

District Review Report

West Boylston Public Schools

Review conducted March 16-19, 2015



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

West Boylston Public Schools District Review Overview	1
West Boylston Public Schools District Review Findings.....	6
West Boylston Public Schools District Review Recommendations.....	22
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit	26
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	28
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	40

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 June 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



West Boylston 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, Level 3, or Level 4 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 West Boylston public school district was conducted from March 16-19, 2015. The site visit included approximately 20 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 30 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted one focus group with four elementary school teachers. No middle/high school teachers attended a scheduled focus group.

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 41 classrooms in 2 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

West Boylston has a town meeting form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are five members of the school committee and they meet monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 1, 2011. The district leadership team includes the director of special education/pupil services, the business manager, the middle school/high school principal, the elementary school principal, and the middle school/high school associate principal. Central office positions have been stable in number over the past four years. The district has two principals leading two schools. The middle school/high school associate principal reports to the superintendent. The other school administrator is an assistant elementary school principal. In the 2013-2014 school year there were 78 teachers in the district.

As of October 1, 2014, 933 students were enrolled in the district's 2 schools:

**Table 1: West Boylston Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2014-2015**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Major Edwards Elementary	ES	PK-5	440
West Boylston Middle/High School	MS/HS	6-12	493
Totals	2 schools	PK-12	933
*As of October 1, 2014			

Between 2010 and 2015 overall student enrollment decreased by 7.9 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 lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 10 K-12 districts of similar size (less than 1,000 students) in fiscal year 2013: \$12,500 as compared with a median of \$14,215 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been well-above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

West Boylston is a Level 2 district because the Major Edwards Elementary and West Boylston Middle/High School are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.

- Major Edwards Elementary is in the 74th percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 because its cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 71 for high-needs students is below the target of 75.
- West Boylston Middle/High School is in the 40th percentile of middle-high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 53 for all students and 46 for high-needs students; the target is 75.
 - West Boylston Middle/High School is also in Level 2 for low MCAS participation for students with disabilities and students in the high needs subgroup.

The district reached its 2014 Composite Performance Index (CPI) target for math but did not reach its CPI goals for ELA and science.

- ELA CPI was 90.0 in 2014, below the district's target of 92.0.
- Math CPI was 85.9 in 2014, and considered on the district's target of 87.0.
- Science CPI was 78.8 in 2014, below the district's target of 87.0.

ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate in the district as a whole and in every tested grade except the 6th grade. Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates improved in every grade except the 4th and 6th grades.

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 73 percent in 2011 and 75 percent in 2014, 6 percentage points above the 2014 state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate by 15 and 14 percentage points in the 3rd and 5th grades, respectively, by 10 and 8 percentage points in the 4th and 7th grades, respectively, and by 1 and 4 percentage points in the 8th and 10th grades, respectively.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 9 to 12 percentage points in the 3rd, 5th, and 7th grades, and by 2 and 5 percentage points in the 8th and 10th grades, respectively.
- The ELA proficiency rate in the 6th grade was 65 percent in 2011 and 64 percent in 2014, 4 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 68 percent.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates declined by 13 percentage points in the 4th grade.

Math proficiency rates were above the state rate and improved between 2011 and 2014 in the district as a whole and in each tested grade except for the 8th grade.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district increased 6 percentage points from 63 percent in 2011 to 69 percent in 2014, above the 2014 state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were above the state rate by 18 percentage points in the 6th grade, by 16 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 10 to 14 percentage points in the 3rd, 5th, and 7th grades, and by 7 percentage points in the 10th grade.
 - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 16 and 17 percentage points in the 3rd and 5th grades, respectively, by 10 and 9 percentage points in the 6th and 7th grades, respectively, and by 6 and 2 percentage points in the 4th and 10th grades, respectively.
- The 8th grade math proficiency rate decreased 11 percentage points from 54 percent in 2011 to 43 percent in 2014, 9 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 52 percent.

Science proficiency rates were below the state rate and have declined between 2011 and 2014 in the 8th and 10th grades located at West Boylston Middle/High School.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates increased 6 percentage points from 63 percent in 2011 to 69 percent in 2014, 16 percentage points above the 2014 state rate of 53 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency rates decreased 28 percentage points from 55 percent in 2011 to 27 percent in 2014, 15 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 42 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency rates declined 9 percentage points from 66 percent in 2011 to 57 percent in 2014, 14 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 71 percent.

Students' growth on the MCAS assessments on average is comparable to that of their academic peers statewide in ELA and in mathematics.

- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 53.0.
 - ELA median SGP was above 60.0 in the 4th grade (median SGP of 64.0), the 5th grade (61), in the 10th grade (72.5), and at Major Edwards Elementary (63.0).
 - ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 7th grade (33.5).
- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 53.0.
 - Math median SGP was above 60.0 in the 4th grade (median SGP of 69.0), in the 6th grade (76.0), and at Major Edwards Elementary (66.0).

- Math median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 7th grade (37.0) and in the 8th grade (24.0).

The district's four year and five year cohort graduation rates have been above the state rate for the past four years and the district reached its 2014 graduation targets.¹

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 90.3 percent in 2011 and 91.5 percent in 2014, above the 2014 state rate of 86.1 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate declined from 96.5 percent in 2010 to 92.2 percent in 2013, above the 2014 state rate of 87.7 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for West Boylston was 0.7 percent in 2011 and 2.5 percent in 2014, above the 2014 statewide rate of 2.0 percent.

¹ 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.

West Boylston Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. The school committee and district and school leaders are providing effective leadership, appropriately focused on continuous improvement, to the West Boylston Public Schools.

A. Members of the school committee are aware of their responsibilities, suitably focusing their efforts on policy adoption and review, evaluation of the superintendent, and development and adoption of the annual budget.

1. School committee members spoke of the importance of providing support for the district's educational efforts by focusing on policy, hiring and evaluation of the superintendent, and budget development. Members stated that the committee avoids becoming involved in the day-to-day operations of the district with one member noting: "We do not manage. We support the superintendent and the administration." Another spoke of avoiding "micromanagement."

a. Interviews and a review of school committee meeting minutes posted on the district's website indicated that the committee focuses on policy development and review, on progress of the district in meeting district and school goals, and on the development and approval of the annual budget.

B. The district takes a collaborative approach to school leadership, while affording principals the authority needed to manage the schools.

1. The administrative team meets regularly, collaborates in the establishment of district and school priorities, and shares responsibility for improvement.

a. Interviews with the superintendent and the principals confirmed that clear communication, shared problem solving, and common values are important to the leadership team. The superintendent described the team's synergy by stating: "Everyone is in everyone's loop."

