

District Review Report

Beverly Public Schools

Review conducted April 29-May 2, 2013



Center for District and School Accountability
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Beverly Public Schools District Review Overview	1
Beverly Public Schools District Review Findings	12
Beverly Public Schools District Review Recommendations	40
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit	51
Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance	53
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory:	66

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

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.

© 2014 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



Beverly 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 system wide functions using the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) six district standards: 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 2012-2013 school year included those classified into Level 3¹ of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance in each of the state's six regions: Greater Boston, Berkshires, Northeast, Southeast, Central, and Pioneer Valley. 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 review 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 on-site 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 Beverly was conducted from April 29-May 2, 2013. The site visit included 37.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 86 stakeholders, including school committee

¹ Districts selected were in Level 3 in school year 2012-2013; all served one or more schools among the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving common grade levels pursuant to 603 CMR 2.05(2)(a). The districts with the lowest aggregate performance and least movement in Composite Performance Index (CPI) in their respective regions were selected for review from among those districts not exempt under Chapter 15, Section 55A. A district was exempt if another comprehensive review was completed or scheduled within nine months of the review window.

members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 9 elementary school teachers, 4 middle school teachers, and 10 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, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 57 classrooms in 7 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

Beverly has a mayoral form of government, and the mayor sits as a member of the school committee; the president of the school committee is elected by the school committee members. There are seven members of the school committee, the mayor and a representative from each ward; they meet monthly.

At the time of the review, the superintendent had been in the position since 2009. The district leadership team included the assistant superintendent, the director of special education, and the director of finance; central office positions were mostly stable in number over the three years before the site visit; at the end of the 2012-2013 school year, both the superintendent and the assistant superintendent retired. The district has seven principals leading seven schools. There are five other school administrators, including assistant principals; the assistant principals are members of a bargaining unit. There were 296 teachers in the district in 2012-2013.

As of October 1, 2012, 4,335 students were enrolled in the district's 7 schools:

**Table 1: Beverly
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Centerville Elementary	Elementary	K-5	363
Cove Elementary	Elementary	PK-5	500
Hannah Elementary	Elementary	PK-5	371
North Beverly Elementary	Elementary	K-5	392
Ayers/Ryal Side School	Elementary	K-5	484
Briscoe Middle	Middle School	6-8	924
Beverly High	High School	9-12	1,301
Totals	7 Schools	PK-12	4,335
Note: Enrollment figures as of October 1, 2012			

Between 2007-2008 and 2012-2013 overall student enrollment decreased by 1.5 percent, from 4,397 in 2008 to 4,219 in 2009 to 4,269 in 2010 to 4,251 in 2011 to 4,252 in 2012 to 4,335 in 2013. 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 state enrollment figures for those populations, are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were slightly higher than the median in-district per-pupil expenditure for all 25 K-12 districts of similar size (4,000-4,999 students): \$11,895 in fiscal year 2012 compared with \$11,635. Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district's level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6) annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for the district and for schools and student subgroups that have at least four years of sufficient data and are therefore eligible to be classified into an accountability and assistance level (1-5). "Sufficient data" means that at least 20 students in a district or school or at least 30 students in a subgroup were assessed on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests for the four years under review.

Four-and two-year trend data are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. Data on student performance is also available in Appendix B. In both this section and Appendix B, the data reported is the most recent available.

1. The district is Level 3 because the North Beverly Elementary School is Level 3.²

A. The North Beverly Elementary School is among the lowest performing 20 percent of elementary schools.³

² Due to the district's Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of "Needs Technical Assistance (NTA)." This serves as an indication that while areas of the district's performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues.

³ A district is classified into the level of its lowest-performing school unless it has been placed in Level 4 or 5 by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education independent of the level of its schools.

B. The district's seven schools place between the 20th percentile and the 58th percentile based on each school's four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other schools serving the same or similar grades: Centerville Elementary (44th percentile of elementary schools); Cove Elementary (52nd percentile of elementary schools); Hannah Elementary] (58th percentile of elementary schools); North Beverly Elementary (20th percentile of elementary schools); Ayers/Ryal Side Elementary (53rd percentile of elementary schools); Briscoe Middle (55th percentile of middle schools); and Beverly High (41st percentile of high schools).

2. The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.

A. The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students and for high needs⁴ students is less than 75 for the district. The district's cumulative PPI⁵ is 74 for all students and 57 for high needs students. The district's cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 62 (low income students), 76 (ELL and former ELL students), 37 (students with disabilities), 83 (Asian students), 62 (African American/Black students), 74 (Hispanic/Latino students), 100 (Multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students) and 76 (White students).

3. The district's English language arts (ELA) performance is low⁷ relative to other districts and its growth⁸ is moderate.⁹

⁴ The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

⁵ The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district's, school's or subgroup's cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group's annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale.

⁶ The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school's performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades.

⁷ All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state's measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, ELL and former ELL students, students with disabilities, Asian students, African-American/Black students, and Hispanic/Latino students.¹⁰

B. The district met its annual growth for all students, African-American/Black students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for high needs students, low-income students, students with disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students.

C. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, high needs students, ELL and former ELL students, students with disabilities, Asian students, and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino.

D. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grades 6, 8, and overall, and low performance in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, and 10 relative to other districts.

E. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate growth in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and overall.

grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: “very high”, “high”, “moderate”, “low” or “very low”. In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts’ CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools’ CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department’s School and District Profiles website: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx.

⁸ Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student’s or group of students’ achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student’s MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles (“academic peers”). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group’s progress toward proficiency based on the group’s current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group’s progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates “moderate” or “typical” growth if the group’s median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles.

⁹ For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a.

¹⁰ A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target.

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful¹¹ declines in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced. Most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

G. The 2012 performance of Centerville Elementary (K-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and CPI. The school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI, and SGP. Most of the gains in grade 3 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grades 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of Cove Elementary (PK-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 4 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI, and SGP. The school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and CPI. Most of the gains in grade 4 were attributable to its performance between 2011 and 2012, and most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

I. The 2012 performance of Hannah Elementary (PK-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grades 4, 5, and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced and CPI. Most of the declines in grades 4, 5, and overall were attributed to its performance over both periods.

J. The 2012 performance of North Beverly Elementary (K-5) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate.

¹¹ The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa.

K. The 2012 performance of Ayers/Ryal Side School (K-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and SGP. The school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 3 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and CPI. Most of the gains in grade 5 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grades 3 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

L. The 2012 performance of Briscoe Middle (6-8) is high relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 8 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and SGP. Most of the gains in grade 8 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

M. The 2012 performance of Beverly High (9-12) is low relative to other high schools and its growth is moderate.

4. The district's mathematics performance is low relative to other districts and its growth is moderate.¹²

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, ELL and former ELL students, multi-race non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, Asian students, African-American/Black students, and Latino/Hispanic students.

B. The district met its annual growth for all students, African-American/Black students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and Hispanic/Latino students.

C. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, high needs students, low income students, ELL and Former ELL students, African American/Black students, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for all students, ELL and former ELL students, Asian students, Hispanic/Latino students, multi-race, non-Hispanic/Latino students, and White students.

D. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grades 6, 8, and overall, and low performance in grades 3, 4, 5, 7, 10 relative to other districts.

¹² For mathematics trends in the aggregate see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b.

E. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate growth in grades 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and overall relative to other districts.

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 5, 6, 7, and overall. Most of the gains in grade 6 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the gains in grades 5 and 7 were attributed to its performance between 2009 and 2012.

G. The 2012 performance of Centerville Elementary (K-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 3, 4 and overall. Most of the gains in grade 3 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of Cove Elementary (PK-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI. Most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

I. The 2012 performance of Hannah Elementary (PK-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grades 3 and 5 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and CPI. Most of the declines in grades 3 and 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

J. The 2012 performance of North Beverly Elementary (K-5) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is low. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grades 3 and 4. Most of the declines in grades were attributed to its performance over both periods.

K. The 2012 performance of Ayers/Ryal Side School (K-5) is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 3, 4, 5, and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI, and SGP. Most of the gains in grades 3, 4, 5, and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

L. The 2012 performance of Briscoe Middle (6-8) is moderate relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 6, 7, and overall in the percentage of students

scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI, and SGP. Most of the gains in grades 6, 7, and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

M. The 2012 performance of Beverly High (9-12) is moderate relative to other high schools and its growth is moderate.

5. The district's science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is low relative to other districts.¹³

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities.

B. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, students with disabilities, and White students, and it did not earn extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for any reportable group.

C. In 2012 the district demonstrated moderate performance in grades 8 and 10, and low performance in grades 5 and overall relative to other districts.

D. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated no potentially meaningful gains or declines.

E. The 2012 performance of Centerville Elementary (K-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools.

F. The 2012 performance of Cove Elementary (PK-5) is low relative to other elementary schools.

G. The 2012 performance of Hannah Elementary (PK-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools.

H. The 2012 performance of North Beverly Elementary (K-5) is low relative to other elementary schools.

I. The 2012 performance of Ayers/Ryal Side School (K-5) is moderate relative to other elementary schools.

¹³ For STE trends in the aggregate see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c.

J. The 2012 performance of Briscoe Middle (6-8) is moderate relative to other middle schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 8 and overall in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher, and CPI. Most of the gains in grade 8 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

K. The 2012 performance of Beverly High (9-12) is moderate relative to other high schools.

6. In 2012, the district met its annual improvement targets for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate, and the five-year cohort graduation rate.¹⁴ The district did not meet its annual improvement targets for the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate. Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available,¹⁵ the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate declined, the five-year cohort graduation rate declined, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined.¹⁶

A. Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 0.5 percentage points, from 80.5% to 81.0%, an increase of 0.6 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 4.9 percentage points, from 85.9% to 81.0%, a decrease of 5.7 percent.

B. Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate increased 0.1 percentage points, from 87.1% to 87.2%, an increase of 0.1 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it declined 1.2 percentage points, from 88.4% to 87.2%, a decrease of 1.4 percent.

C. Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined 0.3 percentage points, from 2.0% to 1.7%, a decrease of 16.5 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 1.2 percentage points, from 2.9% to 1.7%, a decrease of 42.4 percent.

¹⁴ All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state's federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher.

¹⁵ Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote.

¹⁶ For annual dropout rate trends for the last three years available, see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available, see Tables B7a and B7b.

7. The district's rates of in-school suspensions and out-of-school suspensions in 2011-2012 were significantly lower than the statewide rates.¹⁷

A. The rate of in-school suspensions for Beverly was 1.7 percent, half the state rate of 3.4 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Beverly was 3.4 percent, lower than the state rate of 5.4 percent.

B. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for in-school suspensions.¹⁸ The in-school-suspension rate was 3.1 percent for African-American/Black students, 1.5 percent for Asian students, 4.4 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 0.0 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 1.4 percent for White students.

C. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for out-of-school suspensions. The out-of-school-suspension rate was 4.1 percent for African-American/Black students, 1.5 percent for Asian students, 7.0 percent for Hispanic/Latino student, 4.6 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 3.0 percent for White students.

D. There was a significant difference between the in-school suspension rates of high needs students and non high needs students (3.4 percent compared to 0.7 percent), low income students and non low income students (4.1 percent compared to 0.8 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (3.9 percent compared to 1.2 percent). The 2011-2012 in-school suspension rate of 3.9 percent for students with disabilities was lower than the rate of 5.7 percent for their state peers.

