is challenged to meet the specification that District Determined Measures (DDMs) be developed for educators in all grades and subject areas in 2014-2015. Interviewees acknowledged that the district has been unable to meet its 2014-2015 DDM targets and expressed considerable concern about the far more comprehensive implementation requirements for next year.
 3. The district is also challenged by the expectation that, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, student and staff feedback be collected and used as a data component in educator evaluation. Although the new state educator evaluation regulations (603 CMR 35.07) require the use of student feedback as a source of evidence in all educators' evaluations and staff feedback to inform administrators' evaluations, members of the Educator Evaluation Implementation Team (EIT) told the review team that no concrete plans have been developed nor has agreement been reached with the BEA to implement these processes.

Impact: The district has demonstrated its support for the new educator evaluation regulations through its concerted efforts to implement its new educator evaluation system well. However, the district's inability to effectively promote a culture of collegial, growth oriented supervision, dialogue, and evaluation or to provide staff with appropriate, frequent, and timely performance based feedback has seriously compromised the overall impact of the new educator evaluation system. This is compounded by the district's limited capacity to collect, to analyze, and to use student performance and other relevant data, including DDMS, to monitor student progress, to measure academic achievement, to inform Student Impact Ratings, and thereby to accurately determine educator effectiveness.

13. The district does not provide professional development based on the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development. It does not have a professional development plan or a cohesive set of learning experiences driven by district and school improvement plans or student outcomes.

A. The district has designated time and resources for professional development.

1. The 2014-2015 calendar provided to the review team showed that there are three full days plus three half days in-service programs scheduled for this year.
2. The review team met with the professional development team (PDT), which has representation from each school, has team goals, and meets monthly to plan in-service days. Team goals listed on the website are:
 - a. Based on staff feedback and needs, have programs that update the staff on current research, techniques, and trends in education and which transfer into sound practice
 - b. Create learning opportunities for staff that are aligned with learning standards and contribute to measurable student achievement
 - c. Plan professional development days which align with district, school, and educator goals and advance staff ability to apply learning to their practice
3. Administrators reported that the PDT goals are based on Massachusetts Professional Standards of Practice, which are not based on student outcomes.
4. Interviewees reported and documents confirmed that there is monthly common planning time set aside for elementary and middle school teachers.
5. Review team members were told that the district allots \$1,250 per educator for workshops and courses.
6. Interviewees said that the elementary schools share one learning coach, the middle school has two learning coaches (one for grades 5 and 6 and one for grades 7 and 8). Documents provided to the review team indicated that part of the role of the instructional learning coach is to design collaborative, job-embedded professional learning.

- B.** While some professional development is aligned with state mandates, the district does not have a districtwide plan with a set of learning experiences for all its educators that is aligned to district improvement efforts.
1. Interviewees reported that professional development topics for this year were driven by state mandates, primarily DDMs and the new educator evaluation framework. They also said that one in-service day is devoted to teachers teaching teachers about a topic they are expert in and others want to know about.
 2. The PDT goals are generic and do not specify measurable student outcomes (see above).
 3. Review team members reviewed school committee objectives, the superintendent's goals, and school improvement plans but there was no District Improvement Plan with SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results-focused; and timed and tracked) that include student outcomes or accompanying professional development.

Impact: Without a professional development plan that is based on state standards and tied to district and school improvement initiatives including measureable achievement goals, the district will find it challenging to improve student outcomes.

Bourne Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

- 1. As negotiations for a successor agreement to the current collective bargaining agreement begin, district leaders should take decisive and collaborative action to improve communication and climate in the schools.**
 - A.** As a first step, the superintendent should resume the monthly meetings between the teachers' association and the administration.
 1. To set the agenda for the resumed meetings, the district, in collaboration with the teachers' association, may wish to review the contents of "Labor-Management-Community Collaboration in Springfield Public Schools," which provides a case study from the Rennie Center describing how a district improved collaboration, communication, and relationships among the adult stakeholders with the goal of improved student achievement. The direct link is: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/LaborMgmtCommunityCollab.pdf>.
 2. Another resource that might be a useful reference is ESE's annual compilation of all Massachusetts districts' teacher collective bargaining agreements (<http://educatorcontracts.doemass.org/>; after entering database, select districts from next page).

Benefits: In adopting this approach, the district would be acknowledging the labor relations challenge, which is a key element in improving the communication and relationships in the district. More importantly, the district would be communicating its desire to work effectively to resolve the situation. Doing so is likely to lead to a more positive tone, which will benefit the entire organization.