2. Against this backdrop of collaboration, principals reported that sufficient authority is delegated to them in areas such as personnel administration and student management.

C. Interviews and a document review by the team indicated that the district has a high-quality, focused planning process.

1. The number of strategic objectives is manageable.

- a. The district has a five-year strategic plan that is marked by four strategic objectives that are grounded in a clear theory of action. These objectives focus all district initiatives on promoting the college and career readiness of the students.
2. The District Improvement Plan (DIP) and the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) bring these objectives to life through the establishment of initiatives marked by clear action steps, timelines, and performance benchmarks with clear systems of accountability and continuous improvement.
 - a. The DIP and the SIPs contain initiatives that annually address progress the district is making toward the objectives in the strategic plan.
 - b. The plans contain SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked), as well as the action steps, accountability evidence, timelines, and personnel responsible for each goal.
 - c. The superintendent documents district progress toward the initiatives in the DIP at each school committee meeting. The review team did not find evidence of the use of this process to monitor the implementation of SIPs.
 - d. At the end of each school year, progress toward each initiative is assessed and at the annual retreat, attended by school leaders and the school committee, initiatives for the subsequent year are solidified.
- D. The district has collaboratively developed an annual budget focused on educational need and student achievement.
 1. Interviews with the superintendent, school leaders, school committee members, and the town administrator indicated that budget development is focused on educational need and student achievement.
 - a. With a goal of increasing the achievement of students with disabilities, the superintendent recently recommended that the district reduce its reliance on paraprofessionals providing instructional support to these students and---at substantial cost to the district---transition to a service delivery model that relies more on teachers.
 - b. School leaders and school committee members stated that principals and the school committee members look to MCAS scores to provide a rationale for budget increases.
 2. The budget is developed collaboratively with input from a variety of stakeholders.
 - a. The development of the budget begins in the fall and includes input from teachers, principals, and school councils.

- b. Interviews with the superintendent and the town administrator indicated that communication about the budget is open and transparent, and that consensus about the budget is typically reached well ahead of the annual town meeting.
3. The collaboration between the schools and the town has established a positive attitude in the community toward the schools.
 - a. The town regularly funds the schools well in excess of the net school spending requirement.²

Impact: The district has established systematic processes that place educational improvement and student achievement at the forefront of the work of the school committee and educational leaders. Roles and responsibilities are sharply defined, and plans, timelines, and budget priorities are clearly established. The systematic approach to continuous improvement will likely contribute to increased student achievement.

Curriculum and Instruction

- 2. The district has established a formal and clearly defined collaborative process for the continuous review and revision of curriculum documents and related instructional materials. This process has been well articulated and supported by the educational community.**
 - A.** Two documents guide the formal curriculum review and revision process.
 1. *The Curriculum Revision Calendar and Process* document provides an inclusive scope and sequence for each discipline comprising the year of start for the review and the focus of work for each stage/step within the five-year process.
 2. A second document entitled *The District Document Checklist* comprehensively defines the tasks for each stage of the curriculum review cycle. These tasks incorporate a thorough review and realignment of current documents and materials, if needed, as well as data collection and multiple opportunities for teacher feedback.
 - B.** Teachers and administrators at all levels articulated a common understanding of and appreciation for the district's curriculum review and revision process and its collaborative nature.
 1. Administrators reported the establishment of a review process and said that ELA was identified as the content area with top priority, based on a review of MCAS data. They also described the role of curriculum teams to oversee initial development of curriculum during

² Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 10 K-12 districts of similar size (less than 1,000 students) in fiscal year 2013 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)).

the summer. Once the two formal years of “study and review” are concluded, teacher program leaders maintain oversight until the work is completed.

2. Teachers said that curriculum teams had been established for ELA and mathematics as scheduled in *The Curriculum Revision Calendar and Process* document. Informal work has also been initiated in science and there are plans to convene a science curriculum team when the new state frameworks are adopted. Teachers at each level receive an invitation to participate on curriculum teams and the work is collaborative.
- C. This process, developed by the current superintendent shortly after she was hired, has become an institutionalized district practice.

Impact: Having clearly defined, embedded, and collaborative processes for the ongoing and timely review and revision of curriculum and related instructional resources provides teachers with the tools to effectively implement aligned and updated curricula. As a result, all students gain access to a full, up-to-date, and high-quality curriculum within and across all grades.

Assessment

3. The district has begun to make increasing use of student assessment data to improve academic achievement and to inform key aspects of decision-making, including goal, policy, and budget development, instructional practice, and the curriculum. Progress has been greatest at the elementary school, where assessment policies and data collection and analysis practices are more fully developed.

- A. The elementary school has developed a comprehensive and coordinated data system to collect, analyze, and disseminate data from a variety of student assessments, including standardized, benchmark, and common summative and formative assessments.
1. A document review indicated that student assessments at the elementary school include: Fountas & Pinnell and the Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy (DIBELS), ELA benchmark tests that are administered K-5 three times per year and more frequently when used to monitor the progress of struggling students; MCAS; enVisions mathematics assessments administered by K-5 teachers as pre-, post-, and chapter tests; and grade-level, teacher-developed writing rubrics.
- B. At the middle/high school, in addition to MCAS, assessments include: McGraw Hill formative and summative mathematics tests; mid-term and final examinations in core academic areas; Glencoe mathematics formative and summative tests; teacher-developed benchmark assessments in ELA and mathematics (grades 6-8); and content- area writing rubrics.
- C. Interviewees said that staff at all grade levels and subject areas are continually working to develop a comprehensive and balanced set of formative, summative, and benchmark

assessments to accurately monitor student progress, to measure achievement, and to inform classroom instruction and curriculum.