E. There was also a significant difference between the rates of out-of-school suspension for high needs students and those for non high needs students (7.0 percent compared to 1.3 percent), low income students and non low income students (8.1 percent compared to 1.7 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (9.5 percent compared to 2.1 percent).

F. On average students in the Beverly Public Schools missed 1.6 days per disciplinary action,¹⁹ half the state average of 3.1.

¹⁷ Statistical significance based on one sample T test. $P \leq .05$

¹⁸ Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square. $P \leq .05$

¹⁹ Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting.

Beverly Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. There is a district strategic plan, to which the budget prepared by the superintendent is aligned, that drives all School Improvement Plans (SIPs) and teachers' goals.

A. The superintendent, in conjunction with a representative committee, developed a strategic plan that was approved by the school committee.

1. A team of 21 people representing teachers, administrators, the school committee, and the community developed the strategic plan in 2011. Three teams with similar representation developed action plans for each goal.
2. The school committee approved the strategic plan in April 2011 and the plan's update in November 2012.

B. The strategic plan has three major goals.

1. Provide engaging and equitable opportunities to enhance & sustain learning
2. Prepare students for higher education and the 21st Century workforce
3. Increase sustainable and productive community partnerships to maximize educational opportunities

C. The strategic plan drives the work of the district.

1. SIPs follow from the strategic plan.
2. A review of a random selection of teachers' goals showed that they follow the SIPs, which follow from the strategic plan.
3. The superintendent prepares a budget that is aligned with the strategic plan.

Impact: A strategic plan that has been developed by a cross-section of members of the school community is available to provide the vision and direction for all work of the school district.

- The school committee has approved the direction of the school district.
- The superintendent has a blueprint from which to lead the district.

- The principals have the opportunity and obligation to align the work in their schools with the strategic plan.
- The teachers have the opportunity and obligation to align the work in their classrooms with the strategic plan.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. Curriculum and instructional leadership at the elementary level, supported by the district leadership, is in the process of successfully integrating a literacy model that emphasizes the use of data to improve instruction.

- A. Elementary principals, working with coaches, are in the process of providing their teachers with a model of continuous improvement in teaching and learning.
 1. Coaches who have been working for a number of years at the three Title I schools are moving beyond the presentation of data to helping teachers analyze and use data to inform instruction.
 2. All elementary principals, recognizing the importance of teachers working collaboratively, have established common planning time for the teachers in their schools.
 3. Elementary principals have ensured that substantial professional development for literacy instruction has been provided through the Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI) program and the regional District and School Assistance Center (DSAC).
 4. Teachers said that they were feeling “comfortable” engaging in the analysis of data with the reading teacher. One teacher said, “The coach helps us set up interventions.”
- B. The elementary principals themselves are working as a professional learning community. They support one another, share insights and skills, and provide each other with feedback.

Impact: The emergence of a unified understanding among the elementary principals of what constitutes a successful literacy model and how it should be implemented is contributing to a shift in teaching at the elementary schools that is likely to result in improved student learning. The success of the implementation of this literacy model is now driving the implementation of a similar model of data analysis to inform mathematics instruction at the elementary level.

Assessment

3. The district is beginning to build a culture of school, educator, and student improvement through the effective use of data.

- A.** The district's multi-year strategic plan guides the SIPs and the teachers' goals, and contains measurable objectives, specific indicators of performance, and a timeline for outcomes.
- B.** Most SIPs list goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound. All schools provide mid-year progress reports on the attainment of their goals.
 - 1. In the elementary schools where there are purposeful, formalized methods to assess and communicate student growth, the progress reports for SIPs provide important information about school improvement. For example, the Ayers/Ryal Side Elementary School's November 2012 progress report discussed instructional change strategies, activities, persons responsible, resources needed, timelines, and indicators of success.
 - 2. In a few schools, the SIPs have goals related to improving student achievement as measured, e.g., by the Composite Performance Index, MCAS proficiency rates, success on answering open response questions, or Student Growth Percentiles. These include: Hannah Elementary School, Briscoe Middle School, and Beverly High School.
- C.** A districtwide data team, which had been in existence for two years at the time of the review, meets monthly and was focusing on closing achievement gaps. Membership includes the assistant superintendent, the high school principal, the director of special education, one elementary principal, a middle school assistant principal, and the district data coordinator.
- D.** The district has most fully developed its system of data collection and data-based decision-making practices at the elementary level, while the schools at the secondary level are beginning to move in this direction.
 - 1. The elementary schools are in various stages of implementing the BSRI model; they have all formed data teams at each grade level and use common protocols for analysis and decision-making for intervention and re-teaching.
 - 2. All elementary schools use the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE), as well as common district-developed mathematics tests. All elementary schools use benchmark tests three times per year. Elementary report cards are standards based.
 - 3. At the secondary level, the high school is further along than the middle school in its development of common assessments and use of data to drive decision-making. The most

recent New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) report and the school's participation in the Smaller Learning Communities (SLC) grant have provided impetus for change at the high school. Although the middle school uses "do now's" and exit tickets to guide instruction, its use of data to guide daily instruction and inform decision-making is in the early stages.

4. As a result of analyzing data, the high school leveled its classes, established advisory periods, and extended the use of the Collins writing program across all courses.

Impact: As a result of the district's focus on the use of data analysis to improve instruction, it is beginning to build a culture of data-driven decision-making centered on results, and to set an expectation that staff will analyze data for interventions and daily instruction. Although there is some variation in skills relating to data use among school leaders and teachers, a common language and common practices are emerging across the district.

Human Resources and Professional Development

4. The adoption of a new educator evaluation system was a collaborative effort and the district was in the process of implementing it.

- A. Interviews and a review of documents showed that the district, a participant in the Race to the Top program, had negotiated and adopted a new system of educator evaluation with some modifications from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's model system.
 1. Agreement on the evaluation system was reached before the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year, and language was added to the collective bargaining agreement. Pursuant to 603 CMR 35.11(2), the Department reviewed the language to ensure consistency with the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's Principles of Evaluation.
 2. Interviews with school leaders, teachers' association officers, and teachers indicated that negotiations were carried out in a collaborative atmosphere. A working committee including the superintendent, assistant superintendent, teachers, and association representatives cooperated to reach consensus. The superintendent and association president provided strong leadership in reaching the agreement, according to school committee members.
 3. District leaders described a collaborative relationship with the teachers' association. The association noted that they had worked together as a team with administrators to forge an agreement.

4. Principals said that the key to the success of the negotiation of the new system was a good relationship with the association. They agreed that the association and administration worked in a partnership.
 5. Interviews with school committee members reaffirmed the collaborative relationship with the teachers' association that was vital to finalizing the agreement.
- B.** Interviews and a random review of files indicated that the district's evaluation system was being implemented on schedule.
1. Necessary training for teachers and administrators took place over a fifteen-month period, starting in January 2012, according to administrators. In September 2012, a great deal of work on establishing SMART goals was completed during an all-day in-service session.
 2. The entire instructional staff was involved in the process: half on a one-year plan, half on a two-year plan. A review of files showed that all professional staff members were using My Learning Plan to track their growth online during 2012-2013.
 3. A review of the My Learning Plan files showed that the goal setting was consistently related to the district's strategic plan and SIPs.
 4. Interviews and a review of files showed that walkthroughs were taking place, increasing the time spent by administrators in the classroom. Administrators were providing feedback to staff on their work, and teachers said that this feedback had been swift and helpful. In a majority of cases, mid-year formative assessments focused on instruction had been completed.
- C.** Interviews indicated that in the first year of implementation administrators and teachers were making progress in implementing the educator evaluation system.
1. The superintendent said that the district's educator evaluation system had provided leverage to change administrator and staff practices, a major goal for her, and that alignment of SMART goals with district and SIP goals had been important.
 2. Teachers' association leaders referred to the "excellent" feedback that "helps teachers grow." The teacher facilitators and coaches, as well as the principals, said that they saw the new system as changing instruction to "more of a coaching model."
 3. Principals noted that the educator evaluation system "has put teaching/learning at the forefront." Principals added that the implementation of the system was becoming a path to improving instruction in their schools.

Impact: The district's efforts so far to implement its new, collaboratively negotiated educator evaluation system have been perceived as bringing about positive instructional changes. The collaboration initiated in this process has the potential to help improve instruction and to set a tone for cooperative work across the district.

Student Support

5. The district has formed a range of relationships and partnerships with organizations in the local area to support students, and the district itself offers several curricular and extracurricular support programs. There is a sense of community in and around the schools.

- A.** The district maintains partnerships with outside organizations and reaches out to the community.
 - 1. The coordinator of child welfare and attendance serves as a link between the district and several community social and mental health services providing health and counseling referrals, as well as charitable organizations such as Bootstraps. The latter organization runs the food pantry and sometimes provides, e.g., free tickets and clothing for the prom for students in need of them. It also offers educational services such as tutoring and support for GED programs, and a cyber café for middle school students.
 - 2. The coordinator of child welfare and attendance refers families to and works with the North Shore Community Action Plan, which assists families who are in danger of becoming homeless or being evicted.
 - 3. The district provides transportation to school events for elementary and secondary students who live in Apple Village, a low-income housing area from which the only access to the schools is by vehicle.
 - 4. Through the District Attorney's Office for Essex County the elementary, middle, and high schools have a partnership with the Community Collaborative Initiative to assist with student risk issues.
 - 5. Students in the culinary arts elective at the high school can continue at North Shore Community College through an articulation agreement.
 - 6. An agreement with Merrimack and Endicott Colleges brings their graduate education students to serve as fellows who can lead small group instruction, co-teach, and provide independent class instruction. The fellows program also enables the district to deliver intervention services at low cost.

B. In some schools the district provides support services for students that extend beyond the school day or year.

1. Each spring elementary schools offer homework support and transportation for students at Apple Village or other students living at a distance.
2. The summer academy for elementary school students offers children a number of creative and educational programs. The brochure specifically states that although the district is operating the program at an affordable price, there is financial help available for families who find the tuition too high. Contact information is provided in the brochure.
3. The middle school provides a summer school for students in grades 6 and 7 who receive a failing grade in math or ELA.
4. The Summer Success transition program between grades 8 and 9 offers students with Individualized Educational Programs, those with anxiety disorders, and those who have not passed grade 8 courses an opportunity to ease the transition to high school and develop both the academic and the social skills needed for success. Peer leaders play a significant role in making this a welcoming and effective program.
5. The high school operates a summer school for students who have failed a course, as long as the failing grade is not because of unexcused absences. It also has an after-school credit recovery program called STAY, where students use a software program called NovaNET.

C. The community is supportive of the schools.

1. Parent organizations are active and successful in raising funds for the schools.
2. Parents with skills in subjects such as science have given presentations to elementary school students in their areas of expertise.
3. Students identify a sense of community within the schools.

Impact: When a district has strong links to the community and community resources, as well as support programs of its own, students and the school district as a whole benefit from access to personal, health, counseling, and educational opportunities. These supplementary, wraparound services assist students on their path to a successful school experience.

Finance and Asset Management

6. Close communications and collaboration with city officials have contributed to well managed maintenance of buildings and grounds, support for building renovations, and stable and predictable school budgets.