- 2. The district should develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) and align other planning documents with it.**
 - A.** Under the leadership of the superintendent, a working group with wide representation should analyze student performance and other data and develop a DIP.
 1. It is critically important that this stakeholder group recognize, and be committed to, the role of the DIP in creating a blueprint for student success, achieving greater teacher effectiveness, and strongly influencing each school improvement plan.
 - B.** The DIP should include the district's mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.
 1. DIP goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).
 - C.** The DIP's performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district's educational programs.

1. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) should be created in alignment with the DIP and based on an analysis of student achievement data.
 - a. Principals should provide the superintendent, school committee, and staff with regular updates on progress toward SIP goals.
 - b. The principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.
 2. Professional development should be designed to support DIP initiatives and goals.
 3. The work of the district data team and the DDM committee should be included in the DIP.
- D.** The DIP should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
1. The superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and community on progress toward achieving DIP goals.
 2. The district should establish procedures to review the DIP on an annual basis. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted when necessary to meet current conditions.
 3. The superintendent and school committee should consider aligning some goals in the Superintendent's Educator Plan (as part of the district's educator evaluation system) with DIP goals.

Recommended resources:

- A comprehensive and extremely helpful resource for developing the DIP is ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>). These tools support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- The *Massachusetts Definition of College and Career Readiness* (<http://www.mass.edu/library/documents/2013College&CareerReadinessDefinition.pdf>) is a set of learning competencies, intellectual capacities and experiences essential for all students to become lifelong learners; positive contributors to their families, workplaces and communities; and successfully engaged citizens of a global 21st century. This could be a helpful resource as the district articulates its vision and goals.
- *Massachusetts Transfer Goals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MATransferGoals.pdf>) are long range goals that students should work toward over the course of their PK-12 academic

experience. They were written to provide an explicit connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts' definition of College and Career Readiness. They are not recommended for use as a checklist, evaluation tool, or as an assessment tool, but they could be a helpful resource for the district as it articulates a vision and engages in long-term planning.

Benefits: A broad effort to develop and communicate a District Improvement Plan, and to include all stakeholders in the improvement planning process, will refocus the energy of the district on greater teacher effectiveness and improved student achievement. The DIP and SIPs will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district's short- and long-term goals.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district should complete as soon as possible its K-12 English language arts, mathematics, and science consensus maps.

- A.** The district has developed common curriculum templates (consensus maps) used in grades K-12 that include many essential research-based components. These maps should be expanded to include assessments, instructional resources, and strategies that meet all learners' needs, to ensure that teachers at all levels have access to a complete and comprehensive curriculum guide.
1. The district should communicate to teachers the plan for completing the curriculum.
 2. The district should carry out its plan to continue developing DDMs and to add them to the consensus maps.
 3. The district is encouraged to continue referencing ESE's Model Curriculum Units to identify essential components of a comprehensive curriculum and to support teachers as they translate their curricula into instructional practice.
 4. WIDA standards should be integrated into the district's curriculum.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *Mathematics Framework Exploration Activities* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/mathexplore/default.html>) are a growing set of activities designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education mathematics staff and educators. The activities can be accessed and used to promote discussion and collaborative inquiry.
- *Science and Technology/Engineering Concept and Skill Progressions* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/ste/default.html>) articulate of possible ways for students to progress through levels of understanding of concepts.
- ESE's *Writing Standards in Action* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/wsa/>) provide examples of high-quality student writing with annotations that highlight how each piece demonstrates competence in learning standards at each grade level.
- The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards Implementation Guide (Part I)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/Guidance-p1.pdf>) provides general information about the WIDA ELD standards framework, expectations for district implementation, and available support.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean updated and clearly articulated alignment of K-12 curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. Completion of this work will ensure that comprehensive and coherent curricula will be implemented in all classrooms. As a result, all students will have equal access to a high quality education that enables them to be college and career ready.

