District Review Report

Chelsea Public Schools

Review conducted June 8–11, 2015

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

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

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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner
Published March 2016

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

Chelsea Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2014–2015 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Chelsea School District was conducted from June 8–11, 2015. The site visit included 27.5 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 94 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 10 elementary school teachers, 22 middle school teachers, and 26 high school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 86 classrooms in 9 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 Context

The Chelsea Public Schools continue to serve as a gateway to education for immigrant children. A century ago, Jewish, Italian, and Irish immigrants made their way across the Mystic River from the docks of Boston and New York to this one-square-mile community to start their lives in the new world. Later, families from Puerto Rico and other Caribbean islands seeking opportunity in America settled in Chelsea. Now, those seeking shelter from the world's most hostile environments and war zones in Latin America as well as Africa and the Middle East are the city's newest residents. A surge in immigrants, many of them unaccompanied minors from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, has taken place in the last four years, with the largest surge taking place in 2013-2014. Although the surge has slowed this school year, the city continues to welcome new arrivals to the community and to its schools.

The district's student population reflects the diversity and challenges of Chelsea's citizens. Seventy percent of students fit the Commonwealth's high-needs descriptors.[1] Almost a quarter of students (24.1 percent compared with 8.5 percent for the state) are English language learners (ELLs) ; the superintendent reported that this proportion moves to 30 percent when FLEP students, who require some ELL service, are considered. For four out of five students (80.1 percent compared with 18.5 percent for the state), English is not their first language. Almost half (47.7 percent compared with 26.3 percent for the state) are economically disadvantaged. Students with disabilities make up 12.5 percent of enrolled students compared with 17.1 percent for the state.

Under the leadership of the current superintendent, the district has embarked on a multi-year effort to transform its educational system, committed to preparing all its students for life and work in the 21st century. It has provided the leadership to form and sustain a partnership with school districts from five contiguous communities— Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop— called the Five District Partnership (5DP). The 5DP ensures that students who relocate within these districts will have a more stable education, with access to educational programs that use similar teaching methods and shared curriculum units. Teachers equally can collaborate to design curriculum units following the Understanding by Design framework and have shared opportunities for professional development to build their ability to teach and assess for understanding.

Although expectations are clear and set high for student achievement and teacher performance, as well as leadership's role, only pockets of success are currently visible in classrooms. The inconsistent implementation of the Teaching for Understanding framework is also evident in several of the district's systems and practices. District and school improvement planning is clear in goal setting, yet it is unclear about how key components of improvement planning will be met: who will be responsible, how success will be measured, when goals will be achieved, and what resources are needed. Furthermore, classroom support for English language learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities is inconsistent. The district categorizes ELLs under its own system, one that does not correspond with WIDA standards and ACCESS testing. The superintendent reported and a document review confirmed that the district has

[1] English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs, students with disabilities, and students from economically disadvantaged families are characterized as high-needs.

developed a new system of categorization for implementation in the 2015–2016 school year. Although school leaders estimate that 80 to 90 percent of staff have participated in SEI endorsement training or RETELL, review team members observed limited use of explicit instructional strategies that meet the diverse needs of the many students who struggle with language or learning challenges. Support systems for students who are challenged by their environment and home life and who exhibit social and emotional distress, while initiated in a few programs, do not have the consistency, force, and depth that could prevent students from falling through the cracks.

As the community has embraced its student population and committed itself to providing a challenging and contemporary education, for five years it has not met the state's minimum net school spending requirement. Budget constraints have meant increasingly larger class sizes and sparse resources. Teacher salaries are second to the lowest among the five partner communities. This contributes to large teacher turnover[2], which compromises consistency and coherence in the classroom. The superintendent reported that the district has undertaken a multi-year initiative to correct this gap.

The district describes itself as in the midst of a major reconstruction of its educational system in its move toward teaching for understanding. However, successful implementation of its ambitious vision will not take place unless the district builds meaningful systems for planning; finds a long-term solution for underfunding; strengthens instruction; hires and retains high-quality teachers; improves supports for its English language learners and students with disabilities; and develops and manages its budget.

District Profile

The Chelsea School District has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. The nine members of the school committee meet bi-weekly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2011. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent, the executive director of administration and finance, the director of human resources, and a special education administrator. Central office positions have been increasing over the past two years. The superintendent reported that this is because of a 14 percent increase in four years in the enrollment of high-needs students, increased work required by the MSBA for the Clark Avenue School building project, and succession planning for key central office positions. The district has nine principals leading nine schools. There are other school administrators, including assistant principals. There are 413.1 teachers in the district.

[2] According to ESE data, the rates of annual teacher turnover in Chelsea in recent years have been as follows: 12.5 percent in 2010, 16 percent in 2011, 15.8 percent in 2012, 16.5 percent in 2013, and 20.2 percent in 2014.

In the 2014–2015 school year, 6,350 students were enrolled in the district's 9 schools:

Table 1: Chelsea Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2014–2015

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Shurtleff EEC	EEC and ES	PK–K	873
Berkowitz	ES	1–4	570
Hooks	ES	1–4	563
Kelly	ES	1–4	590
Sokolowski	ES	1–4	613
Browne	MS	5–8	545
Clark Avenue	MS	5–8	548
Wright	MS	5–8	521
Chelsea	HS	9–12	1,527
Totals	**9 schools**	**PK–12**	**6,350**
*As of October 1, 2014			

Between 2011 and 2015 overall student enrollment increased by 14 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were similar to the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 34 K–12 districts of similar size (5,000–7,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: $12, 798 as compared with $12,728 (see District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance). Actual net school spending has been below what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Chelsea is a Level 3 district because 6 of its 8 schools with reportable data are in Level 3 for being in the lowest performing 20 percent of schools in their grade span or having a subgroup that is among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

- Edgar A. Hooks Elementary is in the 46th percentile of elementary schools and is the district's only Level 1 school with a cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 81 for all students and 89 for high needs students; the target is 75.

- George F. Kelly Elementary was in the 24th percentile of elementary schools in 2013 with a cumulative PPI of 54 for all students and 60 for high needs students; the target is 75.[3]

- Berkowitz Elementary is in the 12th percentile of elementary schools and Sokolowski Elementary is in the 22nd percentile of elementary schools. Berkowitz Elementary is in Level 3 for being in the lowest performing 20 percent of schools and Sokolowski Elementary is in Level 3 because its English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

- All three of Chelsea's middle schools are in Level 3. The Browne School is in the 4th and Clark Avenue is in the 7th percentile of middle schools. The Eugene Wright Science and Technology Academy was in the 8th percentile of middle schools in 2013.[4]

    - The Browne School's African American/Black students, students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, Hispanic students, and ELLs and former ELLs are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

    - Clark Avenue's students with disabilities and ELLs and former ELLs are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

- Chelsea High is in the 4th percentile of high schools and therefore is in Level 3. Its cumulative PPI is 76 for all students and 77 for high needs students, above the target of 75.

    - Chelsea High is also in Level 3 because its students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and ELLs and former ELLs are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

    - Chelsea High has persistently low graduation rates for students with disabilities, and ELLs and former ELLs.

[3] George F. Kelly Elementary was held at Level 2 in 2014 because all its students in tested grades participated in the 2014 PARCC field tests and were exempt from the ELA and mathematics MCAS.

[4] The Eugene Wright Science and Technology Academy was held at Level 3 in 2014 because all its students in tested grades participated in the 2014 PARCC field tests and were exempt from the ELA and mathematics MCAS.

- Chelsea High has low ELA MCAS participation (less than 95 percent) for students from economically disadvantaged families, and ELLs and former ELLs; however, 97 percent of economically disadvantaged students and 99 percent of ELLs and former ELLs took the math MCAS test.

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

- ELA CPI was 69.1 in 2014, below the district's target of 82.2.
- Math CPI was 67.4 in 2014, below the district's target of 78.9.
- Science CPI was 57.8 in 2014, below the district's target of 70.5.

ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate by 13 percentage points or more for the district as a whole and in every tested grade. Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates declined in the district as a whole and in every tested grade except for the 10th grade. ELA performance varied by school.

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district declined from 47 percent in 2011 to 39 percent in 2014, 30 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate by 41 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 30 to 35 percentage points in the 3rd, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, by 28 percentage points in the 4th grade, and by 13 percentage points in the 10th grade.
    - Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 18 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 14 percentage points in the 7th and 8th grades, and by 10 to 12 percentage points in the 3rd, 4th, and 6th grades.
- 10th grade ELA proficiency rates increased by 17 percentage points from 60 percent in 2011 to 77 percent in 2014, 13 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 90 percent.
- 2014 ELA proficiency rates varied in the district's elementary schools from 22 percent at Sokolowski to 25 percent at Berkowitz to 33 percent at Hooks, and in the district's middle schools from 36 percent at Browne to 43 percent at Clark Avenue.

Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in the district as a whole and in each tested grade by 5 to 33 percentage points. Math performance varied by school.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district decreased from 43 percent in 2011 to 40 percent in 2014, 20 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 60 percent.
- Math proficiency rates in the district were below the state rate by 33 and 32 percentage points in the 5th and 7th grades, respectively, by 28 and 23 percentage points in the 6th and 10th grades, respectively, by 18 percentage points in the 8th grade, by 11 percentage points in the 3rd grade, and by 5 percentage points in the 4th grade.

  - Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates decreased by 20 percentage points in the 7th grade, by 14 percentage points in the 5th grade, and by 5 percentage points in the 6th and 8th grades.

- Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 6 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 5 percentage points in the 10th grade, and by 3 percentage points in the 3rd grade.

- 2014 math proficiency rates varied in the district's elementary schools from 39 percent at Berkowitz to 51 percent at Sokolowski to 75 percent at Hooks, and in the district's middle schools from 24 percent at Browne to 35 percent at Clark Avenue.