- D.** In response to the goal articulated in the District Improvement Plan (DIP) and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) that by May 2015, “all schools will have fully operational data teams that meet regularly to examine data and make recommendations for students who fall below grade level expectations,” data teams have been formed at both district schools.
1. The elementary school data team has been in place for several years and meets regularly throughout the school year. Consequently, it has developed well-defined policies, practices, and procedures to support the collection, analysis, and dissemination of student assessment data. Its tasks include the review, analysis, and communication of the schoolwide Fountas & Pinnel and DIBELS benchmark results, as well as the systematic review of a variety of other student data points, including MCAS data.
 - a. The elementary school uses the Ideal Data Warehouse system, an electronic platform into which benchmark data is entered, stored, and accessed. Interviewees said that the data team analyzes the aggregated and disaggregated data, produces relevant schoolwide reports, communicates with and makes timely and targeted recommendations to grade-level and subject-area teachers and administrators about overall growth rates, and identifies students who require additional academic supports.
 - b. Because the data team at the middle/high school has been formed over the course of this current school year, it has focused much of its attention on defining its mission and building understanding and support among the faculty. Interviews and a review of the middle/high school SIP showed that the data team’s initial efforts this year have been to: define its role, vision, purpose, membership, and timeline; select appropriate data and a student cohort to examine; study the data and establish trends for both strengths and challenges; and produce a document for staff containing specific recommendations for improving student achievement.
- E.** The district makes effective use of MCAS results. School and district leaders told the review team of a range of MCAS data analyses and detailed reports provided by the superintendent and administrative team and of their timely dissemination/presentation to appropriate district stakeholders, including parents and the school committee.
- F.** The district is making increasingly effective use of student assessment results, standardized and local benchmarks, and other pertinent data to improve curriculum and instruction at all grade levels, as well as to inform and support goal, policy, and budget development.
1. The most notable data-driven curriculum improvements cited by interviewees included: the development of K-12 writing rubrics; the adoption of the *enVisions* mathematics program (K-5); the elimination of Number Skills mathematics assessments (K-2); the adoption of the McGraw Hill mathematics program; the implementation of the STEAM curriculum (grades 7-

- 10); major revisions to the high school science program and course sequence; the development of teacher-designed benchmark and formative assessments at all grade levels and content areas; and the systematic use of student performance data to inform and support the district's ongoing curriculum review, revision, and alignment initiatives.
2. Interviews with school and district leaders, as well as a review of the DIP and SIPs, made clear the district's increasing commitment to analyzing and using student assessment results, along with other pertinent data, to prioritize goals, to allocate human and financial resources, and to introduce or discontinue academic programs.

Impact: The district has made the creation of a comprehensive and coordinated data system a priority. If the district maintains the current trajectory, including providing the supports, targeted training, and resources required, it will create a comprehensive data infrastructure to systematically improve classroom instruction, to accurately inform curriculum revision, to effectively support goal and policy development, and to ensure that student achievement is consistently the central factor in district decision-making.

Human Resources and Professional Development

4. **The district's professional development program is well developed, planned, and supported. It incorporates a number of key components of the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development.**
 - A. The district provides comprehensive and coordinated professional development programming that is designed to support educators at all stages of their careers and is directly focused on addressing students' learning needs and improving academic achievement.
 1. The district's professional development goals are clear, specific, and consistently focused on improving professional practice, students' learning opportunities, and academic outcomes. Goals are uniformly articulated in and aligned with the DIP and SIPs. Administrators affirmed that they were actively involved in the development of professional development goals as well as in the design and delivery of both school-level and districtwide programs.
 - a. Interviews and a review of district documents showed that the emphasis for all professional development programming continues to be reading, writing, and thinking across all content areas. Professional development priorities for the 2014-2015 school year include: Writing Across the Curriculum, Google Apps for Education, Teacher Rounds, Robust Vocabulary instruction, Paraprofessional Training, *Envisions* Math Program training, middle/high school literacy in the content areas, and related NEASC initiatives.
 2. Administrators indicated that the district now designs professional development programs and services that reflect a long-term commitment to developing the knowledge, deeper

understandings, and expanded professional skills needed for a significant and lasting impact in the classroom. This more sustained delivery model is also reflected in the multi-year DIP and SIPs.

3. Professional development programs are increasingly informed by and designed based on an analysis of relevant available student performance data. Interviewees told the team that data from a variety of assessments and grade levels is analyzed, including: MCAS results; Fountas & Pinnel and DIBELS benchmark tests (K-5); enVisions assessments (K-5); schoolwide writing rubrics; McGraw Hill tests; teacher- developed benchmark assessments in ELA, mathematics, and science (grades 6-8; and mid-term and final examinations administered at the secondary level.
4. The district invests substantial amounts of time, funding, staff, and technology to support professional development. These include school-based and job-embedded opportunities for educators to systematically share ideas, solve problems, and work together in a variety of ways and settings to achieve well-defined goals and objectives.
 - a. Interviews and a review of district documents indicated that these collaborative opportunities include: two full-day and six early-release in-service days; common planning time regularly scheduled for all K-8 teachers; grade-level and department meetings; and embedded programs such as the Teaching Learning Alliance, literacy work underway initially at the elementary school; the “Teacher Rounds” program for teachers at both the elementary and middle/high school; and a wide range of out-of-district workshops and courses funded by the district.
5. Although focused on core district goals and priorities, district professional development programming is appropriately differentiated in order to best meet the needs, interests, and varying skills and experience of staff. Interviewees said that professional development activities and programs are flexible and diverse and provided in a number of ways, including whole-staff workshops, small study groups and initiatives, action research, and mini-workshops, as well as a variety of relevant paired and independent professional pursuits.

Impact: The district’s efforts to develop a comprehensive and coordinated professional development program to effectively support all educators, to advance district priorities, and to focus systematically on improving student achievement have been considerable. The district’s commitment to providing opportunities for educators to collaborate in structured, sustained, and purposeful ways is creating a culture of continuous professional growth and a growing recognition of the shared responsibility for student learning. These efforts should result in significant and lasting improvements in instructional practices and competencies, in the K-12 curriculum, and ultimately in student academic opportunities, experiences, and learning outcomes.

Student Support

5. The district has established a system of academic and non-academic student supports coordinated by the director of special education/pupil services.

- A.** The superintendent said that the director of special education/pupil services coordinates support programs Pre-K-12. Principals told the team that they have a strong relationship with the director of special education/pupil services and are able to work effectively together. Because the district is small, discussions about the effectiveness of student support strategies are constantly taking place.
1. Interviewees and a review of documents provided by the district showed that a wide range of support programs are provided students with disabilities Pre-K-12.
 - a. Interviewees said that approximately three years ago the district changed from a pull-out model for instructing students with disabilities to a more inclusive push-in model. Through the push-in model, these students now have access to the full curriculum and some improvement has been observed.
 - i. Regular education classroom teachers use student Individualized Education Programs as a guide to implementing accommodations and modifications, and all grades have at least one special education teacher to co-teach with regular education teachers.
 - b. Other special education programs offered Pre-K-12 include academic support classes (limited pull-out when needed), small-group and individualized instruction, and life-skills instruction. Academic support classes are provided to individual or small groups of students in a resource room and students earn credits.
- B.** The district has allocated resources for students' academic and social-emotional support at all schools.
1. In addition to special education teachers for all grades, the elementary school has two reading specialists, two speech and language pathologists, a guidance counselor, physical and occupational therapy staff, a behavior specialist, a life-skills teacher, and a part-time school psychologist. The middle/high school has three guidance counselors, physical and occupational therapy staff, and school psychologist and nursing services. Outside counseling services are available through You, Inc. Paraprofessionals provide support at all grades and are assigned by principals.
 2. A reading specialist, who is also certified as an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher, provides services to English language learners (ELLs) at the elementary school. A speech and language pathologist, who is a licensed ESL teacher, provides ESL services at the middle/high school.
- C.** Student assessment data is used at schools to inform interventions for struggling students.