- 4. It is recommended that the district document and share a multi-year process for the regular and timely review and revision of K-12 curricula. This process should be collaborative in nature and include the necessary resources to support this work including dedicated time and updated instructional resources.**
 - A.** The system should be based on valid research and analysis of state and district common assessment data, including DDMs, and should involve professional staff including teachers and special educators.
 1. The district’s plan should provide a timeline for when K-12 curricula in each discipline will be regularly reviewed and updated, identify participants, and dedicate time (within and among schools) for this ongoing work.
 - a. The plan should include regular meetings to align the curriculum horizontally (across schools) and vertically (between grade levels).
 2. It is recommended that subject areas be prioritized in the review cycle to ensure responsive and timely review and revision based on data analysis and state revisions. The district is encouraged to establish data teams by level to assist in the process of data analysis.
 3. This multi-year plan should be posted to the district curriculum website and shared with faculty.
 - B.** The district should identify resources including time during and/or after school, summer work, professional development, and compensation if appropriate, that would be routinely needed to support this work at all levels.
 - C.** Practices should be established in this plan to ensure that curriculum materials are regularly reviewed and monitored for effectiveness and currency.
 1. Practices might include conducting systematic review of lesson plans and regular collaborative discussions by level and discipline of what materials work well and which materials need revision or replacement, including textbooks.

Benefits to the Bourne school district for implementing this recommendation include a clearly articulated and comprehensive curriculum review process to guarantee currency of curriculum, dedicated time to complete work in a timely manner, and a system for reviewing and updating instructional materials. A workable cycle of curriculum improvement and renewal ensures that curricula are dynamic, will continuously evolve as frameworks are revised at the state level, and that all students have access to a full curriculum that meets their diverse learning needs.

5. It is recommended that the district identify and articulate a district instructional model, communicate this to the full educational community, and support teachers in its implementation.

- A.** The district should convene a representative group of teachers and administrators to define the characteristics of good instruction.
 - 1. The district currently has several resources to support this, including *Understanding by Design* (curriculum mapping resource), *Instructional Practices that Maximize Student Achievement*, and the district's educator evaluation rubric.
 - 2. Key instructional practices should be prioritized as the district's non-negotiables.
- B.** Once a model of instructional practice is identified and defined, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.
 - 1. Using grade level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time, and/or professional development days, the district is encouraged to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model.
 - a. Equitable opportunities should be provided by level for teachers to share best practices reflective of the instructional model, including the use of Atlas to store and share ideas.
 - b. Teachers and administrators might consider watching videos of effective teaching and discussing instructional strategies as a way to calibrate expectations.
 - c. The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs/small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.
 - 2. The administrative team should continue to use power indicators as an effective visual and communication tool for phasing in components of the district's instructional model.
- C.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.
 - 1. Professional development should focus on elements of the instructional model.
 - 2. The district should consider adding support in the form of instructional coaches to provide embedded professional development for teachers.
 - 3. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district's expectations for instruction.
 - 4. Teachers should receive frequent, helpful feedback that helps them to continually improve their instruction (see Human Resources and Professional Development recommendation below).

5. The district should review and, if possible, modify teaching schedules so that teachers at all levels have regular, frequent department and/or grade-level common planning and meeting time that can be used to collaboratively reflect on and improve curriculum and instruction.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a useful resource to support administrators in establishing a walkthrough process and culture of collaboration.
- The March 2014 ESE Educator Evaluation e-Newsletter (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/communications/newsletter/2014-03.pdf>) includes a section called *Implementation Spotlight: Strategies for Focusing Observations and Providing Consistent, Constructive Feedback*.

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

Assessment

6. The work of the district data team and the DDM committee should continue.

- A. The district data team (DDT) should continue its efforts to develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices needed for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources in grades K-12. This should include specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for all schools, grade levels, and subject areas across the district.
 1. The district should consider supporting the work of the DDT by establishing satellite data teams in each school, which would coordinate with the DDT and be responsible for the collection, dissemination, and analysis of student assessment data in their respective grade levels and/or subject areas.
 - a. The data teams should have a collaborative leadership structure in which faculty and administrators work together formally and communicate regularly and systematically. Data teams should have clearly defined authority and responsibilities, closely aligned goals and objectives, and be provided with the resources and supports needed to sustain their efforts.
 2. The DDT, in conjunction with the DDM committee and school data teams, should oversee the development of a comprehensive, coordinated, and balanced system of common formative,

summative, and benchmark assessments, both standardized and locally developed. This unified assessment system should give educators the ability to continuously generate, analyze, and communicate student performance data, monitor ongoing progress, inform instruction, identify needed interventions, accurately measure the academic achievement of every student K-12, and to properly inform the educator evaluation system.