Science proficiency rates were below the state rate for each tested grade and in the district as whole. Between 2011 and 2014 science proficiency rates declined in the district's middle schools.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates decreased 9 percentage points from 21 percent in 2011 to 12 percent in 2014, 41 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 53 percent.

- 8th grade science proficiency rates decreased from 15 percent in 2011 to 11 percent in 2014, 31 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 42 percent.

- 10th grade science proficiency rates increased 24 percentage points from 35 percent in 2011 to 59 percent in 2014, 31 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 71 percent.

- At the middle schools science proficiency rates have declined between 2011 and 2014 by 8 percentage points at Wright (2014 proficiency rate 9 percent), by 7 percentage points at Clark Avenue (14 percent), and by 6 percentage points at Browne (13 percent).

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

- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 40.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.

  - ELA median SGP was above 60.0 at Hooks Elementary (61.0).

  - ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 5th grade (median SGP of 19.0) and in the 8th grade (35.0), and at Berkowitz (39.5) and Clark Avenue (31.5).

- On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 36.0: the state median SGP was 50.0.

  - Math median SGP was above 60.0 at Hooks Elementary (median SGP of 62.0) and Sokolowski Elementary (66.0).

- Math median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 5th grade (14.0), the 6th grade (35.5), the 7th grade (28.0), and the 10th grade (30.0) and at Clark Avenue (34.0), Browne (27.0), and Chelsea High (29.0).

Four-year and five-year cohort graduation rates have improved over the past four years. However, the district did not reach the 2014 four-year and five-year cohort graduation targets.[5]

- The four-year cohort graduation rate increased 9 percentage points from 54.6 percent in 2011 to 63.6 percent in 2014, below the state rate of 86.1 percent. The superintendent reported that 13.7 percent of this cohort are in school for a fifth year, which reflects the student population---in particular, immigrant students with interrupted education.

- The five-year cohort graduation rate increased 11.1 percentage points from 59.0 percent in 2010 to 70.1 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 87.7 percent. The superintendent reported that 4.3 percent of this cohort are in school for a sixth year, which reflects the student population---in particular, immigrant students with interrupted education.

- The annual drop-out rate for Chelsea has consistently been twice or more the state rate since 2010 and was 6.7 percent in 2014, over 3 times the statewide rate of 2.0 percent. The superintendent reported that more than 90 percent of the district's dropouts are over the age of 17, 69 percent are male, and just under 45 percent have been in the district and in the country for two years or less. She noted that the district is designing a social/emotional curriculum to support these students, piloting a school-to-work program, and expanding its partnership with Bunker Hill Community College to promote early college programs to help students "both feel and be more successful." In addition, the HiSET program (new GED) has been expanded to provide an additional educational path for these students.

[5] 2014 graduation targets are 80 percent for the four year and 85 percent for the five year cohort graduation rates and refer to the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rates.

Chelsea Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. The superintendent has developed strong regional collaborations through the Five District Partnership to address mutual concerns and implement innovative approaches to improving instruction and student achievement.

A. The Five District Partnership (5DP) is a joint educational effort among the Massachusetts districts Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop.

1. The Chelsea superintendent in collaboration with the superintendents of the other districts led the development of the 5DP to address the challenge of student mobility across the five districts and the need to stabilize the educational experiences of these students to improve their learning.

    a. The superintendent told the team that the adoption of the Common Core Curriculum by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education provided an additional impetus to collaborate across districts.

2. The mission of the 5DP is to "mitigate the gap in student achievement and maximize resources by aligning curriculum, performance standards, assessments, instruction, resources and professional development across the five districts."

3. The vision of the 5DP is collaboration around four central areas: student achievement, efficiency, educator relationships, and fiscal prudence. To accomplish this, the districts focus on creating common year-long plans (YLPs) and Understanding by Design (UbD) units for instruction and assessment.

4. An executive director position provides strength to the program.

B. The 5DP website lists the following as accomplishments: development of curriculum documents including Year-Long Plans (YLPs) and UbD units; related professional development programs; understanding and implementing new science standards; PARCC and DDM support; and, resources for teachers.

1. Curriculum leaders told the team that YLPs are aligned to the Common Core Standards.

C. Principals told the reviewers that teams of teachers and content-area coaches from all five districts are developing the curriculum units using the UbD format for the 5DP Year-Long Plans.

1. Principals reported that all curricular initiatives are coordinated across the 5DP districts and that Chelsea curriculum development teams, when selecting a new reading program, reviewed each program in the light of the Year-Long Plan and units developed by the 5DP and the associated UbD resources.

2. Elementary coaches told the team that the 5DP helps improve assessment of student performance because "students have similar reports across the schools and districts."

Impact: When the superintendent creates a culture of collaboration across and within districts, it encourages all stakeholders to work together to support higher levels of student achievement by improving instruction while maximizing resources and efficiency.

2. The superintendent promotes a culture of open communication, public confidence, collaboration, and joint responsibility for student welfare within the district and broader community.

A. The superintendent used a broad community participation process to develop the Chelsea Public Schools District Improvement Plan 2011–2016.

1. When first assuming office, the superintendent spent six months meeting with stakeholders throughout the district and then administered a communitywide district survey to inform the plan.

2. The superintendent said that a "bottom-up" process was used to craft the plan.

B. The District Strategic Plan (DSP) and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are publicly presented each year.

C. A document review showed that indicators of success have been developed, including: daily student attendance rate; district attendance percentage; district annual drop-out rate; Chelsea High School programmatic breakdown; early warning indicators; retention rate; student achievement; and student mobility. Results are reported monthly at school committee meetings.

1. School committee members reported that they review data at every meeting, noting that there has been a "dashboard of indicators" for the last four years that have engendered a high level of confidence.

D. The schools are collaborating with community agencies to improve teaching and learning.

1. A community agency representative reported that the superintendent "… has been slowly opening the door to us in a way that's unprecedented … [it] wasn't that way always at the schools."

2. Community agency representatives told the team that the schools are working with the community to ensure that all children and their families have the skills and credentials they need to be successful.

3. The schools have worked with the Massachusetts General Hospital to develop Fit Minutes during which students take breaks or have bursts of activities, which are always linked to instructional goals (such as rote math learning). Teachers have been trained and most classrooms do this daily.

E. The superintendent has worked to ensure that all community and municipal agencies are aware of the needs of the schools, as well as the changing demographics and their impact they on the schools.

1. There have been major demographic shifts in the schools' population. Over the past four years, there has been a significant increase in students arriving from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. The superintendent has worked to keep the data in front of municipal officials, recognizing that it was "… not a surge like last year, but a steady stream."

2. A municipal official told the team that "two years ago the superintendent recognized the influx of immigrants and we arrived at a [budget] number to respond to that situation, maybe in part if not in full." The official said that officials ask questions about enrollment numbers "so we can all understand."

3. A town official said, "On a daily basis I speak with somebody from the school department," adding "The superintendent and I see each other at least monthly in a formal meeting and often informally."

4. A teachers' association representative said that both sides are interested in keeping the lines of communications open. There is a monthly meeting with the superintendent and some cabinet members. Building representatives meet with principals. There is trust with the superintendent.

Impact: When the superintendent promotes a culture of transparency it can lead to an increased level of trust, confidence and commitment that encourages all stakeholders to work together.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district has designed its curricula and defined its instructional practices to attain high levels of achievement and understanding.

A. Leaders and teachers described how the district designed a standards-based educational system aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.

1. The District Curriculum and Instruction Team (DCIT), composed of 30–35 cross- discipline educators, began to align curriculum to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* before the frameworks were officially adopted.

B. Interviewees noted that 100 percent of ELA and mathematics curricula are now aligned to the frameworks. Science curricula are aligned to the Draft Revised MA Science and Technology/Engineering Standards.

C. The Five District Partnership (5DP) initiative has been instrumental in ensuring the mapping and development of curriculum aligned to state standards.

D. As a result of the 5DP collaboration, in 2012 educators formed teacher teams to begin to develop common curriculum maps, called Year-Long Plans (YLPs), organized by grade and content area or subject. This work is ongoing.

1. YLPs currently posted on the 5DP website and accessible to member districts include: ELA, Grades K–10; mathematics, Grades K–8, Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry; History Social Studies, Grades 2–7; and science, Grades 6–8.

2. District teachers and leaders consistently referred to the YLPs as the guiding documents to teach the district's recursive, standards-based curriculum. In fact, these documents form a standards-based scope and sequence of what to teach.

3. YLPs contain yearly pacing guides by grade level and/or subject (e.g., grade 4 mathematics or algebra 1) in two-month blocks to teach specific standards. Although formats vary slightly,[6] the YLPs also include overviews of standards and identify units of study and the resources needed to teach them. They are "living" documents, with ongoing revisions and new plans continually added. For example:

    a. The YLP for science for grades 3–5 has been written for a pilot next year.

    b. The development of YLPs at the high school level has been in place since August 2013; YLPs are reviewed and updated each summer. They have been revised to align with Massachusetts standards, PARCC, and the district's quarterly performance assessments. Discussions are currently taking place about curriculum and unit design and student assessments with adjustments anticipated for the YLP format.

[6] ELA YLPs also include anchor literacy standards, PARCC expectations, and the ten guiding principles for ELA programs from the 2011 state frameworks. Math YLPs include grade-specific expectations for each domain and the Standards for Mathematical Practice from the 2011 state frameworks.

E. Units created using the Understanding by Design (UbD) framework[7] and implemented using the Teaching for Understanding framework provide the structure for curriculum design and implementation.