- A.** City officials as well as school committee members are well informed about school budget requests, the condition of buildings and grounds, and the financial condition of the district; they voiced confidence in the financial information they receive.
 - 1. The school committee's standing committee on finance and facilities includes city council members and members of the community as well as school committee members and administrators, and its monthly meetings are public and attended by other members of the school committee and the public. Its work includes the review of budget proposals; it receives reports on maintenance of the buildings and grounds; it reviews reports on the financial condition of the district and recommends budget transfers as needed; and it reviews and proposes policies affecting financial and facility matters.
 - a. The budget document is complete and transparent, including a comparison of proposed budgets to the current budget for the budget lines and subtotals for each cost center, highlights of proposed changes, and the use of outside funds and revenues. The budget development process is also transparent, including presentations by principals to the school committee as well as open standing committee and school committee meetings and a public hearing.
 - b. Monthly financial reports include the approved and revised budgets, expenditures and encumbrances to date, current balances, and the percent of budget remaining.
 - 2. The school committee and city council hold joint meetings to review areas of mutual concern such as the budget and building needs.
 - 3. School committee and city council members and school and city administrators also participate in a financial forecasting committee in January in order to review projected revenues for the city and their implications for allocation to city departments.
- B.** The school district and city have consolidated custodial and maintenance services, and have found the arrangement to be effective and efficient. City plumbers, electricians, and carpenters assist with school maintenance.
- C.** The school committee and the community have supported building renovations for the schools, most recently a renovated high school and proposed renovations for the middle school.

1. The renovation of the high school building was completed in 2010 with city council support and without the need for an override vote.
 2. Not long before the review team's visit, the school committee voted to approve a Statement of Interest (SOI) to the MSBA for renovations to the middle school, and during the team's visit city officials voiced support for the project.
- D.** The city has agreed to approximately \$1 million in annual school budget increases and has given other support to the schools as needed; actual net school spending has been substantially above required spending for many years.
1. City officials said that at the time of city approval for the renovated high school they and school officials agreed on \$1 million annual increases for the school budget and that they have voted increases of approximately that amount since.
 2. School committee members and administrators said that they expected annual increases of approximately \$1 million and prepared annual budgets accordingly. Previously budget deliberations were difficult and sometimes resulted in special education deficits.
 3. Recent annual budgets, for fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2013, reflect increases between \$673,943 and \$1,171,600 (1.5 percent to 2.6 percent), in line with the \$1 million agreed upon.
 4. In 2011 city officials agreed to make additional funding available to the schools as needed to cover unanticipated health insurance and unemployment costs. The funding was not needed and it was returned to the city.
 5. The percentage by which actual net school spending has exceeded required net school spending has been in the double digits since fiscal year 2007, ranging from 12.2 percent above required spending in fiscal year 2009 to 16.9 percent above in fiscal year 2008.

Impact: Because the budgeting process and financial conditions of the school district are transparent and because school and municipal officials communicate effectively, the district has found itself able to count on predictable and stable budgets and on the support of the city for its regular budget and capital needs.

7. The district has managed its resources effectively and has taken advantage of partnerships and grants to restrict the impact of tight budgets.

- A.** The school district and the city have made cost savings and taken other steps to manage their resources effectively.

1. Administrators mentioned energy efficiencies such as installing solar panels on the property and roof of the high school, the replacement of lighting fixtures and steam traps, and composting. Although space is limited the schools have saved on a few out of district special education tuitions by creating special education programs for children with autism.
 - a. The city and school district together have negotiated health insurance benefits comparable to those offered by the state under the GIC program, which according to district administrators and city officials has lowered costs.
 2. The district buys paper and other supplies cooperatively with the city and through a higher education consortium and the Greater Lawrence Educational Collaborative; it uses state contracts for copiers and other items.
 3. School officials have relied on savings from retirements and the carryover of circuit breaker and other funds to supplement the school budget and to fund contractual obligations and improvements for school programs.
 - a. In fiscal year 2012 the district carried over \$370,244 from fiscal year 2011 circuit breaker funds and open purchase orders, and in fiscal year 2013 it carried over \$325,507.
 4. The district has used data to set some priorities and make budget decisions, using projected enrollment figures to determine the number of classrooms and teachers needed, achievement data to determine where to assign math and reading coaches, including for the North Beverly School, and to make decisions about programs such as Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI) and AP Spanish.
- B.** The district makes substantial efforts to obtain funding and support from partnerships, grants (in addition to entitlements), and outside sources.
1. Partnerships with community and other agencies have supplemented school programs and services. Donations from Cell Signaling, the Beverly Education Foundation, Beverly Hospital, the United Way, and other organizations and individuals have provided additional services. The YMCA offers after-school programs at the elementary schools, and review team members observed the North Shore Education Collaborative's Recovery High School in a Beverly school. A local bank and Beverly's cable TV studio enhance learning experiences for high school students, and health, eye, and dental clinics and the services of a therapist have been or are being established at the middle and high schools. Partnerships with local colleges (Endicott and Merrimack) provide additional classroom support and the enrollment of teachers in Master's programs at Montserrat College of Art has enhanced high school art classes. The DSAC provides support, including coaching, for the district's Level 3 school, North Beverly Elementary.

2. In addition to entitlement and other grants provided through ESE, the district and city have received private and competitive government funding for their Green Communities energy programs, for Summer Success and grade 9 orientation programs, for the high school Smaller Learning Communities programs (including the Freshman Academy, common assessments, and standards-based instruction), for the BSRI program in four elementary schools, for Responsive Classroom activities, and for SmartBoards and computers.
3. The district collects revenues from outside sources, including rents from the YMCA for after-school use of its elementary schools and from the North Shore Education Consortium for two programs in vacant buildings; the programs of both these organizations benefit district students. Some students with disabilities from other districts are tuitioned in.

Impact: By managing its resources effectively and by taking advantage of partnerships and outside funding the district has been able to maintain programs, limit the effect of budget constraints on classroom instruction, and add some improvements.

- The district has balanced its budget in the last several years, without the need for supplementary funding.
- The district's principals said that the school committee has generally supported their initiatives, and elementary class sizes had been held down.
- Some improvements in school programs have been possible, including instructional coaches, new special education classes, and standards-based learning and a Freshman Academy at the high school.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

It is important to note that district review reports prioritize identifying challenges and areas for growth in order to promote a cycle of continuous improvement; the report deliberately describes the district's challenges and concerns in greater detail than the strengths identified during the review.

Leadership and Governance

8. At the time of the review there were some issues about the intersection of roles between the superintendent and the school committee. Some interference at the school committee level undermined the superintendent's leadership. The superintendent retired in June 2013.

- A.** According to the superintendent, one or more members of the school committee inappropriately took on some of the superintendent's roles by such actions as:
 - 1. Meeting along with school department personnel at an area college at which a member was an employee to discuss a possible dual enrollment program without the superintendent's knowledge (there were two other such meetings at which the superintendent was present).
 - 2. Speaking to school personnel about issues that are the responsibility of a superintendent without the superintendent's knowledge.
 - 3. Asking to attend the superintendent's meetings with her leadership team (this was denied).
- B.** A document review showed that the school committee did not follow ESE guidelines²⁰ for doing a mid-cycle goals review of the superintendent.
 - 1. Rather than discussing the superintendent's goals with her, sharing feedback, developing a clear idea of progress made, and determining whether any mid-cycle corrections were needed, the school committee evaluated the superintendent on each of the four standards in the ESE rubric, as well as on her professional practice goal, her student improvement goal, her district improvement goal, and on the two additional district improvement goals set by the school committee in September 2012.
 - 2. ESE educator evaluation guidelines describe evaluating the superintendent on the standards in the rubric as part of the end-of-cycle summative evaluation.
 - 3. One member of the school committee said that there was some confusion over what the committee should be writing in the evaluation and that the committee gave the superintendent more information than they had to—this member said that the committee would “do better in future.”
- C.** Representatives of the teachers' association cited “tensions between the superintendent and the school committee,” saying that the tension was “open at meetings, the chair and

²⁰ See “Guidance for Conducting the Evaluation Process” in *Part VI: Implementation Guide for Superintendent's Evaluation* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/>).

superintendent especially.” They went on to say that there was tension at the time of the review among school committee members, too.

- D. Several interviewees referred to the need for setting limits on the school committee’s role versus the superintendent’s.
 - 1. One school committee member said, “That discussion is always taking place. We need to toe the line about what our responsibilities are versus the superintendent’s. Getting there.”
 - 2. Another school committee member said, “Our super lets us know when we cross over the line.”
 - 3. In an interview with principals it was said of the school committee, “When they overstep [the superintendent], they re-establish a line in the sand.”
- E. In two different interviews with school committee members it was stated that school committee members sit on search committees when principals are being hired.

Impact: When a school committee takes on the superintendent’s roles it diminishes the effectiveness of the superintendent, other administrators, and the school committee itself in carrying out the roles and responsibilities appropriate to their expertise and in building a culture of collaboration around the education mission.

By such actions as communicating individually with school personnel without the superintendent’s knowledge or sitting on search committees for principals, school committee members may send an unclear message to administrators, teachers, and the community about the appropriate chain of command and influence decision-making inappropriately.

9. Differences were apparent at the three school levels in how much progress has been made in improving instruction and student support.

Elementary schools

- A. Five years before the site visit Ayers/Ryal Side became the first Beverly school to use BSRI, and its practices are more firmly in place. The remaining elementary schools were to formally become BSRI schools in 2013-2014.
- B. Regardless of whether or not an elementary school is a BSRI school, every elementary principal has put in place the major components of the BSRI program. Elementary principals told the review team that they work as a team to share ideas about what each school is doing, what works, and what needs improvement. All teachers in all grades are examining data. All elementary schools are using that formative data to form small groups of students and to differentiate instruction. And all paraprofessionals at the elementary level are delivering

interventions. Principals said that teachers were making progress in analyzing data and writing similar re-teaching plans.

High school

- C. The high school principal said that the NEASC evaluation drove the need for change and that he and his leadership team actively pursued a Small Learning Communities (SLC) Grant for support for such goals as decreasing the dropout rate and helping all students to be successful and such initiatives as the one- to-one laptop initiative, standards-based instruction, and advisory programs.. In addition, elements of the SLC grant offered the opportunity for some middle school teachers to participate.
- D. The high school is not as far along in the process of using data to inform instruction as the elementary schools. While teachers have now implemented common midyear and final assessments, their use of those assessments to inform instruction is not fully developed. For example, in a meeting of high school teachers, when asked how common midterms are used, a teacher stated, and others agreed, that they are used to give students grades that are consistent across all sections of a course.
- E. The high school is working toward standards-based instruction, and a third cohort of educators has recently completed training. Although standards-based instruction is not consistently used across all its classes, the high school is steadily moving in that direction. Students expressed the opinion that they learned more and took more responsibility for their learning when they understood whether they were in the formative or summative stages of learning a concept and when they had the opportunity to redo their work until it met the standard.
- F. The high school has developed a rich after-school program to meet the academic, creative, physical, and social needs of students. In addition to opportunities to recover credits, students have an opportunity to suggest and run clubs that they have developed.

Middle school

- G. School leaders at the middle school told the review team that they could not easily rearrange students according to assessment results because the schedule, which is based on students' math levels, prohibits easy regrouping.
- H. According to an administrator, it is very difficult to differentiate instruction and put students into groups because of the age of the building and the size of the classrooms. (See instructional finding below: the team found clear and consistent evidence of instruction being differentiated within the class in only 17 percent of middle school classes visited.). However, the team did observe a few classes where students were grouped and instruction was differentiated.