1. Teachers and principals monitor the performance of students using assessment data, grade-level team meeting review of data, and referrals to school intervention teams (SITs).
 - a. The district has established SITs for the elementary, middle, and high schools. A review of information provided by the district indicated that the team works with the classroom teacher to develop student success in the classroom. The team is trained to assess the individual needs of students and to recommend strategies for success.
 - b. Data teams are in place at all schools, but are evolving at the middle/high school. Each data team has a facilitator or a coordinator. The role of the teams is still being defined as the elementary team initially focused on identifying struggling students, but now focuses on broader school needs.
 - c. The elementary school reviews early intervention information received when a student enrolls and meets with the parents to discuss services. Services can begin on a student's third birthday. The elementary school's SIT meets monthly or as needed to review referrals. Referrals are typically made for academic or social-emotional issues. Follow-up usually takes place 4-6 weeks after suggested strategies are implemented.
 - d. Data from the administration of DIBELS, the Fountas & Pinnell benchmark assessments, and weekly progress monitoring is used to identify and to regroup struggling students in literacy. The DIBELS is administered three times per year and students who do not meet benchmarks are provided support weekly. According to support program information provided by the district, "Students may cycle through three intervention cycles before a special education referral is initiated."
 - e. Grades 4-5 have a daily 30-minute remediation period with students regrouped as a result of assessments. The instruction may include reading or mathematics support.
 - f. The middle school sets its own benchmarks and uses the data to identify interventions for struggling students. Teachers also assess students with end-of-unit tests and mid- and end-of-year assessments in ELA, mathematics, science, and history/social studies. An extra study-skills period is scheduled for struggling students in grades 6-8. The middle school offers an enrichment mathematics class, assigning students based on previous MCAS scores, and a class in language arts skills, which students are assigned to in place of a foreign language based on targeted challenges and MCAS scores.
 - i. The middle school has implemented a tiered behavior support program (PBIS); interviewees said that the program has reduced behavior referrals.
 - g. Struggling high-school students are identified through of a review of data, including mid-term and final exam grades, attendance, and behavior referrals. If necessary, a referral is made to the SIT, which meets at least monthly.

- i. The high school offers an afternoon support program called “5th Block” for students whose potential has yet to be realized and who are at risk of failing a class. Students for this program are identified through the SIT. After-school MCAS support programs are also provided for high-school students who have scored in the Needs Improvement or Warning categories on the 8th or 10th grade MCAS test.
- ii. High-school students told the team that various supports are available for students including guidance and adjustment counselors and teachers who stay after school to provide academic support. They also mentioned that “5th Block” is available to students for academic support.
- iii. Parents identified the guidance counselors and summer remediation programs at the middle/high school as sources of support.
- h. The high school offers night school, credit recovery, virtual high school, and internships, and has partnerships with the College of the Holy Cross, and Quinsigamond and Wachusett community colleges for students to take college courses for credit. In addition, interviewees stated that approximately 30 students are taking college courses on their own.
- i. All students can enroll in Advanced Placement classes, including students with disabilities and students on 504 plans. AP teachers receive two weeks of training in the summer.

Impact: Providing access to a wide range of academic and non-academic support programs means that struggling students receive interventions that will likely improve student achievement. Having common intervention structures and strategies at all schools to identify and support struggling students ensures that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

Curriculum and Instruction

- 6. The district’s ELA and math curricula are incomplete and the district has not developed an ESL curriculum.**
 - A.** District leaders reported that the district is in the first year of implementation of new curriculum K-8.
 - B.** The district’s K-12 ELA curriculum maps reflect the 2011 Massachusetts English Language Arts & Literacy content standards and maps include many components of a comprehensive curriculum. The district has identified elements of the documents that require additional work.

1. Administrators and teachers reported that the ELA curriculum mapping is in various stages of development across the district. They said that various components were missing at different levels, including assessments, alignment of standards at certain grades, and unit development.
 2. A review of the high school ELA curriculum showed that most grade-level ELA maps are complete and several maps are in their initial stages of development.
- C. A review of documents indicated that the K-12 mathematics curriculum maps are the most fully developed of the district's curricula. Their alignment to the *2011 Massachusetts Mathematics Curriculum Frameworks* is nearly completed.
1. Administrators and teachers reported that additional efforts are needed to complete the mathematics curriculum maps. This work includes development of assessments, unit plans, and some standards alignment/adjustments at the secondary level.
- D. The district does not have a curriculum for English language learners (ELLs) aligned with the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development (ELD) Standards or instructional strategies for ELLs tied into district curriculum maps. However, plans are in place to begin this work.
1. A review of documents showed no formal ELL curriculum for the district's ELLs. While some ELA model curriculum units K-1 reference instructional strategies to support ELLs and students with disabilities, there is no documentation of supports in other ELA or mathematics curricula across grades and courses.
 - a. District leaders reported that an ELL curriculum was purchased in 2014 and is in place.
- E. District leaders reported that all teachers who have taken the SEI Strategies course are required to add the WIDA standards to their plans.

Impact: While a process is in place, the district has not fully articulated a continuum of teaching and learning expectations for all students. Without fully aligned curricula all students do not have equal access to a comprehensive and rigorous curriculum throughout their education and are not being adequately prepared for college and career.