1. One goal of the 5DP is to co-create UbD curriculum units to share across the member districts. The UbD units on the 5DP website include those created by educators from the five districts and ESE model UbD units developed during the Race to the Top Initiative. Chelsea educators have contributed many UbD units to the 5DP website.

2. UbD units and the Teaching for Understanding framework are used across all subjects and across all nine Chelsea schools. Interviewees said that all schools share a philosophy of Teaching for Understanding; the nature of the boxes on the UbD grid matches the school level, content, and standards.

3. Interviewees described the district's UbD units as rigorous plans of study framed first in the context of enduring understandings and essential questions. They are created using a backward design process that considers the results, evidence, and planned learning experiences and instructional strategies.

4. Interviewees told the review team that student progress is measured using performance tasks rather than traditional multiple-choice/short-answer quizzes and tests. The superintendent reported that performance assessments are used in addition to multiple-choice/short-answer quizzes and tests, noting that ANet scores reflect multiple-choice answers.

    a. During lesson observations, review team members observed students engaged in collaborative and individual performance tasks, most involving writing. Team members also reviewed several performance tasks in unit plans provided by teachers.

5. The 5DP and the district have provided professional development to build teachers' ability to develop UbD units and to teach and assess for understanding.

    a. Embedded PD takes place in weekly, grade-level PLC/PLT meetings PK–8 and twice weekly PLCs at the high school.

    b. Summer teacher workshops often led by district leaders and teams such as the DCIT have been and continue to be offered for early, middle, and advanced skill levels for UbD, with new teachers as prime participants.

[7] UbD units intend to be rigorous plans of study framed first in the context of enduring understandings and essential questions. They are created using a backward design process that considers the results, evidence and planned learning experiences and instructional strategies. The overarching goal is for students to demonstrate mastery by completing performance assessments or tasks. The performance tasks require students to apply standards-based knowledge, skills and understandings in new ways.

c. The district also shares expertise for PD from the other 5DP districts and also seeks external providers if in-district and 5DP support is insufficient.

F. Leaders and many teachers have a shared understanding of the expectations for good teaching.

1. Leaders identified as teaching expectations the ESE rubrics used in the teacher evaluation model as well as the philosophy and strategies of Teaching for Understanding exemplified in the UbD framework.

2. Teachers identified the need for rigor in teaching UbD units; one teacher described rigor as meaningful, challenging, transferable, and student centered.

3. A leader described rigor as the students, not the teachers, doing the "heavy lifting."

4. Teachers noted that lessons should engage students where they are (in the learning continuum) in complex tasks that are relevant to the world they live in. Students should be reflective and metacognitive, i.e., they should be able to explain their thought process and what they are doing.

   a. Teachers said that these goals, while worthy, are not achieved in every classroom every day.

Impact: Developing and implementing a curriculum and pedagogy of understanding fully aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* can provide students with rigorous and engaging learning experiences that will teach them to think and apply knowledge and understanding. The combination of the Year-Long Plans to address and organize state standards and UbD units can prepare students well for post-secondary education, work, and careers. In addition, using the 5DP for shared curriculum development and implementation across five school districts has the potential to provide a mobile student population with a more coherent, cohesive, and thoughtful learning experience as students make their way through school.

4. The professional learning communities and professional learning teams are key levers for continuous improvement at the school level and constitute a major form of embedded professional development in the district.

A. Interviewees told the team that six or seven years ago, the district established professional learning communities (PLCs) or professional learning teams (PLTs) to meet regularly during the school day. Their goal was and still is to inform decisions about teaching and learning to improve practice and student achievement. (PLCs and PLTs are all referred to as PLCs below.)

1. At the early learning center, kindergarten PLCs meet weekly in clusters during one period of common planning time (CPT).

2. At the elementary complex, grade-level PLCs meet weekly at each school for one period of CPT. Elementary specialists are also integrated into grade-level PLCs. Since elementary PLCs

are grade-level specific, they must share time to balance discussions of all content areas. Interviewees said that sometimes this is a challenge.

3. At the middle schools, the structure of PLCs varies by school and all meet once weekly during CPT. At Clark, there is one vertical content PLC. At Wright, there is one grade-level PLC. At Browne, teachers have four PLCs: one grade-level, one vertical by content, and two grade-level and content.

4. At the high school, teachers participate in at least one content PLC, often by grade level, and meet at least twice a week. High school PLCs include co-teachers, and specialists are dispersed across subjects, e.g., music teachers meet with the Grade 10 US History PLC.

5. In addition to attending school-level PLCs as specialists, the ELL teachers also meet weekly in an ELL PLC.

B. Literacy and math coaches at the elementary and middle schools and instructional coaches at the high school lead PLC meetings. Also, one writing lead teacher at each of the elementary schools and one shared writing coach at the middle schools participate in PLCs and lead discussions about writing. The superintendent reported that an ELL coach for grades 1-4 supports instructional coaches and teachers with implementing SEI strategies for English language learners.

1. Coaches meet weekly with their coordinators (literacy and humanities, STEM for science and mathematics, ELL, and intervention for after-school and summer programs) to discuss current needs, action steps, and dissemination of data to teachers.

2. With consultation and support from coordinators as well as principals and lead teachers, coaches set purposeful meeting agendas.

    a. A document review indicated that a recent agenda for an elementary ELA PLC focused on strengthening the reading/writing connection to build teacher and student capacity for Writing to Text. The agenda for a middle school math PLC centered on helping students become more independent problem-solvers.

C. Using multiple strategies, PLC meetings explore, review, and reflect on teaching and curriculum. Their goal focuses on improving curriculum, instruction, assessment, and student learning. Interviewees described the PLC as a place to learn from coaches, peers, student work and research.

Impact: The district's PLC structure has provided a frequent and safe environment for teachers to continually examine their teaching practice to foster higher levels of student achievement. Guided by coaches and using evidence from student work, data, lesson observations, and feedback, PLCs can promote teachers' understanding of their students' key strengths and challenges. Armed with this knowledge, teachers can collaboratively define action steps to improve instruction, design stronger UbD units and performance assessments. Even more importantly, they can provide evidence of the extent

students' understanding and their progress. Finally, PLCs help create a trusting and collaborative community of learners, where leaders and teachers can experience professional growth and development.

Assessment

5. The district is implementing and adding to an extensive system of assessments to monitor student understanding. The Curriculum Leadership Team analyzes the data and disseminates the results districtwide.

A. The district administers the three summative assessments.

1. The MCAS is in place for summative information about student achievement and growth in ELA (grades 3-10), math (grades 3-10), and science (grades 5, 8, and 10).

2. In 2014, the district piloted selected PARCC assessments at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

3. The district administers the ACCESS assessment to its English language learners (ELLs) in January each year.

B. The district administers three assessments during the school year to measure student progress.

1. In additional to participating in a MKEA pilot in kindergarten through grade 4, the district administers the DIBELS (Dynamic indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) in fall, winter, and spring to screen students' early literacy skills and to monitor the progress of the acquisition of those skills.

2. The district administers Achievement Network (ANet) formative assessments quarterly in grades 2–8. ANet is standards based and measures student achievement against specific grade-level standards.

    a. Teachers use ANet results to identify standards for reteaching.

3. The district administers the SRI (Scholastic Reading Inventory) in grades 3 and 4 in fall, winter, and spring; in grades 5–8 in the fall, winter, spring, and more frequently as necessary; and 4–5 times a year in 10th grade. A review of the Chelsea Assessment Framework indicated that the SRI provides a computer-based quick measure of reading comprehension and is used to make grouping decisions and to guide instructional support for struggling readers.

C. The district administers a number of internal performance assessments as is appropriate for its commitment to the Understanding by Design framework.

1. On-demand writing assessments, which take place quarterly in grades 1–8, measure student writing performance in narrative, informational, and argumentative writing. Teachers score writing based on a common rubric, and calibration of scoring takes place in PLCs.

2. The district initiated math performance assessments this year to measure 8 math practice standards or habits of mind from the 2011 Massachusetts frameworks. Teachers discuss the results at PLCs.

3. Quarterly Performance Assessments at the high school measure content mastery using rubrics with a continuum from Emerging to Developing, Proficient, and Advanced. These were introduced at the high school three years ago and are in place in all courses.

4. Chelsea High School's capstone assessment went schoolwide during the 2014–2015 school year, moving from a pilot of 50 to 1,300 students. Each student provides a written and verbal demonstration of what he/she has learned each semester.

5. Looking at Student Work is a growing practice and provides teachers with evidence of whether students are meeting content standards.

D. An organizational shift that took place two years ago has transferred central responsibility for data analysis.

1. The district rolled the district data team that was in place into the Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT) two years ago. Members of the CLT include the assistant superintendent for programs and accountability, a literacy and humanities coordinator K-4, the literacy and humanities coordinator 5–12, the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) coordinator, an intervention coordinator, and the ELL coordinator. For the last two years, these team members have had responsibility for analyzing and reviewing district data and sharing their insights broadly across the district. They credit themselves with the intensifying districtwide attention to data.

2. The coordinators reported that they and the coaches meet with educators at all levels about data analysis and review.

    a. Coordinators meet individually with the assistant superintendent once a month and that meeting is partly devoted to a review of their data.

    b. The coordinators review available assessment results with school coaches once a week and plan how to share the data with teachers.

    c. Coaches share data with teachers at PLCs. Teachers have access to the data, and beginning this year are expected to review the data in advance of meeting with coaches. However, content directors reported that, to a large extent, they and the coaches lead the focused analysis.

d. Coaches also review data with the school ILT (Instructional Learning Team) that includes the principal, the assistant principal, and a combination of coaches, lead teachers, and social workers.

e. Once a month principals, coordinators, and coaches meet to review data and plan instruction.

f. The superintendent reported that five times per year ANet holds a "step back" meeting with the assistant superintendent and the superintendent to review data; the DSAC meets monthly with the assistant superintendent and the superintendent to review data; and coordinators meet multiple times a year with the assistant superintendent and the superintendent's cabinet to review data. This is to ensure that district leaders are "all on the same page with what we are seeing and monitoring from the top level to the bottom and back up again."