- I. The review team observed that paraprofessionals were in classes at the middle school, but their role did not appear to be well defined.
- J. There is neither a robust set of interventions for middle school students nor an after-school program for middle school students. One member of the middle school staff said that they struggled to do small-group interventions.

Impact: Because of the differences in improvements to instruction and student support among the school levels, there are inconsistencies in the kind and quality of education that students receive as they move through the Beverly schools.

- For the most part, students at the elementary level are receiving appropriate services that meet their educational needs. These needs are determined by formative and summative assessments, which results in flexible regrouping, re-teaching, and enrichment.
- The high school is in a period of transition, and students there are beginning to receive services that are based upon data gathered through formative and summative assessments, with support from the high school's after-school program.
- At the middle school, which does not have an after-school program and where the schedule presents challenges, students do not have the same support or opportunities for learning as do students at other levels.

Without leadership to ensure that progress in improving education is comparable at all levels, these inconsistencies will remain.

Curriculum and Instruction

10. The district does not have a coordinated system for determining the currency, effectiveness, and alignment of the curriculum.

- A. Although revisions to the curriculum are currently under way, there are not any common processes for making revisions, and there is little district oversight.
 - 1. At elementary schools, principals said that the curriculum is revised through weekly, grade-level team meetings.
 - 2. At the middle school, an administrator said that updated curriculum maps with grade-level content are turned in every year.

3. At the high school, facilitators help teachers revise curriculum during department meetings throughout the year. A central administrator, when asked about curriculum revision, did not know where the high school was with updating the ELA documents.

B. Vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum is limited.

1. Elementary schools vary in their fidelity to the current math program and the use of supplemental materials across grade levels. Interviewees noted that one elementary school adheres faithfully to the Everyday Math program while others use it as a resource.
2. At the middle school there is some informal vertical alignment between grades 8 and 9, assisted by the high school's SLC grant. There are not any formal procedures or meetings with respect to vertical alignment between the transition grades 5 and 6 or 8 and 9, except for those that take place in the context of the special education program.
3. According to a high school administrator, it was recently discovered that there was limited vertical alignment of math courses at the high school, and that the situation was similar at the middle school level. The administrator said, "We are so redundant that we can't get to more complex information."

C. The district does not have a system of curriculum review.

1. A district administrator said that the district does not have a system for review of curriculum, acknowledging that the schools would benefit from a curriculum review cycle.
2. At the time of the review the curriculum guide for math K –8 on the district's website, was dated 03/01/03.

D. According to administrators, the district has recently invested in Curriculum Connector, a central curriculum database that can be accessed from anywhere and allows curriculum maps to be developed continually, either individually or collaboratively, at the teacher level, the school level, and the district level. This is a dynamic process that is never "done," and provides for horizontal as well as vertical alignment.

Impact: Because the district does not have a system for revising the curriculum and keeping it up to date and alignment is not monitored districtwide, there is potential for duplication and gaps in the curriculum and as a result gaps in student learning.

11. Some key instructional practices require further development districtwide. The elementary classes observed had the highest incidence of research-based instructional practices and the middle school classes observed had the lowest.

The review team observed 57 classes throughout the district: 15 at the high school, 12 at the middle school, and 30 at the elementary schools. The team observed 28 ELA classes, 14 mathematics classes, and 15 classes in other subject areas. Among those observed were three special education classes and two ELL classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members used the ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. Data from the team's observations is included in Appendix C.

- A.** In observed classes, instructional practices did not consistently reflect elements of an optimal, challenging learning environment, although teachers for the most part demonstrated content knowledge.
 - 1. Clear and consistent evidence that the lesson reflected rigor and high expectations was observed in 47 percent of high school classes, 25 percent of the middle school classes, and in 60 percent of the elementary school classes visited.
 - 2. Clear and consistent evidence that students were engaged in challenging academic tasks was observed in 40 percent of classes at the high school, in 17 percent of classes at the middle school, and in 70 percent of classes at the elementary schools visited.
 - 3. In 81 percent of classrooms observed overall, review team members found clear and consistent evidence that teaching demonstrated knowledge of subject and content.
- B.** Students were not sufficiently challenged in observed classrooms. Clear and consistent evidence of activities or lessons that required students to use higher-order thinking skills was observed in 33 percent of the classes in the high school, in 18 percent of the classes in the middle school, and in 45 percent of classes in the elementary schools.
- C.** The team observed that especially at the secondary level (grade 6-12) classes provided insufficient opportunities for students to articulate their thinking or reasoning orally or in writing, either individually or in pairs or groups. These opportunities were provided in 40 percent of high school classes observed, 27 percent of middle school classes observed, and 57 percent of elementary school classes observed.
- D.** The team observed more consistent use of effective instructional strategies at the elementary level, where there is a research-based literacy curriculum supported by coaches and complemented by extensive and varied professional development.

1. District administration reported that both Ayers and Centerville have tiered instruction in place with much small-group instruction, and that they have a leveled reading program that uses data to inform instruction. This format is now being replicated in all elementary schools in the district.
 2. Reading coaches and special education teachers in the elementary schools work with paraprofessionals, all of whom function as “interventionists.” While their primary responsibility is to support students on IEPs, many also support students in general education, usually in a small group, pullout model involving 20-minute intensive lessons.
 3. Clear and consistent evidence of clear grade-appropriate learning objectives was found in 69 percent of elementary lessons observed.
 4. The team found clear and consistent evidence of the use of appropriate and varied strategies matched to learning objectives and content in 70 percent of elementary lessons observed.
 5. Clear and consistent evidence of appropriate and varied strategies that met students’ diverse learning needs was found in 77 percent of elementary lessons observed.
 6. The team found clear and consistent evidence that lessons were paced to engage all students and promote understanding in 71 percent of elementary lessons observed.
- E. For the most part the incidence of effective instructional practices observed by the team was lowest at the middle school level, with incidence at the high school somewhat higher.
1. Clear and consistent evidence that clear, grade-appropriate learning objectives were communicated was found in 40 percent of lessons observed at the high school and 36 percent of lessons observed at the middle school.
 2. The team found clear and consistent evidence of appropriate and varied strategies matched to learning objectives and content in 40 percent of lessons observed at the high school and 18 percent of lessons observed at the middle school.
 3. Clear and consistent evidence of the use of appropriate and varied strategies that met students’ diverse learning needs was found in 29 percent of lessons observed at the high school and in 17 percent of lessons observed at the middle school.
 4. The team found clear and consistent evidence of lessons paced to engage all students and promote understanding in 40 percent of lessons observed at the high school and in 50 percent of lessons observed at the middle school.

- F. The high school is beginning to use standards-based instruction and grading in several courses, and many teachers are starting to use rubrics. In response to the NEASC report, the high school is also moving towards un-leveling some courses while adding support, determining, as one administrator said, that, “it is this system, not the kids, that is the problem.” This change gives all students access to upper level courses. High school staff also reported that the new technology in use at the high school has “leveled the playing field in many ways, so that all kids can shine.” High school administrators noted that they were trying to get the school to move away from teacher-centered classrooms. The new Freshman Academy has provided team teachers with some training in the reluctant learner and differentiated instruction.
- G. A middle school teacher said, “Kids are differentiated by ability on grade level teams.” Middle school students needing support are grouped together and are accompanied by a paraprofessional or a special education teacher to some of their classes. See the second Leadership and Governance challenge finding above, however, for some of the obstacles to using small groups at the middle school.
- H. The need for additional training in research-based instructional practices has been recognized in two previous external studies and was acknowledged by administrators.
 - 1. The NEASC report of 2010 found that although teachers at the high school used multiple strategies, in many cases they were not effectively meeting the needs of struggling learners as a result of insufficient support and training.
 - 2. The Walker Partnerships study of the special education department found that all staff needed training on how inclusion, in-class support, and co-teaching should operate. In interviews, special education program leaders concurred with this finding.
 - 3. Elementary schools rely on paraprofessionals to assist with differentiation of instruction, particularly for students in Tiers 2 and 3. Administrators told the review team that they would like to see teachers learn how to differentiate within whole-group instruction and raise the level of student engagement.
 - 4. A district administrator said that much professional development was needed to ensure that general education teachers know how to instruct all students.

Impact: When research-based instructional practices are not being fully implemented throughout the district’s schools, students do not have the opportunity to learn to the best of their ability and may arrive at the next grade or level insufficiently prepared.

Assessment

12. The elementary schools have made the most progress in effectively using data. At the secondary levels (grades 6-12), and particularly at the middle school, assessment practices are insufficiently developed for informing daily instruction and guiding decision-making.

A. The elementary schools have the necessary components in place to use data effectively.

1. All five elementary schools have implemented aspects of the Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI) model for collecting, analyzing, and using reading and math data; three of the schools have reached full implementation. Coaches are in place in four of the five schools; the district obtained approval in January 2013 to hire a coach for the Level 3 school, North Beverly, and the Hannah School is scheduled to receive a coach in the 2013-2014 school year.
2. Elementary principals, coaches, and teachers said that all teachers are members of their data teams, that they met regularly, and that they monitor progress. They use information gathered from data to create flexible groups and to change instruction.
3. Elementary principals and coaches described a process through which common assessments are administered at all schools in ELA and mathematics; reports are generated by a district data coordinator and disseminated to principals and coaches who work with the teachers; students who have not mastered the benchmark standards are identified; and re-teaching and/or interventions are planned.
4. All teachers receive professional development in the use of data to inform instruction as part of the BSRI model.

B. The principal and teachers told the review team that there were not any formal data teams at the middle school.

1. Some interviewees told the review team that the middle school was “not data driven.” Use of data to guide instruction and interventions appears to depend on the subject area and team.
2. Middle school facilitators told the team that the principal relies on teachers to collaborate during department meetings to discuss how students are progressing. There is not any formal expectation that they do so.
3. Facilitators and teachers told the team that the format for collecting data varies by team. Math teachers test quarterly using common assessments; common open-response items are administered in ELA, science, social studies, reading, and foreign languages.

4. The middle school assistant principals told the review team that while there are not any formal data meetings, one of the assistant principals “does a lot of number crunching.” Teachers have not had any formal training, “but they own their data.”
 5. Teachers described a voluntary meeting at the start of the school year to exchange ELA and mathematics data. The principal supports their holding this meeting, and teachers said that he provides lunch for them.
 6. The principal told the review team that the school does use some forms of data: MCAS, Gates-McGinitie for reading (limited use), and some common assessments in some content areas. He noted that they had made greater strides in the use of formative assessments such as do now’s and exit tickets. He said that it was not consistent and that they needed to “get better at” common assessments.
 7. Teachers said that when the school applied for an extended learning time grant (ELT) in recent years, a group of teachers formally “looked at a lot of data.” However, the grant application was withdrawn. In a focus group one middle school teacher expressed a wish for a data team, and another a wish for the time to be able to review data.
- C.** The high school staff is developing its ability to use data to inform instruction and to guide decision-making.
1. While a formal data team is not in place at the high school, school leaders and teachers told the review team that data analysis does take place at the department level. The high school is also in the process of developing common mid-year and final assessments, though teachers at the high school have not had sufficient training on how to use them (see second Leadership and Governance challenge finding above).
 2. School and district leaders provided the team with some evidence showing the impact of data analysis in improving student learning.
 - a. Analysis of mid-term exams showed that there was redundancy in the taught curriculum, pushing the school to examine its curricula.
 - b. Analysis of data showed that students who were passing MCAS were still dropping out of school and that a high percentage of students were at-risk students. This forced the high school to “look at the system as the problem, as opposed to the kids being the problem.” The principal said that “everything came out of dropout data,” and that the NEASC report helped to leverage the change.
- D.** Formative assessments are insufficiently used at each level, and this is seen as an area in need of attention by district and school leaders. In the 57 classroom observations conducted by the

team, use of formative assessments and varied questioning techniques to probe for deeper understanding was more frequent at the elementary level.