7. In observed classrooms implementation of key instructional practices was inconsistent across grade levels.

The team observed 41 classes throughout the district: 13 high school and 11 middle school classes at the West Boylston Middle/High School, and 17 at the Major Edwards Elementary School. The team observed 18 ELA classes, 12 mathematics classes, and 11 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were one special education class, five science classes, and three history/social studies classes. 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.** Administrators and teachers mentioned the educator evaluation rubric as one reference tool for identifying best practice and shared several established mechanisms for discussion and support of these practices.
1. Observations showed that several practices described in the “Proficient” level of the educator evaluation rubric were implemented inconsistently districtwide.
 2. Administrators also reported that the district uses *The Skillful Teacher* as an instructional resource and told the team that no particular model or document is used to guide district instructional expectations.
 3. District leaders reported that they have been “guiding teachers to attend to the effective teaching practices in the Massachusetts Rubrics for Effective Teaching.”
 4. Administrators and teachers said that a variety of opportunities are built into school schedules and the district calendar for discussions about and support of instructional best practices.
 - a. Examples include teacher rounds, faculty meetings, K-5 common planning time, middle school team/ grade-level meetings, grades 6-12 department meetings, professional development days, elementary coaching/modeling of lessons, book studies, biweekly meetings among program Leaders/administrators, and regularly scheduled administrative meetings.
- B.** While observers found some evidence of implementation of research-based best practices throughout the district, implementation of key instructional practices was inconsistent across grade levels (See Appendix C).
1. Practices that incorporate the use of multiple instructional resources, including technology, to meet all students’ diverse learning needs were inconsistently seen in observed classrooms across the district.
 - a. The availability of multiple resources to meet all students’ diverse learning needs (#5) was clearly and consistently reflected in 61 percent of observed classrooms. Examples included primary source documents, mathematics manipulatives, listening stations, classroom literacy libraries, materials to build scale homes, engineering kits and tools, and videos.
 - i. This characteristic was most evident at the elementary school (in 82 percent of observed classes); this characteristic was observed in 55 percent and in 38 percent of the middle and high school classrooms, respectively.
 - b. Teachers were observed making use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning in 22 percent of observed classrooms; in 45 percent of middle-school, in 23 percent of high-school, and in 6 percent of elementary classes.

- i. LCD projectors and white boards were used in some classrooms to enhance instruction.
 - ii. Students clearly and consistently used technology such as laptops and graphing calculators as tools for learning and/or understanding in 12 percent of observed classrooms. This practice was noted in 23 percent of high-school, in 18 percent of middle-school, and in 0 percent of elementary classrooms.
 2. Instructional practices that reflect elements of good instructional design or the promotion of higher-order thinking were inconsistently implemented across grade levels.
 - a. While an agenda was posted in some classrooms, teachers clearly and consistently posted or shared with students clear learning objective(s) aligned to *the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (#8)* in 56 percent of classes overall. For example, one learning objective stated: “Today we will At the end of the lesson you will....” Learning objectives were shared with students in 82 percent of middle-school, in 53 percent of elementary, and in 38 percent of observed high-school classrooms.
 - b. In observed classrooms, teachers clearly and consistently planned and implemented lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations for students in 66 percent of all observed classrooms. This characteristic was most evident at the middle school (in 82 percent of observed classes); 71 percent of elementary and 46 percent of high school lessons reflected this characteristic.
 - i. Some observed lessons were teacher centered and not reflective of rigorous and high expectations for students. Students completed desk activities then waited for the next activity or directive; they listened to lectures, reviewed homework and practice problems, and watched demonstrations with little opportunity for engaging in higher-order thinking.
 - ii. Conversely, many lessons engaged all students with rigor and high expectations and were appropriately student centered. For example, students analyzed text about Benjamin Franklin and wrote about a lesson that they learned in their lifetime. Students in another classroom synthesized individual designs to create a scaled model of their ideal home with preset parameters. Others demonstrated active reading strategies to gather facts about ancient religions and to develop a persuasive essay using an “Argument Essay Rubric.”
 - c. Teachers in 54 percent of observed classrooms conducted frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction. Techniques such as “dipsticking,” asking clarifying questions, check-ins with individual or groups of students, exit tickets, and other lesson summary activities were observed in 71 percent of elementary, in 55 percent of middle-school, and in 31 percent of high-school classrooms.

- d. Across the district, in 49 percent of observed classrooms teachers clearly and consistently provided 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 or concepts (#11). At the middle school, 64 percent of observed lessons reflected this characteristic while 47 percent of elementary and 38 percent of high-school lessons provided this opportunity.
 - i. In these classrooms, teachers asked students to explore and analyze content, topics, and graphs; share their thinking; apply knowledge to solve problems and connect events; create models; make text-to-text and text-to-self connections; and analyze text including primary sources to uncover common themes or author's purpose.
- e. Clear and consistent teacher use of questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding (#12) was evident in 61 percent of observed classrooms. This strategy was most evident in 93 percent of elementary classrooms followed by 45 percent of middle-school and 38 percent of high-school classrooms.
 - i. Teachers in these classrooms scaffolded questions, allowing students to readily present then expand upon their thinking, deepening their responses and their understanding of a topic or concept. Students responded to questions such as, what is important about this?, what can we learn about this character from these clues?, why is this event so memorable to the character?, and what is a memorable moment in your life? Students responded to questions that required them to compare and contrast themes, events, and characters and explain multiple ways to solve a problem or represent an answer.

Impact: The use of effective instructional strategies is critical to the teaching process; their consistent implementation makes content/learning standards accessible and meaningful for all students. Without consistent implementation of effective instructional practices, districts cannot ensure that teachers consistently deliver high-quality and rigorous instruction that meets students' diverse learning needs and optimizes their college and career readiness.

Human Resources and Professional Development

8. The district's professional development program is aligned with and supportive of the district's strategic goals and focused on building local ability to provide professional development and improving student achievement. Its overall effectiveness, however, is diminished by the absence of a formal role for teachers in decision-making about professional development at the district level.

A. The district's professional development program is essentially an administrator-driven program; teachers have little formal opportunity for direct and active collaboration in its planning, implementation, or evaluation.

1. The review team was told that the district's professional development programming is directed by the superintendent with the assistance of her administrative team. Decisions about prioritization, planning, design, and delivery are made exclusively by this ad hoc "professional development committee."
2. Teachers and administrators said that although teachers can submit suggestions for professional development programming and are encouraged to provide professional development workshops and trainings for their colleagues teachers do not have representation or a formal role in the professional development decision-making process or a voice in the kinds of professional development offered within the district.
3. Interviews and 2012 TELL Mass survey data (the latest available) indicated an absence of evaluative input from teachers and feedback to staff.³

B. The district's Beginning Teacher Mentoring Program is designed to serve as an effective and efficient means of introducing first-year teachers to the expectations for curriculum development and instruction in the West Boylston Public Schools. Although well organized and supported, the one-year program is not designed to meet the needs of incoming teachers or a beginning teacher's second and third years of service.⁴

³ Of those teachers who responded to the 2012 TELL Mass survey (n=49), 61 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement: "The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about professional development." And 86 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement: "Professional development is evaluated and results are communicated to teachers."

⁴ ESE's 2015 [Guidelines for Induction and Mentoring Programs](#) states that one-year programs do meet the minimal state requirement and "strongly encourages districts to go beyond the minimum requirements as needed to ensure educators receive meaningful supports and leadership opportunities." In addition, the document states: "Districts are encouraged to extend induction programs through a beginning teacher's second and third years of teaching. Research and best practices show positive benefits in teacher effectiveness and retention when induction programs extend into the second and third year of an educator's practice. Examples of extending induction programs may include group mentoring or new teacher support groups." The Guidelines go on to state: "Expanding induction programs to three years also aligns with the Developing Educator Plan used in evaluation for teachers who do not have PTS and can provide them with support needed to reach proficiency within their first three years of practice."