Impact: With assessments in place to measure students' progress annually as well as periodically during the course of the year, the district is gathering, analyzing, and disseminating data that provides teachers with knowledge of students' strengths and challenges. Armed with this knowledge, teachers are in a place to design appropriate and effective instruction to address students' needs.

Human Resources and Professional Development

6. The district has established a well-developed and thorough educator evaluation system aligned to the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework. Formative and summative assessments and evaluations are largely instructive, informative, and promote professional growth.

A. The district adopted the model ESE collective bargaining contract language and implemented the educator evaluation system in school year 2012–2013. The district assigned educators alphabetically to either a one or two-year cycle.

1. A review of changes to the expiring collective bargaining agreement (CBA) described in a December 2014 memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the teachers' association and the school committee showed several minor modifications to the evaluation system.

   a. For example, the association and the district agreed to establish a bargaining team to review evaluation processes and procedures, including development of District-Determined Measures (DDMs). Also, educators would be required to submit no more than eight artifacts for review by evaluators.

B. In line with ESE guidelines, the district strategically uses the educator evaluation rubric by focusing on "high power" evaluation elements "that should be high priorities according to that educator's role and responsibilities as well as his/her professional practice and student learning needs."

1. A review of MOA language shows that each school year the superintendent selects a minimum of 10 evaluation elements to be given priority across the district and principals select another 5 elements for priority across the school.

    a. A principal told the team that elements were selected after collaboration with teachers.

2. The district collects and reviews rating data for each school and evaluator. Interviewees said that the district leadership team (DLT) meets once per month and works to calibrate evaluators' feedback to achieve consistency across the district.

C. The team reviewed 28 evaluation files of teachers and 16 evaluation files of district and school administrators.

1. For the most part, files contained self-assessments, SMART goal-setting documents, formative assessments and evaluations, and summative evaluations. Many contained evidence folders. The frequency of evaluation and document completion varied based on the educator's plan.

    a. Most of the evaluations were instructive and promoted growth. Many included detailed suggestions for improvement, although this varied somewhat by school and/or evaluator. In a number of files, the evaluator included suggestions for how a teacher could improve a proficiency rating to exemplary. However, in some instances, the evaluator provided limited narrative subsequent to rating an educator proficient.

        i. School committee members said that they follow the state model when evaluating the superintendent and review whether district and school goals are being met.

        ii. Participants in each teacher focus group said that they valued the feedback they received from evaluations. Comments included "very thoughtful," "excellent," "very fair and open," and "it has made us better teachers."

        iii. Association representatives told the team that educator evaluation has worked moderately well, although they said teachers need more conversations with evaluators.

D. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district is prepared to implement its DDMs plan in September 2015.

1. An appendix to the CBA describes the creation of the DDMs pilot and working groups of teachers and administrators to identify and select and/or develop DDMs. A joint labor management team has been established to bargain DDMs recommendations.

    a. Interviewees said that a presentation of DDMs will be made at an administrative retreat this summer and the association has agreed on how DDMs data will be used to measure student growth.

E. Interviewees were aware of the requirement to obtain feedback from students about teacher performance and told the team that they have developed surveys that will be sent out either at the end of this year or early next year.

Impact: The district has fully implemented the educator evaluation system. If evaluation consistency within and across schools continues to improve and if evaluations continue to include recommendations and suggestions that promote professional growth, teacher and student proficiency are likely to improve.

Student Support

7. The district is implementing a variety of initiatives to increase positive behavior and enhance teachers' classroom management.

A. The team observed 86 classes throughout the district: 34 at the high school, 20 at the three middle schools, and 32 at the 4 elementary schools and early learning center. In observed classrooms, the tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students was clearly and consistently positive and respectful in 84 percent of elementary classrooms, in 75 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 85 percent of high-school classrooms.

B. Schools have begun to implement various initiatives to enhance teachers' management of student behavior in the classroom.

1. Students who have been referred for behavioral issues are given a functional behavioral analysis.

    a. In kindergarten a Board Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) supports teachers in implementing the individual behavior plans for students in need.

    b. In some schools, after a student is referred for a functional behavior assessment, the social worker may model for teachers appropriate classroom behavior strategies, then collect daily data and follow up on students' progress.

2. Interviewees reported that at the elementary level, school social workers have helped teachers implement the Open Circle curriculum, a behavior management approach, in their lesson planning twice a month.

3. Interviewees reported that at the Berkowitz Elementary School an administrator helps teachers distinguish between classroom behavior management and classroom management.

4. The superintendent reported that the Browne and Clark middle schools are entering year four of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) system that governs all

work around school culture, including the adoption of *Teach Like a Champion*. Chelsea High School is looking to pilot PBIS in the 2015–2016 school year. The Wright Science and Technology Academy uses the Engaging Schools framework for classroom management and building respectful relationships between students and teachers. The superintendent noted that in 2015–2016 the Clark Middle School will be in its second year of involvement in a multi-year ESE PBIS Academy provided by the Massachusetts Tiered System of Supports. Each year of the Academy, the Clark PBIS coaches and leadership team will provide "multiple days of team training, multiple days of coaches' meetings, and multiple days of technical assistance to support the work of implementing a continuum of evidence-based interventions for all students."

C. School personnel are also implementing supports to address issues in students' lives and lead to increases in positive classroom behaviors.

1. Chelsea High School has recently implemented a Restorative Justice process, through which students engaged in non-positive behaviors are informed by peers and others in the school community about the ramifications of those behaviors and then must take steps to rectify the effects of the prior behaviors.

2. Interviewees reported that guidance personnel support a student's positive school behaviors via an "ecological model" that includes the guidance counselor, social worker, school psychologist or BCBA as well as the student's parents to reinforce positive behaviors in the home, including possible in-home therapies.

3. The district recently brought in a consultant to provide professional development to classroom teachers on strategies for managing classroom behaviors that students exhibit as a result of trauma.

4. School personnel may contact and coordinate services with appropriate community partners, e.g., North Suffolk Mental Health, the student's physician, MGH/Chelsea, and the East Boston Medical Center, as needed.

Impact: The district is taking steps to increase positive student behavior and strong classroom behavior management in several schools. These efforts signal to students, parents, and teachers the district's intention to provide, through collaborations and training, an environment conducive to student learning.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

Leadership and Governance/Financial and Asset Management

8. The district has not met required net school spending in recent years. Insufficient budget appropriations and unspent funds have contributed to the shortfall. It has an agreement with the city to close the gap and is making limited progress. There is no clear consensus among elected officials on the extent of this problem or a long-term solution, making strong advocacy difficult.

A. Chelsea has consistently not met its Net School Spending (NSS) requirement since fiscal year 2011. The district has taken steps to close the gap in this most recent year. In the fiscal year 2015 budget, the district is short of its requirement by $725K, moving from a gap of close to 5 percent in fiscal year 2014 to 1 percent in fiscal year 2015.

B. Based on budget deliberations, it is unlikely that the district will meet its requirement in fiscal year 2016.

C. The district is in the final years of a five-year plan with municipal officials to increase school funding by $750,000 per year over the local minimum contribution, an amount agreed upon to move the district closer to minimum spending requirements.

1. District administrators and city officials acknowledged that the additional $750,000 per year may not be sufficient to reach the NSS requirement.

2. City officials and school committee members said that they believe that the schools are funded at the level the school committee requests.

3. The superintendent reported that in fiscal year 2015 the city increased additional funding to $1,050,000.

D. In the period concurrent with NSS shortfalls, the district has encumbered significant expenses that ultimately were not spent in the same fiscal year.

1. The superintendent reported that encumbered expenses carried over into the next fiscal year were not 100 percent spent in the next fiscal year, resulting in that portion of unspent funds being added to the city's minimum contribution two years after the funds were originally encumbered.

E. Interviewees told the team that approximately $863,000 of encumbered expenses in fiscal year 2014 was not spent within the appropriate period; they estimated that approximately $500,000 of encumbered fiscal year 2015 expenses will be unspent in the current fiscal year

F. There is no clear agreement among district and city leaders on the extent of the funding problem or on the long-term solution.

1. One school committee member said, “We are not that far off, are we? To be honest, I do not think it is a multi-year problem,” adding that the issue always gets raised at school committee meetings, but “it’s not a major issue.”

2. Another committee member said, “The city has its own budget problems … it comes up every year. As long as I have been on school committee we have not met NSS.” The committee member added that “throwing money” at the problem does not lead to better results.

3. When asked why the school committee has not asked for the minimum amount another school committee member replied that the state does not reimburse the district for certain ineligible expenses assumed by the town.

4. A city official acknowledged the gap and said, “Our plan is in place for a regular methodical agreement… in 2010 or 2011 we committed $750,000 additional dollars each year for 5 years to address net school spending.”

5. A school finance official said, “Even with the [additional] $750,000, we are not moving the needle.” The official told the team that there is a new plan, “The 2nd plan is to fund us above the minimum.”

6. A city council member said that there has never been a cut to the school budget by the city council.

7. Another city official echoed that, noting that “The gap is getting smaller…” and “You really can’t throw cash at a problem, you need to have a plan.”

8. The superintendent told the team that closing the NSS gap is a concern that the administration “has been aggressively pushing.” The superintendent added, “The community leadership is financially very conservative. They remember receivership and don’t want to go back to that.”