1. Of the 30 elementary classrooms observed, the team saw clear and consistent evidence of frequent formative assessments to check for understanding in 67 percent.
 2. Of the 12 middle school and 15 high school classrooms observed, the team saw clear and consistent evidence of the use of formative assessments in 45 percent and 47 percent, respectively.
 3. There was clear and consistent evidence of the use of varied questioning techniques to promote deeper understanding in 55 percent of elementary classrooms observed, in contrast to 20 percent in the middle school and 36 percent in the high school classrooms.
- E. Particularly at the secondary level, the district does not regularly use both aggregated and disaggregated data to design services for special populations and to evaluate program success.
1. The Walker Partnerships study of the special education department found that student performance data was not being used to determine the degree to which services could be eliminated or changed because student progress was not adequately documented. As a response to the study, the recently hired director of special education plans to examine and clarify entrance and exit criteria. In addition, the study found that the pre-referral process was not practiced uniformly, and it recommended that the process should integrate data and become more comprehensive in scope.

Impact: Without clear district leadership and common K-12 expectations for data analysis, the use of assessment data to guide instruction is less effective at the secondary level in general and least effective at the middle school level. Because staff at the secondary level are not all sufficiently prepared to use data as a tool for improving learning for all students, they have not yet established a culture of making systematic, continuous use of a wide range of data to inform instruction.

Human Resources and Professional Development

13. Although the district has provided training in several areas, it does not have a professional development plan focusing on instruction, assessment, and student achievement. Professional development is not informed by student achievement data or driven by educator needs.

- A. Interviewees said that there was not a district professional development plan, and staff involvement was inadequate.

1. The district professional development committee is not currently active. There is a comprehensive annual calendar, and a staff survey about professional development needs is often administered, but only the leadership team and administrators confer to set the schedule. Teachers noted that professional development offerings did not necessarily respond to the teachers' needs expressed in the survey or to requested programs.
2. Teachers' association representatives confirmed that teachers had limited involvement in planning staff development activities; the association president said that the professional development committee should be reactivated.

B. Teacher training in district initiatives often varies by school and level.

1. Training on the use of data, a critical component to tailoring instruction to meet student needs, varies widely from school to school. Staff in the middle and high schools do not have formal training on examining and using data, while staff in the elementary schools do. There is not any districtwide protocol for the use of data.
2. Training is inconsistent, particularly at the secondary level. In the middle school, some of the training is voluntary. At the high school, training in teaching the reluctant learner initially met with some resistance; therefore, some teachers have been trained, while others have not.

Impact: Without an active and inclusive professional development committee, a professional development plan focused on student learning and informed by teacher needs, and consistent implementation of professional development, teachers do not receive the support they need to build their capacity to help students attain high levels of achievement.

14. The recent loss of the personnel administrator position has led to substantially increased responsibilities for other district administrators and has made it more challenging for the district to select and develop staff highly skilled in providing rigorous instruction for all students.

The personnel administrator position was eliminated in Beverly two years before the review. A previous proposal to consolidate the personnel responsibilities as a city function was not deemed feasible, according to administrators.

- A.** The loss of the personnel administrator has led to significantly increased responsibilities for other district administrators and has made it more challenging for the district to select and develop staff highly skilled in providing rigorous instruction for all students.
 1. After the introduction of the SchoolSpring online application system in the district, the number of applicants for teaching positions greatly increased. While the pool of candidates is larger with the online application system, the system does not address the experience or

- skills of the candidates. In the absence of a personnel director, the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and director of special education have assumed added responsibilities to oversee portions of this process.
2. In describing their added responsibilities in the absence of a personnel director several principals said additional demands have been placed on them and that they missed the dedicated personnel resource, particularly when staffing issues arose.
 3. Principals also noted that the limited coordination of responsibility for personnel oversight has made their task more difficult.
- B.** The implementation of the new educator evaluation system has also added to the responsibilities of district and school leaders; it is a particularly difficult time to be without the support of coordinated support in the area of human resources.

Impact: Without a cohesive system for staff recruitment, selection, and growth, principals and staff will not have support when needed and will not be able to rely on consistent systems. And support for effective implementation of the new educator evaluation system will not be available.

Student Support

15. Leaders have not established a consistent districtwide web of support for all learners based on best practices and informed by data; supports available depend on school-level initiatives and vary by school.

- A.** The Beverly Student Support Teams (BSST) at each level (elementary, middle, and high) function slightly differently. In kindergarten through grade 5, the team looks at formative and summative data and recommends strategies before moving to a referral. At the middle school, the BSST functions similarly, although numerous interviews with middle school staff indicate that they have limited access to data and benchmark testing. The high school BSST team focuses on behavioral issues only and involves the assistant principal, guidance, the school adjustment counselors, and probation and resources officers.
- B.** Data is not consistently used to schedule students for support at the secondary level.
1. High school students are referred to the new “RTI” classes for first-year students when they do not pass courses or when middle school teachers recommend them.
 2. Middle school faculty said that they offered placement suggestions based on reading assessments, if asked, but were generally unaware of the actual placement of those students.

- C. The District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP) lists each school's services and programs to provide for students' needs. It does not, however, list classroom accommodations that the Beverly Student Support Teams could use in advising teachers in order to prevent students from reaching the special education referral process.

Elementary schools

- D. At the elementary level, teachers have developed skills through the Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI). The model of BSRI interventions requires that students with disabilities, English language learners, and those performing below grade level be taught in the same group if they manifest similar needs. The capacity of teachers to deliver these interventions currently varies by school, because some schools adopted the model earlier than others.
- E. For students struggling with MCAS ELA or math at the elementary level, some schools provide Lexia labs before school, as well as after-school math groups.

Middle school

- F. A reading class is available for all grade 6 and eligible grade 7 and 8 students.
- G. For students struggling with MCAS ELA or math at the middle school there is a morning math class as well as a free summer school program. The MCAS classes did not take place in 2012-2013 because the staff member responsible was on medical leave.
- H. Leaders told the team that Tier 2 instruction was delivered as a regular education strategy; however, as described in Curriculum and Instruction above, in observed middle school classrooms the review team found clear and consistent evidence of appropriate and varied strategies that met students' diverse learning needs in only 17 percent of classrooms.
- I. The middle school staff mentioned IXL software as a means of differentiating instruction in math. Although this software does provide benchmark assessments and some students do use this program, teachers said that they had little time to look at the data.
- J. Inclusion services for students with disabilities are delivered by a paraprofessional who accompanies individuals and small groups of up to 10 students. Program leaders said that faculty had varying levels of comfort working with the paraprofessionals.
- K. Middle school guidance counselors do not move with their students through the grades and so change their advisees every year, leading some staff to believe that counselors do not know their students very well.
- L. Most importantly, administrators said that the middle school has a rotating schedule that makes it difficult to provide for students' needs and that there were other obstacles to providing

supports such as small-group interventions or small group instruction. (See the second Leadership and Governance challenge finding above.)

High school

M. Beverly High School found that many of its students who dropped out of school were actually passing their classes and passing MCAS. In an attempt to establish a more supportive student climate, the high school initiated an advisory class for all grades and established the Freshman Academy for all 9th grade students, providing specialized courses, identified as “RTI courses.”

1. High school staff said that the Freshman Academy was considered successful in its first year of operation (2011-2012) because it reduced the number of courses that first-year students did not pass and raised attendance.²¹
2. Program success has not yet been measured for the Freshman Academy through a thorough examination of data.

N. At the high school, the one-to-one laptop program has led to greater differentiation in instruction for students. The technology has also helped students who have difficulty reading handwriting.

O. At-risk students can attend full-year MCAS preparation courses and in-school tutoring in the spring.

P. According to ESE data, the district’s overall annual grade 9-12 dropout rate fluctuated from 2.3 percent in 2010 to 2.9 percent in 2011 to 1.7 percent in 2012, lower in 2012 than in 2010. However, the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate for district students with disabilities was twice the rate for their statewide peers in 2011, 9.9 percent compared with 4.6 percent; in 2012 it was 6.1 percent as compared with 3.7 percent. Beverly’s graduation rate for students with disabilities declined steadily from 70.9 percent in 2010 to 61.4 percent in 2011 to 54.2 percent in 2012, lower than the 2012 rate of 68.6 percent for students with disabilities statewide.

Impact: When a district does not provide a consistent web of support across schools based on data and founded on research-based good practice, it is missing an opportunity to help all its students improve their achievement.

²¹ The district 9th grade retention rate (indicating the percentage of enrolled students repeating the grade), which had fallen already from 12.5 percent in 2008-2009 to 10.4 percent in 2009-2010 to 9.0 percent in 2010-2011, rising slightly to 9.7 percent in 2011-2012, fell to 2.1 percent in 2012-2013 after the first year of operation of the Freshman Academy. Seven students were retained for 2012-2013, in comparison with 35 who were retained the year before, just before the Academy’s first year of operation.

- When supports are not consistent, all students do not have equitable access to a rigorous and challenging curriculum, and some are not able to fully participate in the academic program. Students may progress appropriately at one level but fall behind at the next.
- Limited tracking and monitoring of student data hinders the district from evaluating its programs and interventions adequately.

Finance and Asset Management

16. The district's learning spaces at the middle and elementary school levels are insufficient, restricting classroom activities, programs, and available teaching materials. At the time of the review the district was moving forward with plans to renovate and expand the middle school and free up space in the elementary schools.

A. The middle school does not meet students' needs.

1. Review team members found the condition of the middle school to be wanting, with small classrooms that made varied learning activities challenging for teachers. It has limited space for technology, and storage for teaching materials in the rooms is inadequate. Spaces for small-group instruction are insufficient and the school does not have the room to add special education and other programs for high-needs students.
2. Administrators said that middle school spaces are inadequate and impossible to upgrade.
3. According to district administrators and city officials, the school committee had approved a Statement of Interest (SOI) with the MSBA to renovate and expand the middle school from a grade 6-8 school to one that includes grade 5, updating and adding to an obsolete building and alleviating overcrowding. The renovation is intended to create larger classrooms and provide a variety of learning spaces for small-group and individual instruction and other services. City officials support the proposal as well.
4. Teachers said that the school needed more up-to-date technology and a better computer network permitting more students access at a time.

B. Elementary schools are crowded and do not have any space available to add classrooms or programs for high-needs students.

1. Review team members observed no empty classrooms or other available spaces at the elementary schools; on a few occasions they saw individual instruction taking place in hallways.

2. Enrollment projections indicate that the elementary population will increase. Administrators said that space for small-group instruction at the elementary schools is limited and there is no room for additional elementary classrooms unless spaces intended for science are taken over.
 3. Administrators, school committee members, and city officials described long-range plans to create additional elementary school space by moving grade 5 into an expanded middle school and by moving preschool students to the McKeown School, which is currently rented to the North Shore Education Consortium. These steps would free classroom space in the elementary schools.
- C. There is a need to create programs for students with disabilities and other high-needs students in the district in order to provide better services and to bring out-of-district students back into district schools, but because of overcrowded schools appropriate spaces are not available.
1. An audit of the special education program recommended improved programs for students with disabilities, especially recommending bringing some of the approximately 69 out-of-district students back into the district.
 2. However, administrators noted there is currently no space at the elementary and middle schools for new programs.