Impact: By not providing teachers with formal opportunities to collaborate with administrators in the planning, design, and implementation of professional development programs and services, the district misses opportunities to:

- encourage the sharing of ideas;
- enhance teachers' sense of ownership, professionalism, and shared commitment to district goals;
- strengthen and expand the PLC model;
- promote shared leadership;
- better support continuous programming improvements; and
- improve learning opportunities and academic outcomes for students across the district.

West Boylston Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Curriculum and Instruction

1. **The district should complete as soon as possible its K-12 ELA and mathematics curriculum maps.**
 - A. The district should complete the alignment of grades 6-12 curricula, including grade 8 algebra content standards and select courses at the high school, to the 2011 mathematics standards. Grade/course specific common assessments and instructional resources should be added to the K-12 mathematics curriculum documents to ensure that all teachers have access to a complete and comprehensive curriculum.
 - B. The district should communicate to teachers the plan for completing the curriculum.
 1. The district should carry out its plan to continue developing DDMs and to add them to the curriculum maps.
 2. 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.
 3. The district should continue with its plans to integrate WIDA standards into the district's curriculum for classes in which English language learners participate.

Recommended resources:

- *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.
- *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 are 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.

2. It is recommended that the district provide more support to teachers in implementing key instructional elements and practices.

- A.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement key instructional practices.
1. Professional development should focus on key elements of effective teaching.
 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.

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/eval/communications/newsletter/2014-03.pdf>) includes a section called *Implementation Spotlight: Strategies for Focusing Observations and Providing Consistent, Constructive Feedback*.

Benefits: A district that prioritizes high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement at school, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

3. The district is encouraged to provide teachers with more formal, direct opportunities to collaborate with administration in the planning, design, and implementation of professional development and induction programs and services.

- A.** The district should consider creating a professional development committee, composed of representatives from all levels. This committee should be assigned primary responsibility for the overall direction, planning, implementation, and oversight of the district's professional development programs and services.
- B.** The district should consider establishing a steering committee, jointly composed of teachers and administrators, charged with developing a comprehensive induction program plan for both beginning and incoming teachers.
 - 1. The new induction plan should be designed as a fully coordinated three-year induction program that is integral to and directly supportive of the district's professional development goals and objectives.
 - 2. The new induction program plan should include: program goals; roles and responsibilities of key participants; orientation and training programs/schedules for teachers and their mentors; processes for mentor selection and matching; recognition and compensation for mentors; and a program evaluation component for both teachers and mentors.

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.
- *ESE's Guidelines for Induction & Mentoring Programs* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/guidelines.pdf>), published in April 2015, provides updated information for how districts can develop, implement, and refine induction and mentoring programs for educators new to the profession, the district, and/or their roles.

Benefits: The active involvement and formal collaboration of teachers in all aspects of the district's professional development process will:

- contribute to the creation of an authentic and more cohesive professional learning community and promote a model of shared leadership within the district;
- increase teachers' sense of ownership and enhance their support for and active participation in school improvement initiatives;

- promote a culture of professional growth and continuous improvement through shared learning and meaningful collaboration; and
- enhance instructional practices and overall educator effectiveness, academic opportunities, experiences, and outcomes for all students.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from March 16-19, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Thomas Pandiscio, leadership and governance and financial and asset management
2. Michele Kingsland-Smith, curriculum and instruction
3. Frank Sambuceti, assessment and professional development
4. James L. Hearn, *review team coordinator*, human resources and student support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president and building representative.

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

The team visited the following schools: Major Edwards Elementary (PK-5) and West Boylston Middle/High School (grades 6-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with two principals, an associate principal and an assistant principal, and a focus group with four elementary school teachers. No middle or high school teachers attended the middle/high school focus group. The team conducted a focus group with six high school students.

The team observed 41 classes in the district: 24 at the middle/high school and 17 at the elementary school.

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

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 03/16/2015	Tuesday 03/17/2015	Wednesday 03/18/2015	Thursday 03/19/2015
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews, including personnel files; and an interview with teachers’ association.	Interviews with town or city personnel; Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; school committee interviews; parent focus group; and visits to the middle/high school for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; Interviews with district staff and principals; visits to the Major Edwards Elementary School and the middle/high school for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to the Major Edwards Elementary School and the middle/high school for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: West Boylston Public Schools
2014-2015 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	16	1.7%	83,556	8.7%
Asian	13	1.4%	60,050	6.3%
Hispanic	65	7.0%	171,036	17.9%
Native American	1	0.1%	2,238	0.2%
White	814	87.2%	608,453	63.7%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	930	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	24	2.6%	29,581	3.1%
All Students	933	100.0%	955,844	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2014

**Table B1b: West Boylston Public Schools
2014-2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations⁵**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	149	--	15.8%	165,060	--	17.1%
Low Income	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs and Former ELLs	20	--	2.1%	81,146	--	8.5%
All high needs students	--	--	--	--	--	--

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 941; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391.

⁵ Because of changes in free-lunch policies in some districts the population of students from low-income families and high-needs students has not yet been calculated for the 2014-2015 school year.