G. Underfunding for the schools has left the district with serious challenges.

1. A district administrator told the team that Chelsea has the second lowest teachers’ salaries in the region, second only to Winthrop. According to ESE data, the fiscal year 2013 average teacher salaries for the 5DP districts are as follows: Malden, $78,868; Revere, $ 78,309; Everett, $68,899; Chelsea, $66,727; and Winthrop, $57,879.

2. An administrator told the team that because the district has not been able to offer competitive salaries there is a lot of staff turnover. According to ESE data, the district’s 2014 teacher turnover rate was 20 percent, compared with the state rate of 12 percent.

3. Principals reported that class sizes have increased from about 21 to near 30. Classroom teachers told the team that the biggest challenge was class size and cited the example of a sheltered English class where there are 49 students, with some support.

    a. They also told the team that social workers' caseloads have increased from 15 to 30 and continue to increase; this is primarily because of an increase in the number of cases, rather than a reduction in staff. The superintendent reported that social workers do not have a set caseload beyond the students who receive social work support on their IEPs.

4. While some teachers reported that they have "more than enough resources," others disagreed and told the interviewers:

    - "We haven't had pencils in a long time."
    - "We have been more than six months without graph paper."
    - "We are well resourced but not in technology."
    - "There are not enough computers; we need to run around to borrow Chrome books."

5. The superintendent reported that the district is moving toward increasing the budget for Chromebooks and iPads.

6. A principal said that although 80 percent of the student body does not speak English as a first language there is only one second language learning specialist in his/her school. During classroom visits, reviewers observed few ESL support staff in general classrooms.

Impact: Without a strong long-term solution to the funding problem, the school committee cannot adequately advocate in the community to ensure that necessary funds are appropriated for the district. By not fully spending its appropriation, the district exacerbates its already tight resource constraints.

9. Although the district has worked to create a vision and a set of priorities focused on improving student achievement and instruction, it has not designated staff with primary responsibility for implementing priorities or identified measureable evidence, outcomes, and indicators to show that priorities have been met.

A. There are a large number of interrelated district and school level plans.

1. *The Chelsea Public Schools District Improvement Plan 2011–2016* is a 113-page document, which includes: Mission; Vision, Values; Indicators of Success; Strategic Plan; Thematic Goal; Theory of Action; Strategic Objectives Action Plans for six standards (Leadership, Governance, & Communication; mCurriculum & Instruction Evaluation; Human Resource Management & Professional Development); Student Academic Support, Access, & Participation; Financial and Asset Management Effectiveness

and Efficiency; Core Instructional Practices; Improvement Objectives for ELA, Math, & Science; a description of the Strategic Planning Process; and a number of appendices.

2. Annual Strategic Plans include a thematic goal, theory of action, strategic objective, strategic initiatives, and SMART goals to address the strategic initiatives with associated benchmarks.

3. Annual School Improvement Plans are substantially aligned to the annual Strategic Plan.

B. While most of the district and school level plans are detailed, they all are missing guidelines for prioritization of what should be implemented.

1. The plans' goals are generally clear, specific and strategic, serving an important purpose of the school or district.

2. Not all of the plans include benchmarks nor do those benchmarks that are present include evidence of whether a goal has been achieved. Many of the measures of effectiveness are not specific.

3. Most of the strategies/action steps in the plans are not timed and few deadlines are presented. For example, the timeline for all of the action steps for the previously cited goal are listed as ongoing. Action steps also do not include information about the resources needed to address the action steps and the costs associated with those needed resources.

4. Action steps do not clearly identify a specific individual responsible for implementing and accomplishing the action.

    a. The superintendent reported that the district has moved away from identifying one specific individual responsible for implementing and accomplishing an action to DLT members collectively and individually being responsible to a one-year strategic plan.

Impact: Without plans that detail implementation priorities, clear goals with measurable outcomes, personnel responsible for achieving the goals, specific action steps to achieve the goals, resources and associated costs required, the district, schools, and community cannot systematically implement, monitor, and refine continuous improvement efforts.

Curriculum and Instruction

10. In observed classrooms, the learning environment was not consistently positive and respectful. There was a low incidence of the use of instructional technology by teachers and students.

A. The tone of interactions between teachers and students and among students was clearly and consistently positive and respectful (#1) in 84 percent of observed elementary lessons, in just 75 percent of middle school lessons, and in 85 percent of high school lessons. Behavioral standards

were clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably (#2) in 88 percent of observed elementary lessons, but in 75 percent of middle school lessons, and in 68 percent of high school lessons.

1. In most observed classes, teachers and students treated each other with respect and classrooms exhibited a positive tone conducive to learning. Observers noted that behavior was either not an issue or dealt with effectively by the teacher.

    a. In several classrooms, however, review team members noted a tone that was not positive and respectful between teachers and students; there were abrupt lesson beginnings without greeting students and with limited or no introduction and preparation for the work of the lesson.

    b. In other classrooms, students were unruly and in some cases, according to all observers, classes either erupted into chaos or teachers conducted lessons over students' disruptive behavior or loud voices. While teachers were not disrespectful in these instances, they had difficulty gaining or regaining control of the lesson.

    c. In some cases, teachers ignored or made no attempt to engage either the "pockets" or the majority of students who did not participate in the lesson tasks or requirements. Classroom rituals and routines clearly and consistently promoted transitions with minimal loss of instructional time (#4) in 88 percent of elementary lessons, in 65 percent of middle school lessons, and in 74 percent of high school lessons.

B. In a few observed lessons, much time passed at the beginning of lessons before the class settled down to address the lesson objectives and activities. In other instances, teachers did not redirect students when they were not engaging in the lesson.

C. Multiple resources were available to meet all students' diverse learning needs (#5) in 63 percent of elementary lessons, but in 40 percent of middle school lessons, and in 24 percent of high school lessons. The team noted a low incidence of the use of instructional technology by both teachers and students in observed classrooms.

1. In just 6 percent of elementary lessons, teachers clearly and consistently used technology to support instruction and enhance learning (#6). Observers noted teachers using technology to support teaching and learning but in 40 percent of middle school lessons and in 18 percent of high school lessons. Observers often saw teachers using digital projectors as overhead projectors—the static projection of text or a graphic—rather than taking advantage of digital learning.

2. Students used technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding (#22) in just 3 percent of elementary lessons, in 20 percent of middle school lessons, and in 15 percent of high school lessons.

Impact: Without clarity and consistency in expectations for classroom behaviors and the development of good learning habits, students' habits of mind cannot be fully developed. Ineffective classroom management might also be a prime factor in teacher burnout, according to research catalogued by the American Psychological Association (APA), and linked to teacher turnover. Without introducing technology in almost every aspect of teaching and learning, Chelsea's students will not be as well prepared and skillful as their peers in other communities and, indeed, in other countries.

11. In observed lessons, the clarity that leaders and many teachers expressed in interviews about standards-based teaching practices using a Teaching for Understanding framework not been translated into consistent instruction.

The team observed 86 classes throughout the district: 34 at the high school, 20 at the three middle schools, and 32 at the four elementary schools and early learning center. The team observed 33 ELA classes, 32 mathematics classes, 10 science, and 11 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 6 special education classes, including several co-taught classes, and 12 classes targeted to English language learners (ELLs). The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

A. Teachers clearly and consistently communicated clear learning objective(s) aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks (*#8*)* in 63 percent of observed elementary lessons, but in 80 percent of middle school lessons, and in 74 percent of high school lessons.

B. The review team found that teachers clearly and consistently planned and implemented lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations (#7) in 59 percent of observed elementary classes, in 75 percent of middle school classes, and in 53 percent of high school classes. Students were observed engaged in challenging academic tasks (#17) in 63 percent of elementary lessons, in 70 percent of middle school lessons, and in just 47 percent of high school lessons.

1. Practices that demonstrated rigor and high expectations included a grade 4 math performance task following a classroom discussion to develop a multi-step equation to solve a problem. The students worked in small groups to develop their own multi-step equation using multiplication and addition and a number line. In a grade 8 ELA lesson, students used dialogue and stage directions to make inferences about characters and motives. This was accompanied by a task to select supporting text and then discuss their ideas with a partner.

2. Practices that demonstrated lower expectations for rigor and challenge included a high school history lesson where the teacher sat at a desk while students read an article and filled in blanks on a worksheet. The "do now" on the board was then assigned as homework. In a middle school math class, students were required to copy what the teacher read from the screen at the front of the room

C. In observed lessons, teachers clearly and consistently provided opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (#11) in only 47 percent of elementary lessons, but in 65 percent of middle school lessons, and in 53 percent of high school lessons. Observers noted students clearly and consistently demonstrating the use of higher order thinking skills in 50 percent of elementary lessons, in 55 percent of middle school lessons, and in 38 percent of high school lessons.

1. Fine examples of higher-order thinking included a high school world history class where students were learning about point of view. The paired task required students to synthesize their study of the causes of the Vietnam War by analyzing and evaluating multiple sources to determine if it was either a "good" war or a "bad" war. In a grade 2 ELA lesson, students wrote and illustrated books about dinosaurs using a thematic key to organize and record facts before constructing sentences, then paragraphs, then illustrations. They used a rubric to prompt their work then met individually with the teacher for evaluation.

2. Higher-order thinking was not required in a grade 9 Algebra 1 class in which students were completing worksheets to procedurally add and subtract abstract polynomial equations with no introduction or discussion of what they could mean or represent. In another focus on procedure, the beginning of a lesson to dissect a frog in biology mentioned rules and procedures rather than introducing the lesson or reviewing why dissection was useful and predicting what students might find or learn.