3. The data system should provide professional staff with convenient, real time access to student performance data, as well as to other relevant academic and demographic data, as appropriate.
- B.** Targeted and sustained professional development should be provided for all staff in the development of valid and reliable student assessments, including DDMs. Ongoing training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided for staff in every school, grade level, and content area.
- C.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making, including budget development, district and school improvement plans, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
- The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.
- *District-Determined Measures* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssguEalxfpzD6gG9zxvPWl0c>) is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean a significantly expanded ability to continuously monitor student academic progress and to accurately measure achievement, which will lead to improved classroom instruction and student support services, enhanced curriculum, and better informed educational policy and decision making. In addition, the district will become better able to meet the increasing data demands of educator evaluation, as well as to identify and to develop

appropriate professional development programs and services. Ultimately, the district will provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

Human Resources and Professional Development

- 7. The district should develop policies and practices to effectively promote the culture of growth oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation that is the goal of the educator evaluation system.**
 - A.** The district should review its current supervisory policies, practices, and expectations to ensure that the frequency of unannounced classroom visits by principals and supervisors is sufficient and that the quantity and quality of evaluative feedback, both written and verbal, is enhanced.
 1. Evaluators should serve as instructional coaches/mentors to educators, to engage them in an ongoing, performance based, collaborative dialogue, thereby providing them with formal and informal feedback, guidance, and support that is continuous, frequent, and focused on specific professional practices and skills.
 2. The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of principals and supervisors to ensure that they are regularly providing all staff with high quality instructional feedback that is timely, informative, instructive, and capable of promoting individual growth and overall effectiveness. Administrators should receive ongoing training to enhance their capacity to observe and analyze instruction and to provide feedback focused directly on professional practice, growth, and student achievement.
 - B.** In order to meet the current requirements of the new state educator evaluation regulations the district should develop and use multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement in order to create valid and reliable Student Impact Ratings.
 1. The district's efforts to develop DDMs should be accelerated, prioritized, and properly resourced. In order to meet state requirements, DDMs that are integral to curriculum and instruction and can provide meaningful data to educators need to be implemented in the district this year in all areas, with the exception of the specific areas for which Bourne was granted an extension.
 2. Student academic growth should be at the center of the district's educator evaluation system and efforts.
 - C.** District leaders, in partnership with the BEA, should develop plans to incorporate student and staff feedback into the educator evaluation system.

Recommended resources:

ESE's *District-Determined Measures* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/ddm/>) provides a wealth of information, implementation resources, and other materials to support the development and use of DDMs.

Rating Educator Performance

(www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/resources/implementation/RatingEdPerformance.pdf) is a guide to assist educators and evaluators in the determination of Summative Performance Ratings.

Rating Educator Impact: The Student Impact Rating

(www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/ddm/EducatorImpact.pdf) is a guide to assist educators and evaluators in the determination of Student Impact Ratings.

Quick Reference Guide: Student and Staff Feedback (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf>) includes an overview, resource links, and FAQ related to student and staff feedback.

Benefits: Massachusetts' new educator evaluation framework is designed to promote student learning, growth, and academic achievement. It does so by providing educators and educational leaders with timely, relevant, and continuous feedback for improved practice, enhanced opportunities for professional growth, and clear structures for accountability. Improved outcomes for both students and staff will result from developing effective systems, procedures, and genuinely collaborative practices designed to facilitate and to promote the full and faithful implementation of the core goals of the new educator evaluation regulations.

8. The district should develop a professional development plan aligned to district improvement initiatives.

- A. The district should outline and document a set of learning experiences for its educators that is systematic, sustained, and aligned.
 - 1. Working with the professional development team, district leaders should create a professional development plan for the district that is aligned with the District Improvement Plan and the district's instructional model (see Leadership and Governance and Instruction recommendations above).
 - a. As part of the plan, the PDT should identify specific professional development needs, determine how they might be met, and recommend adjustments in professional development practices to meet them.
 - 2. The plan should address needs indicated by student performance data and trends from classroom observations. It should include goals focused on improving teacher practice and student outcomes.

3. Professional development requires a long-term commitment by administrators and embedded support structures, such as facilitated team meetings, to convey and promote a common understanding of instructional practices expected from all educators.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
- *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncg&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqt9EmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.

Benefits: Developing a districtwide professional development plan that is driven by district improvement efforts and includes expected learning experiences for educators and student achievement outcomes will help move the district toward high quality professional development. A high quality professional development program coupled with the time and resources already available in the district will likely lead to improved student achievement.

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Site Visit Schedule

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from October 20-23, 2014, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Owen Conway, leadership and governance and financial and asset management
2. Michele Kingsland-Smith, curriculum and instruction
3. Dr. Frank Sambuceti, assessment and human resources
4. Lenora Jennings, review team coordinator; student support and professional development

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: director of business services, chair finance committee, town administrator, finance director, town treasurer, chair of Bourne school committee, vice chair of the Bourne school committee, and one selectman.