Impact: Space limits at the elementary and middle schools restrict the district's ability to implement improved classroom and small-group instruction; they also make it impossible for the district to bring back many of the out-of-district students. If these limits continue, projected growth of elementary enrollments will exacerbate existing problems.

Beverly Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

- 1. As the new superintendent begins his tenure, the school committee would best redirect its focus to high-level decisions around policy and the budget and to working with the superintendent in a way that supports district goals and improves education.**
 - A.** School committee members should support the superintendent in taking full responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the schools.
 1. School committee members should avoid having private conversations with administrators or teachers about issues that may directly affect the business of the school committee without first notifying the superintendent.
 - B.** The school committee should consider reviewing the district's educator evaluation plan and ensuring that it is familiar with ESE guidance on the difference between a mid-cycle goals review and a summative evaluation of the superintendent.

Recommended resource:

- The Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation, *Part VI: Implementation Guide for Superintendent Evaluation* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartVI.pdf>) details the model process for superintendent evaluation and includes relevant documents and a form for recording goals, evidence and ratings. The Guide includes resources that school committees and superintendents may find helpful, including a model for effective goal setting.
- C.** The school committee should consider taking steps to pursue governance support, for instance investigating possible participation in the District Governance Support Project (DGSP), a program jointly developed by MASC, the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS), and ESE. One of the purposes of the program is to assist school committee members to develop an understanding of the specific expectations for school committee members. The school committee might also investigate the possibility of support for governance for Beverly from the MASC separate from the DGSP.

Benefits to the Beverly Public Schools from implementing this recommendation: When the school committee provides high-level support for district goals and leaves day-to-day operations to the

superintendent, it helps to foster a collaborative relationship and effective decision-making that will ultimately serve the needs of students.

2. The new superintendent should work together with all principals to establish specific expectations for school improvement in such areas as:

- **elements of effective instruction that will be expected in every classroom;**
- **the use of data from assessments to inform instruction; and**
- **the provision of consistent interventions.**

A. The district should develop a vision and definition of high-quality instruction.

1. The principals, superintendent, and other curriculum leaders in the district should identify what effective instruction should look like in every classroom.
2. Principals and other administrators should do frequent walkthroughs together to observe classroom instruction, to calibrate their findings, and to give feedback to teachers on trends that indicate areas for improvement.

B. The district should support teachers at all levels in using data to inform instruction.

1. The district should ensure that benchmark assessments are developed and implemented at every level.
2. Teachers should be provided with professional development on how to use the data that is generated from those assessments to inform their instruction.

C. A tiered system of support should be implemented at all levels.

1. The district should ensure that a comprehensive set of interventions is available for students at all levels.
2. Guidelines for assigning students to interventions and monitoring their progress should be established and clearly communicated at all levels.

Recommended resources:

- *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSESelf-Assesment.pdf>) is a tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.

- *Conditions for School Effectiveness Research Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/ConditionResearchGuide.pdf>) is a thorough description of research that supports the Essential Conditions which can be used to consider the impact of decisions made to improve schools.
- *Emerging and Sustaining Practices for School Turnaround* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/2013EmergingPractices.pdf>) is a description of practices that appear to contribute to schools' ability to produce and sustain rapid growth in student achievement.

Benefits to the Beverly School District from implementing this recommendation will include consistency in teachers' capacity to deliver effective instruction, to use data from assessments to adjust their instruction to the needs of their students, and to provide students with the interventions they need.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district should develop a system for continuous curriculum review, alignment, and revision.

- A.** Building on the curriculum work that is already in place, the district should establish a consistent system and schedule for the continual improvement and alignment of curriculum, with oversight from one or more district-level administrators.
 1. A curriculum review cycle should be established in order to ensure that all curriculum is up to date.
 2. Horizontal and vertical alignment should be part of the districtwide approach to curriculum.
 3. A consistent approach to school improvement may involve a reorganization of administrative duties in order to provide direction and oversight in developing, updating, and aligning K-12 curriculum.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Model Curriculum Units* provide exemplars that could be useful as the district develops its systematic approach to curriculum. (The units can be accessed by request at http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/download_form.aspx.) Supplemental presentations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/resources/>) provide more information about the units.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.

- B.** The district should ensure that a system is in place to oversee the new electronic curriculum-mapping program, and to ensure the effective use of this mapping as a hub of decision-making.
 - 1. There should be continual support from an administrator who has a clear understanding of and insight into the intricacies of the mapping process.
 - 2. Professional development should be provided so that teachers can maximize the effectiveness of the tool.

Benefits: A consistent, coordinated system for curriculum review and revision will help the district to ensure that all students experience rigorous, aligned instruction and a coherent K-12 learning experience that prepares them for success after high school. Effective supervision and support for Curriculum Connector will help to ensure that curriculum mapping becomes an integrating force in the district. The reflective and collaborative process of mapping has the potential to have a deep impact on student achievement.

4. The district should systematically support teachers as they continually increase their ability to use effective instructional practices.

- A.** Effective instructional practices that the district should consider implementing in every classroom include the following:
 - 1. Differentiated instruction that meets students’ developmental levels and learning needs and challenges students appropriately;
 - 2. A classroom climate that promotes high levels of student engagement and responsibility and enriches discourse;
 - 3. Oral and written evidence in students’ work of their use of higher-order thinking skills.
- B.** The district should provide a robust system of professional development, including embedded professional development such as coaching and professional learning communities, to help teachers to develop and enhance their instructional skills.

Recommended resources:

- *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning. This resource might be a useful reference as the district identifies and provides professional development focused on specific instructional elements. It is part of ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>).

- *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/mathclass_char.doc) and *An Effective Standards-Based Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/scitechclass_char.pdf)

are references for mathematics and science and technology/engineering instructional planning and observation. They are intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will help educators to share a common understanding of high-quality instructional practices. Targeted professional development and support will help teachers to provide students with effective instruction that promotes a higher level of student achievement.

Assessment

5. **As recommended under Leadership and Governance above, the district should set clear and consistent expectations in order to firmly establish a culture of making systematic, continuous use of data to improve student achievement and inform all aspects of decision-making.**
 - A. At the elementary level, the district should continue the building of a culture of effectively using data to inform instruction, continuing its support of the effective model currently in use in the elementary schools.
 - B. With the assistance of the district data team, the district should work to establish a parallel, coherent, and systematic approach to the effective use of data at the secondary level. District leaders should take the following steps:
 1. Ensure that there is a common vision and set of expectations about how data will be used to guide teaching and learning at the secondary level.
 2. Building on the assessments already in place, determine the type of data at the secondary level (6-12) that will enable teachers in the content areas to more frequently and effectively monitor student learning.
 3. Establish data teams at the secondary level charged with monitoring student achievement using reliable and consistent measures from grade 6 through grade 12; clarify the relationship between these teams and the district data team.

4. Analyze the performance data of high-needs students to better understand and focus on the factors that may be impeding their achievement. Use this information to put in place effective interventions, particularly at the middle school level.
 5. Provide teachers in grades 6-12 with training on using data to inform daily instruction, and monitor the implementation of data-based instruction.
 6. Establish a system of data collection and dissemination that provides teachers with timely information to guide daily planning, re-teaching, and interventions, including providing teachers with direct access to the data.
 7. Extend the dissemination of student performance data to parents through the use of a parent- and student-friendly information system.
- C. The district should ensure the systematic development of formative assessment practices at all levels.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's District Data Team Toolkit (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) provides information to help districts to establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a district data team. It might be a useful reference as the district works to strengthen data analysis practices at the secondary level.
- The District Analysis and Review Tool (DART) is organized by the District Standards and can help district leaders see where similar districts in the state are showing progress in specific areas to identify possible best practice. (DART overview: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/>; *DART User Guide*: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/userguide.pdf>)
- Edwin Analytics (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) is a powerful reporting and data analysis tool that gives authorized districts and state level users access to new information, reports, and perspectives on education and programs that specifically support improvements in teaching and learning.

Benefits: The more fully developed assessment practices at the elementary level are providing teachers and intervention staff with frequent and reliable student performance data that guides daily instruction. The recommendations above will provide teachers at the secondary level with the tools to frequently monitor students' learning and to ensure that instruction is flexible and targeted to meet the needs of all learners. In addition, these recommendations will help the district identify district-determined measures, an important element of the educator evaluation system.

Human Resources and Professional Development

6. Building on its strong start in implementing the new educator evaluation system, the district should continue to refine the system and monitor its effectiveness as implemented so far.

- A.** At the time of the review, various interviewees said that they saw the educator evaluation system as implemented so far as providing leverage to change administrator and teacher practices, as providing excellent feedback that helps teachers grow, as changing instruction to more of a coaching model, as putting teaching and learning at the forefront, and as providing a path to improving instruction (see Human Resources and Professional Development strength finding above).
 - 1. As it continues implementation of the new system, including implementing impact ratings and district-determined measures, the district should continue the strong collaborative approach it brought to the original educator evaluation agreement.
- B.** The review team recommends that administrators use the educator evaluation process (including walkthroughs, mid-year formative assessments, and summative evaluations) to identify effective practice and to discuss specific approaches, professional development, and professional learning community collaboration needed to enhance professional growth and student learning.
- C.** As the district gains more experience with the implementation of its agreed-on system, stakeholders should consider whether any of the modifications of the ESE model hinder the effective use of the new system as an instrument for improvement in teaching and learning; if so, they should take appropriate steps to revise any such area of the agreement.

Benefits: Continuing its collaborative approach, using educator evaluation to enhance professional growth, and monitoring the effectiveness of the system as implemented will help the district follow through on making educator evaluation a lever for transforming practice districtwide.

7. The district should develop and implement a data-driven professional development plan that incorporates input from educators.

- A.** The district should re-establish its professional development committee as a way to ensure input from educators at all levels.
- B.** With guidance from the professional development committee, the district should develop a comprehensive professional development plan.
 - 1. The plan should be designed to systematically build the capacity of staff at all levels to attain high levels of achievement for all students. It should include:

- a. content-area learning;
 - b. job-embedded professional development (such as instructional coaching);
 - c. structures for regular, frequent collaboration to improve curriculum and instruction; and
 - d. a process for evaluating the impact of professional development on teaching and learning.
2. The plan should be aligned with the district's priorities for improving instruction, and should be informed by student achievement data and by data reflecting educators' professional development needs. As recommended above, without compromising the confidentiality of individual evaluations, the district should use the educator evaluation system to inform professional development.

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 Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/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.

Benefits: A comprehensive, cohesive plan for professional development that reflects students' needs and educators' input will help to ensure a common language in the district about teaching and learning, and will bring the district closer to its goal of increasing student achievement.

8. **The review team recommends that the district ensure the coordination of the functions formerly performed by the personnel administrator. The district should provide support for principals and other staff who are carrying out these key functions. Reorganization of administrative responsibilities and additional personnel in central office should be considered.**
 - A. Central office administrators and school principals have had added responsibilities due to the loss of the personnel administrator position two years before the review, an increase in the number of candidates for positions through the SchoolSpring application system, and the implementation of the new educator evaluation system. Limited coordination of personnel oversight has also posed a challenge.
 - B. The district should ensure the coordination of the responsibilities formerly held by the personnel director and provide support for staff who are performing these functions. The

district should consider reorganizing administrative responsibilities and, if possible, adding personnel in the central office.