D. Several other characteristics in the inventory addressed students' opportunities to think and to elaborate on their thinking. Observers noted that students clearly and consistently articulated their thinking verbally or in writing #18) in 63 percent of elementary lessons, in 73 percent of middle school lessons, and in only 4 percent of high school lessons. Students clearly and consistently elaborated about content and ideas when responding to questions (#20) in 59 percent of elementary lessons, in only 35 percent of middle school lessons, and in just 38 percent of high school lessons. In this last characteristic, observers checked to see whether teachers probed students for more information to explain or elaborate on their ideas or reasoning using follow-up questions or asked students "How do you know?" or "Why?" or "Why not?"

1. A fine example of students' elaborating on their thinking was observed in an elementary ESL/ELA class. Students were engaged in independent analyses of text and knowledge construction. After students shared their ideas, the teacher asked whether they had noticed something that others said that they had not noticed before. The teacher then followed up by asking students to tell about a similar experience in their own lives.

2. A less ineffective practice observed for this characteristic was noted when the teacher asked students to describe where they had seen a similar concept in another unit of study. After a

student gave a one-word answer, the teacher himself gave an elaborate explanation and provided several examples rather than asking the students to do so.

E. Observers found that teachers clearly and consistently conducted frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction (#15) in 72 percent of elementary lessons, in 65 percent of middle school lessons, and in 56 percent of high school lessons. Teachers clearly and consistently used questioning techniques that required thoughtful responses that demonstrated understanding (#12) in 69 percent of elementary lessons, in 50 percent of middle school lessons, and in 62 percent of high school lessons.

1. Good examples of the use of formative assessment included a grade 4 math class where the teacher circulated checking work as students tried to calculate how many layers of cubes were needed to get to a certain volume. The teacher stopped the class when students were struggling with a question and worked it out on the board with them. Students were then asked whether anyone had a different way of solving the problem. A grade 6 ELA class used clickers to demonstrate understanding; as a result, both teacher and students knew how well students understood the question.

2. A less effective formative assessment was a class in which the teacher did all the talking to answer the "do now."

F. The application of knowledge is a key principle of UbD units and teaching for understanding. Observers noted that students clearly and consistently made connections to prior knowledge, or real-world experiences, or could apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects (#21) in 41 percent of elementary lessons, in just 35 percent of middle school lessons, and in only 38 percent of high school lessons.

1. In a grade 4 mathematics class, students were alerted that they would now "apply" what they had learned about area and perimeter formulas. The teacher asked them to work in small groups on differentiated tasks to purchase materials and to construct animal pens using squares and rectangles, making sure to use their knowledge of place values as they budgeted for items. Before beginning the task, students were asked to discuss in groups what they thought would be challenging about the project. In a grade 10 ELA class, students were preparing to draft public service announcements based on their research on controversial topics such as gangs, violence, vandalism, and teen pregnancy.

2. Although in some mathematics classes students were able to relate math procedures to real-world experiences and to apply their knowledge and understanding, there were missed opportunities in others.

Impact: The absence of consistently high quality instructional practices in the district may be partially linked to inconsistent classroom management practices in some classrooms. Without consistent, rigorous instruction, some students are not able to attain the high levels of achievement and understanding that is the goal of the district's instructional practices.

12. The district has not enriched its curriculum and instructional practices at Tier 1 to adequately and consistently address the needs of English language learners.

A. Although some steps have been taken to support ELLs, the district has not sufficiently addressed this subgroup's learning needs in its standards-identification, units of study, teaching resources, and instructional practices in Tier 1.

1. There is staff capacity to apply SEI strategies in lessons. A leader noted that 80–90 percent of core academic teachers have had SEI endorsement or RETELL training.

2. A review of 5DP and ESE/RTTT UbD units for use in regular education classes indicated that they do not adequately include WIDA standards and appropriate modifications or teaching strategies for ELLs.

    a. Only a handful of the units include any reference to subgroups, often in general terms such as, "If students require modifications, provide modifications."

    b. A few of the units include differentiation in Stage 3 entitled, "Differentiation for ELL Students, Students with Disabilities, and Students with Advanced Skills." These described varied learning strategies to implement with subgroups.

3. District leaders noted that 80 percent of teachers had taken RETELL, but implementation in the classroom needed to be addressed. A district administrator noted that both administrators and teachers had taken RETELL and the district was trying to get coaches in the classrooms.

    a. The superintendent also reported that this is a priority initiative in the 2015-2016 one-year strategic plan.

B. In observed lessons, teachers clearly and consistently used appropriate modifications for ELLs and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products (#10) in 38 percent of elementary lessons, in 35 percent of middle school lessons, and in 18 percent of high school lessons.

1. In many lessons, observers noted that teachers missed opportunities to highlight vocabulary and differentiate instruction based on students' learning needs. Review team members also observed that teachers clearly and consistently paced lessons to meet students' diverse learning needs (#14) in 72 percent of elementary lessons, in 75 percent of middle school lessons, and in 53 percent of high school lessons. This indicates that in one out of four elementary and middle school lessons and in almost half of high school lessons, observers judged that lessons were not paced to enable all students to access lesson objective(s).

C. Recent MCAS results highlight the need to address the learning needs of the district's ELLs more effectively, especially for writing skills.

1. In 2014, Chelsea's ELLs and former ELLs lagged behind their state peers in all content areas. ELLs/former ELLs ELA proficiency rates for Chelsea were 15 percent compared with 36 percent for the state; ELLs/former ELLs math proficiency rates for Chelsea were 23 percent compared with 35 percent for the state; and ELLs/former ELLs science proficiency rates were 7 percent for Chelsea compared with 18 percent for the state.

2. In 2014, Chelsea's ELLs and former ELLs lagged behind their state peers on open-response items in ELA and mathematics. This MCAS component evaluates students' ability to think and write coherently using standard English. In ELA open-response items, 12 percent of Chelsea's ELLs/former ELLs scored 2 or above compared with 37 percent for the state. In mathematics open-response items, 23 percent of Chelsea's ELLs/former ELLs scored 2 or above compared with 34 percent for the state.

3. The superintendent reported that for the 2015-2016 school year the district has contracted with an outside provider to have a writing coach work with teachers to ensure familiarity with the Common Core standards and related writing demands, to align and embed strong writing practices across grade levels, and to create writing assignments and rubrics.

Impact: Without sufficiently addressing the broad spectrum of skills and knowledge related to vocabulary, reading comprehension, writing and discourse skills that students need to succeed in academic work with appropriate identification of WIDA standards and application of SEI strategies, the district cannot adequately support ELLs as they progress through the school system.

Human Resources and Professional Development

13. In recent years a high percentage of teachers has turned over every year in the district.

A. According to ESE data, since 2010 the turnover rate of teachers in the district has increased from 13 percent in 2010 (52 teachers) to 16 percent in 2011 and 2012 to 17 percent in 2013 to 20 percent in 2014 (83 teachers).

1. According to 2014 ESE data, the teacher retention rate varies by school level. In 2014, the high school retained 76.6 percent of teachers. The Browne, Clark, and Wright middle schools retained 60 percent, 74.4 percent, and 69.4 percent of teachers, respectively. The Berkowitz, Hooks, Kelly, and Sokolowski elementary schools retained 88.6 percent, 85.3 percent, 85.3 percent, and 88.6 percent of teachers, respectively. The early learning center retained 93.5 percent of teachers.

B. The district is making some efforts to provide support for new teachers, although most are not fully in place.

1. A mentoring program for first-year teachers is fully in place, and last year the district piloted a second-year mentoring program.

2. The district is in the process of creating a professional learning academy to differentiate professional development for teachers with less experience.

3. Interviewees said they are focusing on retaining teachers by developing leadership opportunities and incentives that will keep them in the district. While no specific career ladder is in place, leadership positions such as coordinators, coaches, and mentors are available for some teachers.

    a. The superintendent reported that the district provides 50 percent tuition reimbursement to all teachers and paraprofessionals for any college courses in public and private institutions. She also noted that the district provides 100 percent tuition reimbursement to all administrators for any college courses in public and private institutions.

C. The review team found widespread concern about turnover.

1. Interviewees said that improving instructional practices and student achievement is a challenge because of turnover. An interviewee said that PLCs are a frequently used form of professional development in the schools. Teachers review data and plan instruction. But effective PLCs take time to develop and teacher turnover inhibits that development.

2. Teachers in focus groups at all levels concurred that teacher turnover is a problem in the district.

    a. They said that teachers are reluctant to form collaborative teaching relationships because there is a great likelihood that teachers with whom they work closely may leave.

    b. Teachers said that turnover prevents the district from developing a strong core of teachers who will be “change leaders.” They noted that second- and third-year teachers leaving is the district’s core problem.

    c. Others said that more encouragement and administrative support for teachers is needed.

3. One parent identified turnover at the high school as its biggest challenge.

4. High school students stated that turnover is hard for juniors and seniors as they build relationships with teachers only to see them leave.

5. The superintendent reported that the district is leveraging its educator evaluation system to support teachers' growth and to identify and support potential leaders. She noted also that the district is working to recruit and retain teachers by developing an internal pipeline of educators. For example, student teachers from several area universities do their student teaching in Chelsea and then are given first consideration for teaching positions in the schools. The superintendent also reported that the district is engaging with outside providers to support teachers.

D. The district has begun to address the District Improvement Plan action step of researching reasons for staff mobility and proposing a long-range plan to stabilize staffing.

1. The district recognizes its need to hire teachers who speak Spanish.

2. Interviewees reported that some 80–85 percent of paraprofessionals and the four parent liaisons are bilingual and despite the efforts of the district few teachers in the district are able to communicate directly with non-English-speaking parents, of whom Spanish-speakers are the largest group.

    a. The superintendent reported that the district seeks to hire Spanish speaking staff for every position and has instituted four parent liaison positions, one at each grade range. The superintendent noted that the district also has endorsed and paid for language immersion courses for staff.