The team conducted interviews with the four members of the school committee.

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

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

The team visited the following schools: Bournedale Elementary School (PK- 04), Peebles Elementary School (grades K-4), Bourne Middle School (grades 5-8), and Bourne High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and focus groups with 25 elementary school teachers, 8 middle school teachers, and 7 high school teachers.

The team observed 50 classes in the district: 15 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 20 at the 2 elementary schools.

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

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 10/20/2014	Tuesday 10/21/2014	Wednesday 10/22/2014	Thursday 10/23/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; town or city personnel; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; student focus group and visits to Bourne Middle School and Bourne High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school and district staff; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Bournedale, Peebles, and the middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Bournedale, Peebles, and Bourne High School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Bourne Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	22	1.1%	82,990	8.7%
Asian	35	1.7%	58,455	6.1%
Hispanic	66	3.2%	162,647	17.0%
Native American	7	0.3%	2,209	0.2%
White	1,818	88.9%	620,628	64.9%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.0%	1,007	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	97	4.7%	27,803	2.9%
All Students	2,046	100.0%	955,739	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2013

**Table B1b: Bourne Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	275	39.8%	13.4%	164,336	36.0%	17.2%
Low Income	525	76.0%	25.7%	365,885	80.1%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	3	0.4%	0.1%	75,947	16.6%	7.9%
All high needs students	691	100.0%	33.8%	456,639	100.0%	47.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2014. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 2,053; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2a: Bourne Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	176	89	87.2	86.2	82	82.6	-7	-4.2
	P+	176	70.0%	66.0%	59.0%	54.0%	57.0%	-16.0%	-5.0%
4	CPI	177	84.2	88.2	80.4	80.2	79.1	-4	-0.2
	P+	177	58.0%	71.0%	56.0%	53.0%	54.0%	-5.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	162	55	62	45	46	49	-9	1
5	CPI	187	86.2	82.6	85.7	80.3	84.5	-5.9	-5.4
	P+	187	61.0%	59.0%	62.0%	55.0%	64.0%	-6.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	172	34	32.5	32	31	50	-3	-1
6	CPI	184	88.2	88.8	88.6	90.9	85.8	2.7	2.3
	P+	184	68.0%	72.0%	71.0%	76.0%	68.0%	8.0%	5.0%
	SGP	170	54	48	60	58	50	4	-2
7	CPI	173	90.7	87.7	90.8	89.6	88.3	-1.1	-1.2
	P+	173	76.0%	69.0%	77.0%	73.0%	72.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	154	46	43	43	51	50	5	8
8	CPI	191	94	90.2	90.9	93.1	90.2	-0.9	2.2
	P+	191	84.0%	76.0%	78.0%	83.0%	79.0%	-1.0%	5.0%
	SGP	177	31.5	35	37	38	50	6.5	1
10	CPI	140	96	98.2	97.8	96.6	96	0.6	-1.2
	P+	140	87.0%	94.0%	95.0%	91.0%	90.0%	4.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	111	48.5	43	58	57	50	8.5	-1
All	CPI	1,228	89.7	88.8	88.2	87.3	86.7	-2.4	-0.9
	P+	1,228	72.0%	72.0%	70.0%	69.0%	69.0%	-3.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	946	44.5	43	44	47	50	2.5	3

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2b: Bourne Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	176	86.9	84	87.7	86.1	85.1	-0.8	-1.6
	P+	176	66.0%	66.0%	68.0%	71.0%	68.0%	5.0%	3.0%
4	CPI	177	81.2	82.7	81.7	76.6	79.6	-4.6	-5.1
	P+	177	52.0%	53.0%	54.0%	43.0%	52.0%	-9.0%	-11.0%
	SGP	162	50	46	49	35.5	50	-14.5	-13.5
5	CPI	188	77.1	76.4	81.9	74.1	80.4	-3	-7.8
	P+	188	48.0%	49.0%	56.0%	50.0%	61.0%	2.0%	-6.0%
	SGP	174	41	30	37	22.5	50	-18.5	-14.5
6	CPI	184	79.8	83.8	82.8	83.8	80.2	4	1
	P+	184	58.0%	64.0%	62.0%	63.0%	60.0%	5.0%	1.0%
	SGP	171	66	61	61	58	50	-8	-3
7	CPI	171	78	77.2	78.1	69.9	72.5	-8.1	-8.2
	P+	171	55.0%	55.0%	52.0%	41.0%	50.0%	-14.0%	-11.0%
	SGP	154	61.5	63	43	41.5	50	-20	-1.5
8	CPI	191	75.9	78.2	70.4	72.8	74.7	-3.1	2.4
	P+	191	55.0%	53.0%	48.0%	45.0%	52.0%	-10.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	177	43.5	45	35.5	32	50	-11.5	-3.5
10	CPI	141	92.5	91.7	93.1	92	90	-0.5	-1.1
	P+	141	82.0%	82.0%	85.0%	81.0%	79.0%	-1.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	111	54.5	51	47	41	50	-13.5	-6
All	CPI	1228	81.3	81.7	81.5	78.9	80.3	-2.4	-2.6
	P+	1228	59.0%	60.0%	59.0%	55.0%	60.0%	-4.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	949	53	49	45	38	50	-15	-7