Benefits: The district has an opportunity to create a cohesive system to improve staff recruitment, selection, and growth. With this district support, principals will be able to rely on consistent systems and focus their time and effort on instructional leadership, and less time will be diverted from central office administrators' original responsibilities. Implementation of the educator evaluation system will also benefit from this support.

Student Support

9. The district should ensure consistent, districtwide implementation of practices and supports that meet students' diverse needs.

- A.** The district should train all administrators and teachers in instructional practices that meet the needs of all learners and use the educator evaluation system to ensure that these practices are in place.
 - 1. The district should ensure that teachers have received RETELL training to meet the needs of English language learners. This training will offer teachers strategies that are effective for all learners.
 - 2. The district should provide the professional development and support that teachers need in order to effectively differentiate instruction. This should include strategies for using the district's SmartBoards and iPads in a way that extends student learning.
 - 3. Teachers should receive follow-up coaching to ensure that professional development is ongoing and that teachers are provided frequent feedback about the ways in which their instruction meets the needs of all learners.
- B.** The district should seek to provide a more cohesive support system and should evaluate the effectiveness of programs and interventions.
 - 1. The district should provide a comprehensive, data-driven system of support services at all levels. Schedules and school culture should reflect a student-centered environment where all students are well-served by classroom teachers, specialists, and counselors and have adequate supports outside of the school day and school year.
 - 2. The system should include plans for evaluating the impact of specific interventions and programs, including by using aggregated and disaggregated data, in order to continually adjust and improve the district's system of supports and to add programs as needed.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students. The *MTSS Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/mtss-self-assessment.xlsm>) is a tool to help districts determine their current status in each of the MTSS components. (Instructions for the tool can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/instruction.pdf>.)
- ESE's *Early Warning Indicator System* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html>) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to solve systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.

Benefits: By implementing instructional practices and a system of supports that are designed to meet the needs of all students, the district will help to ensure that all students have access to an academic program that is comprehensive and rigorous. If students' needs are met in the general education classroom and if students receive services as needed that are targeted to their specific needs, special education referrals may decrease.

Finance and Asset Management

10. The district should proceed with its plans to renovate the middle school and to create additional space for elementary programs.

- A.** The middle school is overcrowded; more space would provide for expanded services for students. Technology upgrades are needed as well.
1. A renovated middle school should, as planned, include larger classroom spaces, better for small-group instruction and the use of technology to enhance learning.
- B.** Because of projected increases in elementary enrollment, additional classroom spaces will soon be needed at that level. Additional space for pull-out programs and programs and interventions for high-needs children will also be needed.
1. Classroom space at the elementary level is limited at the present time, and the addition of classrooms to accommodate future enrollment increases would require taking over science classrooms and other special spaces. Implementing district plans to move some elementary

programs, such as fifth grade, into a renovated middle school would free space to alleviate these limitations, and carrying through with plans to reopen a closed school would also free some space at the elementary schools for new classrooms and special programs.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation will include larger classrooms, better spaces for small group instruction, and improved technology to support a more flexible environment for varied and differentiated activities at the middle school level. Additional classroom space at the elementary level will prevent overcrowding and will preserve spaces for science and specialized instruction. Additional space will also permit new in-house special education programs to improve programs for students with disabilities.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 29-May 2, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Nadine Bonda, leadership and governance
2. Mary Eirich, curriculum and instruction
3. Christine Brandt, assessment, review team coordinator
4. Russ Dever, human resources and professional development
5. Katherine Lopez-Natale, student support
6. George Gearhart, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: director of finance and operations, payroll, accounts receivable and accounts payable; Beverly's chief financial officer.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chair; vice-chair; secretary; committee chair of curriculum, instruction, and student life subcommittee; chair of negotiations; chair of policy subcommittees; and Beverly mayor and members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president, vice president.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: assistant superintendent, director of pupil personnel services, Title(s) VI and IX director and coordinator of child welfare, and director of technology.

The team visited the following schools: Beverly High School (grades 9-12), Briscoe Middle School (grades 6-8), Ayers/Ryal Side School (K-5), Centerville Elementary School (K-5), Cove Elementary School (PK-5), Hannah Elementary School (PK-5), and North Beverly Elementary School (K-5).

During school visits, the team conducted focus groups with 9 elementary school teachers, 4 middle school teachers, and 10 high school teachers. The team conducted one focus group with seven principals.

The team observed 57 classes in the district: 15 at the high school, 12 at the middle school, and 30 at the 5 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 4/29/2013	Tuesday 4/30/2013	Wednesday 5/1/2013	Thursday 5/2/2013
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Beverly High School and Briscoe Middle School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Ayers, Centerville, Hannah, and North Beverly elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Beverly High School and Briscoe Middle School and Cove Elementary School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

Table B1a: Beverly
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Asian	97	2.2%	56,517	5.9%
Afr. Amer./Black	111	2.6%	81,806	8.6%
Hispanic/ Latino	366	8.4%	156,976	16.4%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat.	106	2.4%	26,012	2.7%
Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl.	3	0.1%	1,020	0.1%
White	3,652	84.2%	630,150	66.0%
All students	4,335	100.0%	954,773	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2012

Table B1b: Beverly
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Group	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	853	49.7%	19.1%	163,921	35.5%	17.0%
Low income	1,132	66.0%	26.1%	353,420	76.5%	37.0%
ELL and Former ELL	110	6.4%	2.5%	95,865	20.7%	10.0%
All high needs students	1,715	--	38.4%	462,272	--	47.9%

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. 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 4,464; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2: Beverly
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

	FY11		FY12		FY13
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated
Expenditures					
From local appropriations for schools					
By school committee	44,682,659	44,691,951	45,682,659	45,641,240	46,854,259
By municipality	11,590,354	24,219,819	12,449,714	22,595,308	12,277,795
Total from local appropriations	56,273,013	68,911,770	58,132,373	68,236,548	59,132,054
From revolving funds and grants	---	7,644,439	---	7,300,013	---
Total expenditures	---	76,556,209	---	75,536,561	---
Chapter 70 aid to education program					
Chapter 70 state aid*	---	6,694,328	---	6,730,266	6,901,866
Required local contribution	---	34,027,524	---	34,390,816	35,366,026
Required net school spending**	---	40,721,852	---	41,121,082	42,267,892
Actual net school spending	---	47,014,479	---	47,977,068	49,016,392
Over/under required (\$)	---	6,292,627	---	6,855,986	6,748,500
Over/under required (%)	---	15.5	---	16.7	16.0

*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: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved January 10, 2014

**Table B3: Beverly
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010–2012**

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012
Administration	\$397.73	\$370.99	\$357.40
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$681.38	\$617.00	\$641.12
Teachers	\$4,655.46	\$4,645.78	\$4,511.49
Other teaching services	\$997.28	\$946.20	\$992.41
Professional development	\$94.41	\$98.08	\$102.91
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$205.97	\$215.18	\$260.13
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$418.12	\$395.72	\$366.14
Pupil services	\$624.46	\$905.73	\$951.32
Operations and maintenance	\$855.53	\$804.97	\$824.22
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,577.88	\$2,736.90	\$2,887.53
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$11,508.23	\$11,736.56	\$11,894.67

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

Table B4a: Beverly
English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	322	83.2	88.0	84.8	84.8	1.6	0	--	Low
	P+	322	57%	67%	60%	59%	2	-1		--
4	CPI	332	80.5	81.4	81.8	81.1	0.6	-0.7	--	Low
	P+	332	54%	55%	53%	56%	2	3		--
	SGP	304	45.0	49.0	45.0	54.0	9.0	9.0		Moderate
5	CPI	299	88.8	85.4	87.9	84.4	-4.4	-3.5	Yes	Low
	P+	299	66%	63%	73%	64%	-2	-9		--
	SGP	272	50.0	42.0	58.0	53.0	3.0	-5.0		Moderate
6	CPI	351	89.6	91.1	89.4	89.5	-0.1	0.1	--	Moderate
	P+	351	76%	78%	73%	75%	-1	2		--
	SGP	337	65.0	68.0	62.5	60.0	-5.0	-2.5		Moderate
7	CPI	307	90.5	90.1	92.0	89.7	-0.8	-2.3	--	Low
	P+	307	75%	74%	77%	72%	-3	-5		--
	SGP	284	52.0	48.0	43.0	51.0	-1.0	8.0		Moderate
8	CPI	326	92.0	91.6	92.3	94.2	2.2	1.9	--	Moderate
	P+	326	81%	80%	81%	83%	2	2		--
	SGP	304	45.0	44.0	42.0	54.0	9.0	12.0		Moderate
10	CPI	312	90.9	93.1	95.2	96.2	5.3	1.0	--	Low
	P+	312	79%	80%	88%	89%	10	1		--
	SGP	253	51.0	44.0	46.0	46.0	-5.0	0.0		Moderate
All	CPI	2,249	87.8	88.5	89.1	88.5	0.7	-0.6	--	Low
	P+	2,249	69%	71%	72%	71%	2	-1		--
	SGP	1,754	52.0	49.0	49.0	54.0	2.0	5.0		Moderate

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. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

**Table B4b: Beverly
Mathematics Performance, 2009-2012**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	323	81.6	85.3	83.2	83.0	1.4	-0.2	--	Low
	P+	323	60%	68%	62%	61%	1	-1		--
4	CPI	330	80.6	77.5	78.4	80.2	-0.4	1.8	--	Low
	P+	330	53%	45%	45%	53%	0	8		--
	SGP	303	50.0	47.0	50.0	56.0	6.0	6.0		Moderate
5	CPI	302	76.5	77.5	78.1	79.1	2.6	1.0	Yes	Low
	P+	302	53%	55%	58%	56%	3	-2		--
	SGP	277	43.0	45.0	49.0	56.0	13.0	7.0		Moderate
6	CPI	351	76.4	80.5	79.4	82.8	6.4	3.4	Yes	Moderate
	P+	351	55%	58%	56%	65%	10	9		--
	SGP	337	41.5	56.0	44.0	54.0	12.5	10.0		Moderate
7	CPI	310	70.9	70.2	74.2	74.9	4.0	0.7	Yes	Low
	P+	310	43%	44%	50%	49%	6	-1		--
	SGP	285	34.0	37.0	42.0	54.0	20.0	12.0		Moderate
8	CPI	322	72.1	75.7	75.0	78.6	6.5	3.6	--	Moderate
	P+	322	45%	51%	52%	56%	11	4		--
	SGP	301	67.0	55.0	59.0	55.0	-12.0	-4.0		Moderate
10	CPI	308	87.1	90.1	91.9	90.0	2.9	-1.9	--	Low
	P+	308	73%	77%	79%	77%	4	-2		--
	SGP	250	52.0	56.0	54.0	42.0	-10.0	-12.0		Moderate
All	CPI	2,246	77.8	79.3	79.9	81.3	3.5	1.4	Yes	Low
	P+	2,246	54%	56%	57%	60%	6	3		--
	SGP	1,753	48.0	49.0	50.0	53.0	5.0	3.0		Moderate

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. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Table B4c: Beverly
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
5	CPI	302	80.0	82.8	76.4	78.3	-1.7	1.9	--	Low
	P+	302	49%	57%	47%	49%	0	2		--
8	CPI	322	71.0	74.3	76.3	76.9	5.9	0.6	--	Moderate
	P+	322	37%	42%	46%	48%	11	2		--
10	CPI	285	87.8	86.0	91.6	91.1	3.3	-0.5	--	Moderate
	P+	285	70%	67%	77%	75%	5	-2		--
All	CPI	909	79.0	80.7	81.0	81.8	2.8	0.8	--	Low
	P+	909	51%	55%	56%	57%	6	1		--

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. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above.