3. One district administrator estimated that some 15 teachers within the district speak Spanish; another interviewee noted that 3 of 5 new administrators hired for next year are bilingual.

    a. The superintendent reported that 15 teachers with professional status at Chelsea High School speak Spanish. She noted that the district collects ethnicity data but does not routinely collect data about second language proficiency data. The superintendent said that she asked administrators how many educators in their schools speak Spanish. She noted that with six of nine schools reporting, the district has 35 teachers who speak Spanish and 10 bilingual administrators.

5. The superintendent reported that the district has conducted random sampling of the exit interviews of teachers leaving voluntarily and has a plan to increase salaries.

Impact: The inability of the district to retain teachers inhibits its ability to build a stable corps of high-quality teachers and provide students with the effective instruction that results in improved student achievement. Without a diverse faculty that reflects the demographics of the district, students do not have appropriate role models to help them navigate the school environment.

Student Support

14. The district has not successfully implemented tiered support systems that serve the learning needs of all students.

A. In observed classrooms, effective modifications and accommodations in Tier I instruction were seldom in evidence.

1. Review team members noted little differentiation in observed lessons.

    a. In instances where team members did see differentiation it was often limited to all students doing the same task but at different times.

B. Interviewees reported that the district currently does not have the systems and practices to meet all Tiers 2 and 3 needs across the district and that those needs are substantial.

1. The superintendent reported that the district has been working with the Massachusetts Tiered System of Supports for the past two years to bring in professional development and coaching in this area and will be starting the Tiered System of Support Academies in the fall. She noted that this is a priority in the district and it is in process.

C. The district's model for special education services is not clear. The district's written description of its special education services advocates for an inclusion model within a tiered framework.

1. The superintendent reported that the district is expanding the continuum of services for students with more intense special education needs. The intent is to offer these students additional placement in the district rather than placing them in outplacement.

D. Title I staff reported that at the elementary level they implement a 45–60 minute ELA block using the *Read to Grow* model, targeting students identified by Title I staff as needing interventions.

E. Systematic identification and provision of services for English language learners (ELLs) in need of special education services are not in place.

1. Interviewees said that the special education team is still trying to figure out how to address the challenge of identifying ELLs who need services and that their approach is not systematic.

    a. Interviewees reported that only one elementary school is effectively teasing out when struggling ELLs may need services to address a learning disability.

2. One administrator said that the district is trying to build capacity for bilingual evaluators to do the testing and placement.

a. The superintendent reported that there are only 15 bilingual teachers with professional status at the high school. She also reported that the district does not have accurate data on the number of bilingual teachers with professional status in all its schools or the number of bilingual teachers without professional status in all its schools.

3. The superintendent reported that the Instructional Support Teams, which include both ELL and special education staff, make decisions about service provision.

4. Plans to provide ELLs in levels 1–3 with opportunities to participate in mainstream classes and to develop a flexible transition model to provide them with exposure to a stronger English language environment have not been uniformly implemented across the district.

5. Efforts to use Elevations software to track the progress of ELLs across the four domains (reading, writing, speaking and listening) are in the early stages.

F. District responsibility for the coordination of services for ELLs has fallen to three different people in the last three years.

G. ACCESS results indicated that Chelsea students show progress in moving through levels 1 and 2, but do not move much beyond Level 3; fewer advance to Levels 4 and 5.

1. The superintendent reported that the district was converting English language learners (ELLs) to Former English language learners (FELL s) too soon. Because ACCESS was not administered to FELLs, their progress to levels 4, 5, and 6 was not captured. She noted that for 2015–2016 the district has revamped its exit criteria to show ELLs' progress at levels 3, 4, and 5. She also reported that Chelsea is the only district in the state that now uses an ELL coding system that directly correlates with the WIDA system (1-5).

H. Interviewees reported that there are often delays of two to three months in producing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and posting them in Aspen for teachers and other educators to see.

1. The superintendent said that there may be a one month delay for a fully translated IEP. However, parents are provided with an IEP in English within the compliance deadline. This is explained to parents at the IEP meeting and parents are asked to sign a form stating that they understand the services to be provided.

Impact: When systems and practices are not in place to meet students' diverse learning needs, the district cannot promote high achievement for all students. Without a clear set of systems and practices in place to help families advocate for special services for their children, the district cannot ensure equity and access for all students.

Financial and Asset Management

15. The district's budget development process does not sufficiently include consideration of district goals, and planning documents do not inform budget development. The fiscal year 2016 budget document does not contain complete or consistent financial information that would help inform budget decisions.

A. The FY2016 Budget Calendar, approved by the school committee, outlines a schedule of activities and meetings including internal staff meetings, school committee meetings, and meetings with school councils, to discuss budget development. The schedule does not include consideration of improvement or strategic plans in budget development.

1. December to January meetings with principals are used to "review instructions, develop staffing proposals, class numbers, recommend savings, and prepare budget proposals for submission to the business office."

2. When asked whether District Improvement Plans (DIPs), Department Improvement Plans, and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are a factor in the budget process, a district administrator said that principals' requests could tie into those plans but the administrators developing the budget do not refer to the plans.

B. The district's 2015–2016 Strategic Plan, Department Improvement Plans, and SIPs do not identify or quantify specific resources such as staff, supplies, or equipment needed to meet initiatives or goals that would inform the budget.

1. When asked which district document is used to inform budget development, the superintendent named the one-page strategic improvement document.

C. The DIP identifies new staff positions, materials, and funding sources as being "Strategies/Action Steps" to meet certain goals. However, the approved budget does not include most of the staff positions or materials identified.

1. Of seven new staff positions identified in the DIP as "Strategies/Action Steps" to meet goals, only three positions are funded in the fiscal year 2016 budget: ELL coordinator, high school assistant principal, and Browne assistant principal.

2. A STEM coach for the middle schools, assistant business manager, nine teachers, and eight paraprofessional positions are added and approved in the new budget although those positions are not mentioned in the DIP.

D. The fiscal year 2016 budget document contains department and school narratives that explain current staff positions as well as items and services on which the schools spend the non-salary budget funds. Some occasional requests for staff and/or materials do not correspond quantitatively to either department or school improvement plans and do not appear to be approved or requested.

1. Examples are school expense budgets. Seven schools asked for funds for materials, instructional supplies, and assessment materials to meet goals. Two schools' budgets for school expenses were increased and five were decreased. The high school's school expense budget was increased $32,000 although the increase was not explained or requested.

E. The fiscal year 2016 budget document, while including financial detail for fiscal years 2014, 2015 and 2016, does not appear to contain actual budget expenses for fiscal year 2014, a period for which actual expenses would be available.

1. Historical amounts for fiscal year20 14 are primarily numbers rounded to thousands or tens of thousands of dollars, indicating they are likely budgeted amounts instead of actual expenses.

F. Historical budget and actual expenses are not provided for grant spending.

G. Historical budget, actual expenses, or fiscal year 2016 proposed revenue and expenses are not provided for revolving accounts.

H. There are inaccuracies in the department detail.

1. Detail numbers and summary numbers do not match for District Administration, Instruction & Assessment, SPED, Benefits, Facilities & Transportation, High School, Clark, Hooks, Berkowitz, and Sokolowski.

2. There are two calculation errors in the Facilities & Transportation budget detail.

3. The resulting difference is an over-reporting of the fiscal year 2015 budget by $131,500.

I. There are inaccuracies in the budget detail.

1. Detail numbers and summary numbers do not match for SPED, Benefits, and Other Instructional Programs.

2. There are calculation errors in District Administration and SPED budget detail.

3. The resulting difference is an over-calculation of the fiscal year 2016 budget total of $20,701.

Impact: The budget development process has been a lost opportunity for close review of improvement plans, spending trends, and resource allocation. Inaccuracies in a budget document, even though relatively small, may result in a loss of district credibility with staff, school committee, community, and municipal officials.

Chelsea Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

1. The district should identify the amount of funding needed to achieve its goals for improvement. The school committee and city officials should come to a clear agreement as to how to provide the funding necessary to meet state requirements and address the district's needs.

A. The superintendent should work with the school committee to identify the level of funding necessary to address the district's needs and support its priorities for improvement (see Financial and Asset Management recommendation below).

1. The district should consider changing its budget development process from its past practice of beginning with a level-service budget.

2. Since the current budget development process has resulted in a budget that is below Net School Spending requirements, a different approach should be considered with the central priority being to identify the financial resources the district needs to achieve its improvement goals and meet Net School Spending requirements. Approaches might include:

   a. Zero-based: Begins without reference to the previous year's budget.

   b. Outcome-focused: Closely linked to the planning process.

   c. Program & planning based: Focused on outcomes.

B. The school committee and superintendent together should clarify and communicate the district's goals and measurable objectives to the community and municipal officials to promote public confidence and support for the district's goals of improving student achievement and instruction.

1. The school committee and superintendent should communicate to the community that its budget is based on the district's and schools' achievement plans and on the analysis of data.

C. The school committee and city officials should develop a clear plan for meeting the Net School Spending requirement and funding the district at an appropriate level.

1. The school committee and the superintendent together should consistently advocate for a needs-based budget and the financial arrangements necessary to support it. They should make clear that a Net School Spending budget is the minimum legally acceptable budget and should be considered as a floor and not a ceiling. It should not be considered as the funding goal.

2. Together, the school committee and the superintendent should make clear to the community and municipal officials the specific ways in which the ability of the schools to improve student

achievement is further diminished with each year the district's budget is funded below the level of a needs-based budget.