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2c: Bourne Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	188	76.6	82.9	83.1	72.6	79	-4	-10.5
	P+	188	46.0%	59.0%	56.0%	43.0%	53.0%	-3.0%	-13.0%
8	CPI	191	75	75.1	71.8	76.4	72.4	1.4	4.6
	P+	191	42.0%	44.0%	39.0%	41.0%	42.0%	-1.0%	2.0%
10	CPI	120	90.5	90.9	92.4	92.7	87.9	2.2	0.3
	P+	120	77.0%	77.0%	77.0%	79.0%	71.0%	2.0%	2.0%
All	CPI	499	79.7	81.7	80.6	78.9	79.6	-0.8	-1.7
	P+	499	53.0%	57.0%	54.0%	51.0%	55.0%	-2.0%	-3.0%

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

**Table B3a: Bourne Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	488	79.6	79.4	78.7	76.8	-2.8	-1.9
		P+	488	50.0%	53.0%	51.0%	49.0%	-1.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	346	39	38	40	39	0	-1
	State	CPI	241,069	77	76.5	76.8	77.1	0.1	0.3
		P+	241,069	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	183,766	46	46	47	47	1	0
Low Income	District	CPI	376	83.1	83.8	82.1	78.8	-4.3	-3.3
		P+	376	58.0%	60.0%	58.0%	54.0%	-4.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	269	37	40	40	39	2	-1
	State	CPI	189,662	77.1	76.7	77.2	77.5	0.4	0.3
		P+	189,662	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	51.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	145,621	46	45	47	47	1	0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	202	66.1	64.3	63.8	64.4	-1.7	0.6
		P+	202	24.0%	27.0%	22.0%	25.0%	1.0%	3.0%
		SGP	139	36	37	33	36	0	3
	State	CPI	90,777	68.3	67.3	66.8	66.6	-1.7	-0.2
		P+	90,777	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	66,688	42	43	43	43	1	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	10	0	0	0	67.5	67.5	67.5
		P+	10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	40.0%
		SGP	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	47,477	66.2	66.2	67.4	67.8	1.6	0.4
		P+	47,477	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,239	50	51	53	54	4	1
All students	District	CPI	1,228	89.7	88.8	88.2	87.3	-2.4	-0.9
		P+	1,228	72.0%	72.0%	70.0%	69.0%	-3.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	946	44.5	43	44	47	2.5	3
	State	CPI	488,744	87.2	86.7	86.8	86.7	-0.5	-0.1
		P+	488,744	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	390,904	50	50	51	50	0	-1

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

**Table B3b: Bourne Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	488	67.7	68.8	70.2	65.2	-2.5	-5
		P+	488	35.0%	36.0%	40.0%	33.0%	-2.0%	-7.0%
		SGP	350	47.5	45.5	40	33	-14.5	-7
	State	CPI	241,896	67.1	67	68.6	68.4	1.3	-0.2
		P+	241,896	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	184,937	46	46	46	47	1	1
Low Income	District	CPI	375	70.8	72.2	73	67.7	-3.1	-5.3
		P+	375	40.0%	41.0%	45.0%	38.0%	-2.0%	-7.0%
		SGP	274	48	47	39	34	-14	-5
	State	CPI	190,183	67.3	67.3	69	68.8	1.5	-0.2
		P+	190,183	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	41.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	146,536	46	45	46	47	1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	207	54.6	52.7	56.6	51	-3.6	-5.6
		P+	207	17.0%	14.0%	20.0%	14.0%	-3.0%	-6.0%
		SGP	139	47	41	37	28	-19	-9
	State	CPI	91,181	57.7	56.9	57.4	57.1	-0.6	-0.3
		P+	91,181	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	67,155	43	43	42	43	0	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	9						
		P+	9						
		SGP	4						
	State	CPI	47,847	62	61.6	63.9	63.8	1.8	-0.1
		P+	47,847	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,607	52	52	53	52	0	-1
All students	District	CPI	1,228	81.3	81.7	81.5	78.9	-2.4	-2.6
		P+	1,228	59.0%	60.0%	59.0%	55.0%	-4.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	949	53	49	45	38	-15	-7
	State	CPI	490,288	79.9	79.9	80.8	80.3	0.4	-0.5
		P+	490,288	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	392,953	50	50	51	50	0	-1