Table B5a: Beverly
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	885	75.8	76.6	78.2	77.3	1.5	-0.9
		P+	885	44%	43%	48%	48%	4	0
		SGP	636	46.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	-1	0
	State	CPI	235,216	75.3	76.1	77.0	76.5	1.2	-0.5
		P+	235,216	44%	45%	48%	48%	4	0
		SGP	177,719	45.0	45.0	46.0	46.0	1	0
Low income	District	CPI	634	77.8	77.7	80.3	78.6	0.8	-1.7
		P+	634	48%	47%	52%	51%	3	-1
		SGP	468	50.0	44.5	44.0	45.0	-5.0	1.0
	State	CPI	180,261	75.5	76.5	77.1	76.7	1.2	-0.4
		P+	180,261	45%	47%	49%	50%	5	1
		SGP	137,185	45.0	46.0	46.0	45.0	0.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	437	70.5	69.3	69.4	67.9	-2.6	-1.5
		P+	437	33%	28%	31%	31%	-2	0
		SGP	294	39.0	44.0	40.0	40.0	1.0	0.0
	State	CPI	91,757	67.8	67.3	68.3	67.3	-0.5	-1.0
		P+	91,757	28%	28%	30%	31%	3	1
		SGP	66,785	40.0	41.0	42.0	43.0	3.0	1.0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	40	65.3	69.2	74.2	66.3	1.0	-7.9
		P+	40	30%	28%	40%	40%	10	0
		SGP	18	58.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-58.0	0.0
	State	CPI	45,367	64.8	66.1	66.2	66.2	1.4	0.0
		P+	45,367	30%	32%	33%	34%	4	1
		SGP	29,933	51.0	51.0	50.0	51.0	0.0	1.0
All students	District	CPI	2,249	87.8	88.5	89.1	88.5	0.7	-0.6
		P+	2,249	69%	71%	72%	71%	2	-1
		SGP	1,754	52.0	49.0	49.0	54.0	2.0	5.0
	State	CPI	497,549	86.5	86.9	87.2	86.7	0.2	-0.5
		P+	497,549	67%	68%	69%	69%	2	0
		SGP	395,772	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

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 B5b: Beverly
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	883	61.6	63.2	65.7	66.8	5.2	1.1
		P+	883	28%	28%	33%	34%	6	1
		SGP	638	41.0	42.0	44.0	47.0	6.0	3.0
	State	CPI	235,552	64.5	66.7	67.1	67.0	2.5	-0.1
		P+	235,552	32%	36%	37%	37%	5	0
		SGP	178,144	45.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	1.0	0.0
Low income	District	CPI	632	62.3	64.8	68.0	67.9	5.6	-0.1
		P+	632	28%	31%	36%	36%	8	0
		SGP	470	42.0	43.0	44.0	47.5	5.5	3.5
	State	CPI	180,433	64.5	67.1	67.3	67.3	2.8	0.0
		P+	180,433	33%	37%	38%	38%	5	0
		SGP	137,529	44.0	47.0	46.0	45.0	1.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	438	55.9	55.3	56.0	55.9	0.0	-0.1
		P+	438	21%	17%	21%	21%	0	0
		SGP	297	40.5	40.0	37.5	40.0	-0.5	2.5
	State	CPI	91,876	56.9	57.5	57.7	56.9	0.0	-0.8
		P+	91,876	20%	21%	22%	21%	1	-1
		SGP	66,876	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	41	54.5	62.2	68.5	71.3	16.8	2.8
		P+	41	20%	23%	29%	37%	17	8
		SGP	18	43.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-43.0	0.0
	State	CPI	45,695	59.2	61.5	62.0	61.6	2.4	-0.4
		P+	45,695	29%	31%	32%	32%	3	0
		SGP	30,189	49.0	54.0	52.0	52.0	3.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	2,246	77.8	79.3	79.9	81.3	3.5	1.4
		P+	2,246	54%	56%	57%	60%	6	3
		SGP	1,753	48.0	49.0	50.0	53.0	5.0	3.0
	State	CPI	497,984	78.5	79.9	79.9	79.9	1.4	0.0
		P+	497,984	56%	58%	58%	59%	3	1
		SGP	396,357	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

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 B5c: Beverly
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	319	64.9	66.3	67.4	66.1	1.2	-1.3
		P+	319	26%	29%	33%	27%	1	-6
	State	CPI	96,996	62.1	64.3	63.8	65.0	2.9	1.2
		P+	96,996	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Low income	District	CPI	224	64.8	65.4	70.1	66.6	1.8	-3.5
		P+	224	27%	29%	36%	29%	2	-7
	State	CPI	74,300	61.1	63.6	62.8	64.5	3.4	1.7
		P+	74,300	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	165	58.3	62.7	59.1	58.2	-0.1	-0.9
		P+	165	17%	25%	23%	16%	-1	-7
	State	CPI	38,590	58.1	59.0	59.2	58.7	0.6	-0.5
		P+	38,590	18%	19%	20%	20%	2	0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	14	55.8	55.0	55.0	58.9	3.1	3.9
		P+	14	15%	20%	0%	21%	6	21
	State	CPI	15,271	50.8	51.8	50.3	51.4	0.6	1.1
		P+	15,271	15%	16%	15%	17%	2	2
All students	District	CPI	909	79.0	80.7	81.0	81.8	2.8	0.8
		P+	909	51%	55%	56%	57%	6	1
	State	CPI	211,464	76.8	78.3	77.6	78.6	1.8	1.0
		P+	211,464	50%	52%	52%	54%	4	2

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 B6: Beverly
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012**

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	2.0%	2.3%	2.9%	1.7%	-0.3	-16.5%	-1.2	-42.4%	2.5%

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 B7a: Beverly
Four-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	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	150	63.7%	72.1%	70.1%	65.3%	1.6	2.5%	4.8	6.8%	74.1%
Low income	106	65.6%	69.7%	71.1%	67.9%	2.3	3.5%	-3.2	-4.5%	72.4%
Students w/ disabilities	83	58.6%	70.9%	61.4%	54.2%	-4.4	-7.5%	-7.2	-11.7%	68.6%
English language learners (ELLs) & Former ELLs	8	--	--	66.7%	62.5%	--	--	-4.2	-6.3%	61.1%
All students	332	80.5%	86.0%	85.9%	81.0%	0.5	0.6%	-4.9	-5.7%	84.7%

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 B7b: Beverly
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011

Group	Number Included (2011)	School Year Ending				Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011		State (2011)
		2008	2009	2010	2011	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	137	72.1%	67.1%	77.6%	73.0%	0.9	1.2%	4.6	5.9%	76.5%
Low income	83	70.4%	68.8%	73.7%	73.5%	3.1	4.4%	-0.2	-0.3%	75.0%
Students w/ disabilities	83	65.6%	63.2%	77.2%	66.3%	0.7	1.1%	-10.9	-14.1%	70.8%
English language learners (ELLs) & Former ELLs	6	--	--	--	66.7%	--	--	--	--	64.2%
All students	305	87.1%	82.1%	88.4%	87.2%	0.1	0.1%	-1.2	-1.4%	86.3%

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 B8: Beverly
Attendance Rates, 2009-2012

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All Students	95.2%	94.8%	95.2%	95.6%	0.4	0.4%	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 B9: Beverly
Suspension Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
In-School Suspension Rate	3.5%	7.3%	1.4%	1.7%	-1.8	-51.4%	0.3	21.4%	3.4%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	3.4%	3.9%	3.9%	3.4%	0	0%	-0.5	-12.8%	5.4%

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.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory:

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful.	ES	0	4	26	(0)	0	0
	MS	0	1	11	(1)	6	11
	HS	0	1	14	(2)	51	89
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	5	9	16	(0)	5	9
	MS	0	2	10	(1)	13	23
	HS	0	2	13	(2)	39	68
3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.	ES	0	6	24	(0)	0	0
	MS	0	2	10	(1)	10	18
	HS	0	2	12	(2)	46	82
4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations.	ES	2	10	18	(0)	8	14
	MS	2	7	3	(1)	21	37
	HS	4	4	7	(2)	28	49
5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.	ES	1	8	21	(0)	3	5
	MS	2	4	6	(1)	15	26
	HS	0	3	12	(2)	39	68
6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES	2	5	22	(0)	12	22
	MS	7	4	1	(1)	14	26
	HS	3	5	5	(2)	28	52
7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	1	6	23	(0)	3	5
	MS	1	2	9	(1)	10	18
	HS	1	2	12	(2)	44	77

(Please see next page)

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content.	ES	0	3	27	(0)	4	47
	MS	1	2	9	(1)	7	12
	HS	3	2	10	(2)	46	81
9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident.	ES	4	5	20	(0)	14	25
	MS	5	2	4	(1)	11	20
	HS	5	4	6	(2)	30	55
10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content.	ES	1	8	21	(0)	9	16
	MS	4	5	2	(1)	18	32
	HS	4	5	6	(2)	29	52
11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills)	ES	8	8	13	(0)	22	40
	MS	6	3	2	(1)	13	24
	HS	8	2	5	(2)	20	36
12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding.	ES	7	7	17	(0)	18	33
	MS	7	1	2	(1)	13	24
	HS	4	5	5	(2)	24	44
13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES	1	6	23	(0)	14	25
	MS	6	4	2	(1)	13	23
	HS	7	3	4	(2)	29	52
14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding.	ES	2	6	20	(0)	8	15
	MS	1	4	5	(1)	14	26
	HS	5	4	6	(2)	31	58
15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction.	ES	0	10	20	(0)	7	13
	MS	1	5	5	(1)	17	30
	HS	6	2	7	(2)	32	57
16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning.	ES	9	7	12	(0)	21	40
	MS	6	2	4	(1)	10	19
	HS	6	1	6	(2)	22	42

(Please see next page)

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence					
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent	Overall		
		(0)	(1)	(2)	#	%	
17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines.	ES	0	4	25	(0)	5	9
	MS	0	9	3	(1)	18	32
	HS	5	5	5	(2)	33	59
18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	3	6	21	(0)	10	18
	MS	3	7	2	(1)	18	32
	HS	4	5	6	(2)	29	51
19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning.	ES	4	7	20	(0)	11	19
	MS	2	6	4	(1)	17	29
	HS	5	4	6	(2)	30	52
20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.	ES	5	8	17	(0)	18	32
	MS	4	4	3	(1)	12	21
	HS	9	0	6	(2)	26	46
21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses).	ES	18	1	11	(0)	32	63
	MS	6	1	1	(1)	3	6
	HS	8	1	4	(2)	16	31
22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter.	ES	10	6	14	(0)	16	29
	MS	1	4	6	(1)	13	24
	HS	5	3	6	(2)	26	47
23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding.	ES	15	6	8	(0)	32	57
	MS	12	0	0	(1)	9	16
	HS	5	3	7	(2)	15	27
24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars.	ES	12	7	7	(0)	30	58
	MS	9	2	1	(1)	10	19
	HS	9	1	4	(2)	12	23