**Table B2a: West Boylston 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	79	83.7	83	82.5	87.7	82.6	4	5.2
	P+	79	61.0%	57.0%	53.0%	72.0%	57.0%	11.0%	19.0%
4	CPI	80	91.5	85.7	88.2	83.8	79.1	-7.7	-4.4
	P+	80	77.0%	69.0%	71.0%	64.0%	54.0%	-13.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	75	73	73	82	64	49	-9	-18
5	CPI	68	87.8	87.8	88.7	92.3	84.5	4.5	3.6
	P+	68	69.0%	68.0%	69.0%	78.0%	64.0%	9.0%	9.0%
	SGP	65	47	38	57	61	50	14	4
6	CPI	72	87.2	85.3	93.1	85.1	85.8	-2.1	-8
	P+	72	65.0%	64.0%	79.0%	64.0%	68.0%	-1.0%	-15.0%
	SGP	70	29	30.5	45	40	50	11	-5
7	CPI	84	88	86.1	83.8	93.5	88.3	5.5	9.7
	P+	84	68.0%	61.0%	58.0%	80.0%	72.0%	12.0%	22.0%
	SGP	82	21.5	29.5	21	33.5	50	12	12.5
8	CPI	79	90.9	92.2	89.1	91.1	90.2	0.2	2
	P+	79	78.0%	82.0%	73.0%	80.0%	79.0%	2.0%	7.0%
	SGP	75	20	27	43	56	50	36	13
10	CPI	64	96.2	98.9	99	97.7	96	1.5	-1.3
	P+	64	89.0%	94.0%	93.0%	94.0%	90.0%	5.0%	1.0%
	SGP	58	69.5	62.5	85	72.5	50	3	-12.5
All	CPI	526	89.3	88.3	89.1	90	86.7	0.7	0.9
	P+	526	73.0%	70.0%	71.0%	75.0%	69.0%	2.0%	4.0%
	SGP	425	39	40	56	53	50	14	-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: West Boylston 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	80	85.2	77.8	82.5	89.7	85.1	4.5	7.2
	P+	80	62.0%	54.0%	63.0%	78.0%	68.0%	16.0%	15.0%
4	CPI	80	87	83.2	87.5	88.4	79.6	1.4	0.9
	P+	80	62.0%	58.0%	66.0%	68.0%	52.0%	6.0%	2.0%
	SGP	75	53	56.5	72	69	50	16	-3
5	CPI	67	80.9	86.3	85.3	89.6	80.4	8.7	4.3
	P+	67	58.0%	70.0%	64.0%	75.0%	61.0%	17.0%	11.0%
	SGP	64	43	48	48	54	50	11	6
6	CPI	72	86.7	83.3	94.7	92.7	80.2	6	-2
	P+	72	68.0%	69.0%	84.0%	78.0%	60.0%	10.0%	-6.0%
	SGP	69	59	50	71	76	50	17	5
7	CPI	85	73.6	81.4	77.5	82.1	72.5	8.5	4.6
	P+	85	53.0%	54.0%	59.0%	62.0%	50.0%	9.0%	3.0%
	SGP	83	43	35	44	37	50	-6	-7
8	CPI	79	75.6	73.1	72	69.6	74.7	-6	-2.4
	P+	79	54.0%	42.0%	43.0%	43.0%	52.0%	-11.0%	0.0%
	SGP	75	24	29	30	24	50	0	-6
10	CPI	64	91.8	99.3	94.5	91.8	90	0	-2.7
	P+	64	84.0%	94.0%	82.0%	86.0%	79.0%	2.0%	4.0%
	SGP	58	79	69	41.5	57.5	50	-21.5	16
All	CPI	527	82.7	83.5	84.4	85.9	80.3	3.2	1.5
	P+	527	63.0%	63.0%	65.0%	69.0%	60.0%	6.0%	4.0%
	SGP	424	50	48	52	53	50	3	1

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

**Table B2c: West Boylston 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	68	85.1	90.1	85.5	88.6	79	3.5	3.1
	P+	68	63.0%	74.0%	61.0%	69.0%	53.0%	6.0%	8.0%
8	CPI	78	78	70.8	70.7	67	72.4	-11	-3.7
	P+	78	55.0%	32.0%	35.0%	27.0%	42.0%	-28.0%	-8.0%
10	CPI	56	86.5	89.7	92.7	83.5	87.9	-3	-9.2
	P+	56	66.0%	71.0%	80.0%	57.0%	71.0%	-9.0%	-23.0%
All	CPI	202	82.7	83.7	81.6	78.8	79.6	-3.9	-2.8
	P+	202	60.0%	60.0%	56.0%	50.0%	55.0%	-10.0%	-6.0%

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: West Boylston 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	118	73.7	73.1	74.3	73.3	-0.4	-1
		P+	118	37.0%	38.0%	39.0%	42.0%	5.0%	3.0%
		SGP	90	35	36	50.5	45	10	-5.5
	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	53	80.6	80.1	82.8	84	3.4	1.2
		P+	53	54.0%	55.0%	57.0%	62.0%	8.0%	5.0%
		SGP	41	33	33	58	52	19	-6
	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	75	65.2	64.3	63.7	63.7	-1.5	0
		P+	75	20.0%	21.0%	19.0%	23.0%	3.0%	4.0%
		SGP	56	37	37	43.5	35.5	-1.5	-8
	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	12	0	0	0	70.8	70.8	70.8
		P+	12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
		SGP	8	--	--	--	--	--	--
	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	526	89.3	88.3	89.1	90	0.7	0.9
		P+	526	73.0%	70.0%	71.0%	75.0%	2.0%	4.0%
		SGP	425	39	40	56	53	14	-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: West Boylston 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	119	63.3	65.7	67.7	64.7	1.4	-3
		P+	119	29.0%	32.0%	33.0%	33.0%	4.0%	0.0%
		SGP	90	39.5	48	58	50	10.5	-8
	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	53	70.8	72.1	76.5	74.5	3.7	-2
		P+	53	46.0%	45.0%	51.0%	47.0%	1.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	40	40	54.5	58	44	4	-14
	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	76	54.4	56.6	57.9	54.3	-0.1	-3.6
		P+	76	13.0%	16.0%	14.0%	18.0%	5.0%	4.0%
		SGP	56	36	48.5	61	49.5	13.5	-11.5
	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	12	0	0	0	68.8	68.8	68.8
		P+	12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%	33.0%	33.0%
		SGP	8	--	--	--	--	--	--
	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	527	82.7	83.5	84.4	85.9	3.2	1.5
		P+	527	63.0%	63.0%	65.0%	69.0%	6.0%	4.0%
		SGP	424	50	48	52	53	3	1
	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: West Boylston 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	46	64.1	70.2	68.5	59.2	-4.9	-9.3
		P+	46	24.0%	33.0%	25.0%	11.0%	-13.0%	-14.0%
	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	21	63.6	75	71.3	65.5	1.9	-5.8
		P+	21	23.0%	44.0%	41.0%	10.0%	-13.0%	-31.0%
	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	27	60.9	62.5	63.8	55.6	-5.3	-8.2
		P+	27	21.0%	15.0%	8.0%	11.0%	-10.0%	3.0%
	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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	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	202	82.7	83.7	81.6	78.8	-3.9	-2.8
		P+	202	60.0%	60.0%	56.0%	50.0%	-10.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	211,440	77.6	78.6	79	79.6	2	0.6
		P+	211,440	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: West Boylston Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2011-2014**

	School Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	0.7%	1.8%	3.0%	2.5%	1.8	257.1%	-0.5	-16.7%	2.0%

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: West Boylston Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2011-2014**