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

**Table B3c: Bourne Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011-2014**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	188	68	70.5	70.3	68.5	0.5	-1.8
		P+	188	34.0%	36.0%	33.0%	32.0%	-2.0%	-1.0%
	State	CPI	100,582	63.8	65	66.4	67.3	3.5	0.9
		P+	100,582	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	147	69.3	73.3	71.9	70.4	1.1	-1.5
		P+	147	37.0%	39.0%	35.0%	35.0%	-2.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	79,199	62.8	64.5	66.1	66.8	4	0.7
		P+	79,199	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	33.0%	5.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	81	58.2	58.2	59	55.6	-2.6	-3.4
		P+	81	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	14.0%	-3.0%	-4.0%
	State	CPI	38,628	59.2	58.7	59.8	60.1	0.9	0.3
		P+	38,628	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	2.0%	2.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	3						
		P+	3						
	State	CPI	16,871	50.3	51.4	54	54	3.7	0
		P+	16,871	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
All students	District	CPI	499	79.7	81.7	80.6	78.9	-0.8	-1.7
		P+	499	53.0%	57.0%	54.0%	51.0%	-2.0%	-3.0%
	State	CPI	211440	77.6	78.6	79	79.6	2	0.6
		P+	211440	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	3.0%	2.0%

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

**Table B4: Bourne Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013**

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	0.8	1.6	0.5	3.1	2.3	2.88	2.6	5.20	2.2

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

**Table B5a: Bourne Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	64	68.4%	82.4%	82.0%	84.4%	16.0	23.4%	2.4	2.9%	74.7%
Low income	45	77.4%	76.5%	80.4%	86.7%	9.3	12.0%	6.3	7.8%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	28	55.3%	86.4%	83.3%	75.0%	19.7	35.6%	-8.3	-10.0%	67.8%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	148	84.0%	91.8%	90.3%	91.2%	7.2	8.6%	0.9	1.0%	85.0%

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

**Table B5b: Bourne Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	61	73.8%	69.7%	82.4%	82.0%	8.2	11.1%	-0.4	-0.5%	78.9%
Low income	51	75.6%	77.4%	76.5%	80.4%	4.8	6.3%	3.9	5.1%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	30	63.3%	57.9%	86.4%	83.3%	20.0	31.6%	-3.1	-3.6%	73.8%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	68.5%
All students	145	86.4%	85.1%	91.8%	90.3%	3.9	4.5%	-1.5	-1.6%	87.5%

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

**Table B6: Bourne Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2011-2014**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	94.6%	95.3%	94.8%	95.3%	0.7	0.7%	0.4	0.4%	94.9%

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

**Table B7: Bourne Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	8.1%	6.2%	7.2%	6.4%	-1.7	-21.0%	-0.8	-11.1%	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	8.1%	6.1%	4.3%	3.1%	-5.0	-61.7%	-1.2	-27.9%	4.3%

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

**Table B8: Bourne Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$20,052,000	\$20,139,703	\$20,460,000	\$20,662,040	\$20,750,000	--
By municipality	\$11,662,253	\$11,026,133	\$11,351,256	\$11,220,378	\$12,414,168	--
Total from local appropriations	\$31,714,253	\$31,165,836	\$31,811,256	\$31,882,418	\$33,164,168	--
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$3,743,563	--	\$3,434,035	--	--
Total expenditures	--	\$34,909,399	--	\$35,316,453	--	--
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$4,684,058	--	\$4,771,738	--	\$4,825,238
Required local contribution	--	\$17,178,276	--	\$17,508,247	--	\$17,624,172
Required net school spending**	--	\$21,862,334	--	\$22,279,985	--	\$22,449,410
Actual net school spending	--	\$24,335,358	--	\$26,084,233	--	\$26,450,003
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$2,473,024	--	\$3,804,248	--	\$4,000,593
Over/under required (%)	--	11.3%	--	17.1%	--	17.8%