Group	Number Included (2014)	School Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	21	79.2%	69.6%	66.7%	85.7%	6.5	8.2%	19.0	28.5%	76.5%
Low income	14	87.5%	80.0%	55.6%	92.9%	5.4	6.2%	37.3	67.1%	75.5%
Students w/ disabilities	12	60.0%	45.5%	75.0%	75.0%	15.0	25.0%	0.0	0.0%	69.1%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.9%
All students	71	90.3%	86.0%	89.1%	91.5%	1.2	1.3%	2.4	2.7%	86.1%

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: West Boylston Public Schools
Five-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	15	90.0%	83.3%	73.9%	73.3%	-16.7	-18.6%	-0.6	-0.8%	79.2%
Low income	9	87.5%	87.5%	86.7%	66.7%	-20.8	-23.8%	-20.0	-23.1%	78.3%
Students w/ disabilities	8	91.7%	70.0%	54.5%	75.0%	-16.7	-18.2%	20.5	37.6%	72.9%
English language learners or Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	70.9%
All students	64	96.5%	93.1%	89.5%	92.2%	-4.3	-4.5%	2.7	3.0%	87.7%

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: West Boylston 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	95.7%	95.8%	95.5%	95.8%	0.1	0.1%	0.3	0.3%	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: West Boylston Public Schools
Suspension 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	
In-School Suspension Rate	1.3%	2.5%	1.1%	2.5%	1.2	92.3%	1.4	127.3%	2.1%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	2.4%	4.3%	3.6%	3.0%	0.6	25.0%	-0.6	-16.7%	3.9%

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: West Boylston 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	\$9,802,817	\$9,806,829	\$10,151,094	\$10,128,027	\$10,444,680	\$10,378,312
By municipality	\$3,609,240	\$3,447,316	\$3,547,884	\$3,870,470	\$3,980,939	\$3,915,640
Total from local appropriations	\$13,412,057	\$13,254,145	\$13,698,978	\$13,998,497	\$14,425,619	\$14,293,952
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$1,417,644	--	\$1,339,395	--	\$1,448,009
Total expenditures	--	\$14,671,789	--	\$15,337,893	--	\$15,741,961
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$2,804,550	--	\$2,841,510	--	\$2,864,560
Required local contribution	--	\$6,360,524	--	\$6,565,606	--	\$6,706,677
Required net school spending**	--	\$9,165,074	--	\$9,407,116	--	\$9,571,237
Actual net school spending	--	\$11,259,473	--	\$12,064,391	--	\$12,315,374
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$2,094,399	--	\$2,657,275	--	\$2,774,137
Over/under required (%)	--	22.9	--	28.2	--	28.7

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

Data retrieved March 23, 2015, and April 13, 2015

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

Expenditure Category	2011	2012	2013
Administration	\$649	\$669	\$682
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$652	\$657	\$693
Teachers	\$5,495	\$5,243	\$5,627
Other teaching services	\$894	\$911	\$679
Professional development	\$75	\$45	\$45
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$176	\$174	\$150
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$510	\$485	\$437
Pupil services	\$1,020	\$944	\$960
Operations and maintenance	\$760	\$812	\$784
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,911	\$1,940	\$2,443
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$12,143	\$11,880	\$12,500

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%	6%	94%
	MS	0%	0%	100%
	HS	0%	15%	85%
	Total #	0	3	38
	Total %	0%	7%	93%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	0%	6%	94%
	MS	0%	0%	100%
	HS	0%	15%	85%
	Total #	0	3	38
	Total %	0%	7%	93%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	0%	9%	91%
	HS	0%	38%	62%
	Total #	0	6	35
	Total %	0%	15%	85%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	6%	6%	88%
	MS	9%	9%	82%
	HS	8%	15%	77%
	Total #	3	4	34
	Total %	7%	10%	83%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	12%	6%	82%
	MS	18%	27%	55%
	HS	23%	38%	38%
	Total #	7	9	25
	Total %	17%	22%	61%
Teaching				
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0%	0%	100%
	MS	0%	0%	100%
	HS	0%	0%	100%
	Total #	0	0	41
	Total %	0%	0%	100%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	6%	24%	71%
	MS	0%	18%	82%
	HS	8%	46%	46%
	Total #	2	12	27
	Total %	5%	29%	66%

Teaching (continued)	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to the <i>2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks</i> .	ES	29%	18%	53%
	MS	9%	9%	82%
	HS	15%	46%	38%
	Total #	8	10	23
	Total %	20%	24%	56%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	ES	0%	24%	76%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	23%	15%	62%
	Total #	4	8	29
	Total %	10%	20%	71%
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	53%	18%	29%
	MS	64%	18%	18%
	HS	54%	46%	0%
	Total #	23	11	7
	Total %	56%	27%	17%
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	12%	41%	47%
	MS	9%	27%	64%
	HS	31%	31%	38%
	Total #	7	14	20
	Total %	17%	34%	49%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	0%	7%	93%
	MS	18%	36%	45%
	HS	23%	38%	38%
	Total #	5	10	23
	Total %	13%	26%	61%
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas.	ES	12%	0%	88%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	15%	8%	77%
	Total #	5	3	33
	Total %	12%	7%	80%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	0%	18%	82%
	MS	9%	18%	73%
	HS	15%	23%	62%
	Total #	3	8	30
	Total %	7%	20%	73%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	12%	18%	71%
	MS	9%	36%	55%
	HS	31%	38%	31%
	Total #	7	12	22
	Total %	17%	29%	54%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	88%	6%	6%
	MS	55%	0%	45%
	HS	46%	31%	23%
	Total #	27	5	9
	Total %	66%	12%	22%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	0%	35%	65%
	MS	0%	36%	64%
	HS	15%	38%	46%
	Total #	2	15	24
	Total %	5%	37%	59%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	ES	6%	39%	56%
	MS	18%	18%	64%
	HS	31%	15%	54%
	Total #	7	11	24
	Total %	17%	26%	57%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	29%	35%	35%
	MS	8%	25%	67%
	HS	38%	23%	38%
	Total #	11	12	19
	Total %	26%	29%	45%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	47%	6%	47%
	MS	9%	36%	55%
	HS	31%	31%	38%
	Total #	13	9	19
	Total %	32%	22%	46%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	53%	12%	35%
	MS	36%	18%	45%
	HS	38%	23%	38%
	Total #	18	7	16
	Total %	44%	17%	39%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	94%	6%	0%
	MS	73%	9%	18%
	HS	54%	23%	23%
	Total #	31	5	5
	Total %	76%	12%	12%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	22%	28%	50%
	MS	0%	27%	73%
	HS	23%	15%	62%
	Total #	7	10	25
	Total %	17%	24%	60%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	41%	18%	41%
	MS	36%	9%	55%
	HS	31%	23%	46%
	Total #	15	7	19
	Total %	37%	17%	46%