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

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

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

Data retrieved October 17, 2014

**Table B9: Bourne Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2011-2013**

Expenditure Category	2011	2012	2013
Administration	\$376	\$388	\$457
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$637	\$700	\$806
Teachers	\$4,435	\$5,009	\$5,245
Other teaching services	\$945	\$918	\$970
Professional development	\$138	\$181	\$174
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$295	\$193	\$172
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$342	\$405	\$418
Pupil services	\$1,167	\$1,289	\$1,268
Operations and maintenance	\$1,150	\$1,053	\$1,226
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,873	\$2,972	\$3,175
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$12,359	\$13,109	\$13,911

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful.	ES	0%	5%	95%
	MS	0%	0%	100%
	HS	7%	20%	73%
	Total #	1	4	45
	Total %	2%	8%	90%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	20%	10%	70%
	MS	13%	0%	87%
	HS	47%	7%	47%
	Total #	13	3	34
	Total %	26%	6%	68%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	5%	5%	90%
	MS	0%	7%	93%
	HS	7%	27%	67%
	Total #	2	6	42
	Total %	4%	12%	84%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	10%	5%	85%
	MS	7%	7%	87%
	HS	7%	13%	80%
	Total #	4	4	42
	Total %	8%	8%	84%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	30%	25%	45%
	MS	13%	20%	67%
	HS	60%	13%	27%
	Total #	17	10	23
	Total %	34%	20%	46%
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	5%	5%	90%
	MS	7%	7%	87%
	HS	0%	7%	93%
	Total #	2	3	45
	Total %	4%	6%	90%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	30%	35%	35%
	MS	7%	20%	73%
	HS	20%	33%	47%
	Total #	10	15	25
	Total %	20%	30%	50%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.	ES	25%	40%	35%
	MS	40%	13%	47%
	HS	53%	13%	33%
	Total #	19	12	19
	Total %	38%	24%	38%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	ES	25%	35%	40%
	MS	33%	7%	60%
	HS	47%	27%	27%
	Total #	17	12	21
	Total %	34%	24%	42%
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and differentiation of content, process, and/or products.	ES	55%	10%	35%
	MS	60%	13%	27%
	HS	67%	13%	20%
	Total #	30	6	14
	Total %	60%	12%	28%
11. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	30%	20%	50%
	MS	7%	13%	80%
	HS	33%	13%	53%
	Total #	12	8	30
	Total %	24%	16%	60%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	10%	30%	60%
	MS	7%	20%	73%
	HS	13%	27%	60%
	Total #	5	13	32
	Total %	10%	26%	64%
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas.	ES	15%	30%	55%
	MS	0%	7%	93%
	HS	27%	13%	60%
	Total #	7	9	34
	Total %	14%	18%	68%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students’ learning needs.	ES	0%	20%	80%
	MS	0%	0%	100%
	HS	7%	7%	87%
	Total #	1	5	44
	Total %	2%	10%	88%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	25%	20%	55%
	MS	47%	7%	47%
	HS	60%	20%	20%
	Total #	21	8	21
	Total %	42%	16%	42%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	70%	0%	30%
	MS	47%	7%	47%
	HS	40%	20%	40%
	Total #	27	4	19
	Total %	54%	8%	38%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	25%	30%	45%
	MS	0%	27%	73%
	HS	33%	20%	47%
	Total #	10	13	27
	Total %	20%	26%	54%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	ES	30%	20%	50%
	MS	13%	7%	80%
	HS	47%	20%	33%
	Total #	15	8	27
	Total %	30%	16%	54%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	30%	40%	30%
	MS	7%	47%	47%
	HS	27%	20%	53%
	Total #	11	18	21
	Total %	22%	36%	42%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	40%	35%	25%
	MS	20%	33%	47%
	HS	60%	27%	13%
	Total #	20	16	14
	Total %	40%	32%	28%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	40%	5%	55%
	MS	0%	40%	60%
	HS	33%	20%	47%
	Total #	13	10	27
	Total %	26%	20%	54%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	85%	5%	10%
	MS	67%	13%	20%
	HS	67%	7%	27%
	Total #	37	4	9
	Total %	74%	8%	18%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	30%	25%	45%
	MS	7%	13%	80%
	HS	13%	20%	67%
	Total #	9	10	31
	Total %	18%	20%	62%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	45%	35%	20%
	MS	33%	20%	47%
	HS	53%	47%	0%
	Total #	22	17	11
	Total %	44%	34%	22%