3. The school committee should collaboratively engage other town boards, local officials, union leaders, and the public to meet district goals. Together with the superintendent, members should advocate for an understanding that the success of the Chelsea Public Schools and the success of the city of Chelsea are inextricably connected and that there is mutual self-interest in ensuring that the schools are able to have all students succeed at high levels.

    a. The Massachusetts Association of School Committees states that a school committee should serve as "… an advocate for students and learning before the people of the community and, as such, a vigorous ambassador for public education before all citizens…" and that it should "…work to ensure that necessary funds are appropriated for the district…"

Recommended resource:

- The Rennie Center's *Smart School Budgeting* (http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html; direct link: http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation. It describes the budgeting approaches listed above, as well as other strategies.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation could include increased community support and the financial commitment needed to achieve high performance by students and staff. It will also lead to compliance with the minimum spending requirements established by the Commonwealth.

2. The superintendent, with input from stakeholders, should lead the revision of the current DIP and SIPs with the goal of developing clear, focused, specific and measurable district and school plans based on student achievement data and designed to improve student achievement.

A. Current district and school improvement plans should be revised.

1. They should continue to be grounded in a vision and a thorough analysis of needs to be addressed and strengths on which to build.

2. The district should continue its practice of extensively reviewing current student achievement data, other measures of student progress, and additional information.

3. The revision should utilize the results of the analysis to establish SMART goals (Specific, and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented, Rigorous, Realistic and Results-focused; and Timed and Tracked).

4. The plans should include activities or action steps that specify what the district and schools will do to achieve the intended outcomes.

a. The action steps should address the following questions:

- Who, specifically, will lead/implement/monitor the activity?
- When it will start?
- When it will be completed?

B. The DIP and SIPs should be used as tools for continuous improvement.

1. Procedures should be established by the district and schools to periodically review progress toward DIP and SIP goals. When required to meet changed conditions, strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted.

C. The superintendent should ensure that all principals and coordinators align their SIPs and Department IPs with the DIP and that they also contain SMART Goals.

1. The development of the SIPs should: include input from all stakeholders; be based on an analysis of student achievement and other data; include measurable performance goals for students; and drive the development, implementation and modification of educational programs.

2. Principals and their faculties should review the progress toward SIP goals on a regular basis and the school committee should be given periodic updates.

D. The SIPs' implementation should be monitored consistently and midcourse adjustment should be made as necessary.

1. The superintendent or designee should meet regularly with principals to review the progress of the SIPs' objectives and the schools' student achievement progress.

2. Principals should use the SIP to inform their self-assessment and goal setting process as part of the educator plan, and teachers' educator plans should be aligned with their school's SIP and the DIP.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *District Standards and Indicators* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/StandardsIndicators.pdf) identify the characteristics of effective districts in supporting and sustaining school improvement.

- The *District Self-Assessment* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/district-self-assessment.pdf) frames the District Standards and Indicators, along with key questions, in a rubric for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.

- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.

- *Focused Planning for Accelerating Student Learning* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/dsac/FocusedPlanning.pdf) provides guidance for Level 3 districts to accelerate achievement for all students through the development of a focused, actionable and sustainable Accelerated Improvement Plan (AIP).

- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.

- *Elements of a Well-Written Measure* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/5.2.2R.docx) and *Crafting Meaningful Measures Checklist* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/5.2.1T.docx) describe how to articulate clear measures of implementation (output) and change (outcomes). They are part of ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/lg.html).

- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs.

- *Turnaround Practices in Action* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/2014PracticesReport.pdf) is a practice guide that highlights practices and strategies observed in turnaround schools that have shown significant and rapid gains in student achievement. It presents key practices for consideration as avenues to improve and sustain ongoing and future turnaround efforts.

- *The Turnaround Practices in Achievement Gain Schools Video Series* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/default.html) highlights the work of three Achievement Gain schools referenced in the Turnaround Practices report. In these videos, the school staff and leadership tell their unique turnaround story through the lens of the four high leverage turnaround practices (leadership, intentional practices, student specific support, and climate and culture). Each video has an accompanying Viewing Guide.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will develop measureable goals and a specific action plan for achieving them. This will provide a pathway to continuous improvement and more coherent and efficient district systems.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. To continue its efforts to improve instruction, the district should develop and implement a research-based walkthrough protocol that provides multiple opportunities for non-evaluative supervision and feedback to teachers. The protocol should have a particular focus on rigorous instructional strategies that promote higher-order thinking and encourage students to articulate and extend their thinking. In a related recommendation, the district should hold supervisors and evaluators more accountable for their work and follow-up activities with teachers as they conduct walkthroughs (non-evaluative) and classroom observations (evaluative).

A. The district should develop a clear and consistent walkthrough protocol and tool(s) for staff who conduct supervisory walkthroughs. The primary goal of walkthroughs should be to focus on improving the quality of teaching.

1. The district's PLC structure and the presence of non-evaluative staff members such as coordinators, coaches, and lead teachers provide both the structure and the personnel to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs on a frequent basis.

2. Walkthroughs should address improving teachers' skills and capacity to meet their own and the school's instructional improvement needs as well as students' diverse learning needs.

3. Grade-level or content-level PLCs might consider identifying specific teaching characteristics or lessons components as the focus of sequential walkthroughs. The review team recommends that walkthroughs include SEI strategies as a consistent priority, in addition to other areas of focus.

4. The district can also use the walkthrough process to gather insights into how well professional development activities have been implemented in classroom practice and to identify needs for professional development at the district or school level.

5. The district should collaborate with the DSAC to design the walkthrough process and professional development in walkthrough best practices.

B. Observation data and trends observed from walkthroughs should be presented and discussed with staff frequently.

1. Possible opportunities for these discussions include PLC meetings, department meetings, and faculty meetings.

2. DLT and CLT meetings should periodically include agenda items that share knowledge and information about what leaders have observed in walkthroughs and what is being done to improve the way in which teaching and UbD units address the needs of all students, especially second language learners.

C. The district should develop systems to ensure the effectiveness of all staff members who supervise and evaluate teachers and to clarify their role in the improvement of instruction.

1. The district should strengthen its expectations and criteria for evaluating those leaders who supervise teachers and those who evaluate teachers. This should include goal setting and evidence that supervisors and evaluators provide useful and timely feedback to teachers, monitor progress in embedding SEI strategies in teaching practice, and provide ongoing follow-up and support.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf)supports instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

- Appendix 4, *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.

- ESE's *Writing Standards in Action* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/wsa/) provide examples of high-quality student writing with annotations that highlight how each piece demonstrates competence in learning standards at each grade level.

- Presentations from WIDA discussions with district leaders (http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-03MathLiaisons-ELLDirectors.pdf and http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-01LiteracyLeaders-ELLDirectors.pdf) provide information about developing and using Model Performance Indicators to support instruction.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will help to ensure more consistent, effective instructional practice in every classroom that more adequately meets the learning needs of all students. Other benefits from implementing this recommendation can include:

- Greater consistency in supervision through more effective observational practices to improve implementation of teaching for understanding, the district's teaching model

- A clearer set of expectations and a strong focus on addressing the learning needs of students whose first language is not English through standards, content, and instructional strategies

- More robust communication at the school and district levels about instructional trends and improvement

- An accountability system that ensures stronger supervision and evaluation practices

4. WIDA standards and SEI strategies should be thoroughly incorporated into curriculum units.

A. The district should more deliberately and consistently match its standards-based design of UbD units and its teaching for understanding strategies to students' learning needs.

1. The district should require that WIDA standards be included in curriculum units in appropriate detail. Given the percentage of teachers and leaders who have participated in RETELL, there is sufficient capacity to begin this work, although additional professional development may be needed.

2. In addition to WIDA standards, teachers should use SEI strategies appropriately in lessons.

3. Those teachers, specialists, and leaders who have not yet participated in RETELL should be required to do so.

Recommended resources: The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development Standards Implementation Guide (Part I*) (http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/Guidance-p1.pdf) provides general information about the WIDA ELD standards framework, expectations for district implementation, and available support.

- *Useful WIDA ELD Standards Resources from the Download Library* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/DownloadLibrary.html) can be used as a type of recommended reading list for educators new to the WIDA ELD standards who are interested in developing a deeper understanding of the framework's components and how to apply them into classroom instruction and assessment.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation will help the district to ensure that it meets the learning needs of its students whose first language is not English. These strategies will also benefit other students---including those for whom literacy is a challenge.

5. The district should develop a multi-pronged effort to improve the learning environment in some classes by addressing classroom management and school culture at each school level.

A. As a first step, the district should provide or identify professional development to support teachers who struggle with classroom management. To build on efforts already being implemented at some schools, a collaborative group comprised of teachers and leaders PK–8 should study, select, and then recommend a consistent schoolwide approach to strengthen students' social and emotional learning and behavior for each school level (i.e., one for ELC and the elementary schools, one for the middle schools).

B. This group can build upon the behavioral strategies currently in use in some schools and grade levels to create a more coherent approach that can be communicated and supported districtwide. Supporting the goals and efforts already implemented, each school level should uniformly and consistently promote social and emotional learning using a research-based

approach that encourages positive behaviors and interactions between teachers and students and between students and students.

1. As an example, the district might consider Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), which is being piloted at one school (see Student Support strength finding above).

C. At the high school level, the district should encourage a more deliberate and collaborative setting of classroom norms by teachers and students.

1. Co-created norms should clarify agreed-to expectations and commitments for students and teachers to ensure a positive and respectful learning environment in each classroom.

Recommended resources:

- *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline* (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf) highlights ways in which states and school districts can promote academic excellence by creating safe and productive learning environments for all students.

- *Addressing Students' Social, Emotional, and Health Needs* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/StudentsNeeds.pdf) provides guidance and promising practices to help schools create a safe school environment and make effective use of a system for addressing the social, emotional, and health needs of its students that reflects the behavioral health and public schools framework.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation could include a stronger school culture and learning environments that are consistent and more conducive to learning in every school and classroom. In addition, students could have better opportunities to develop their social and emotional skills. This can help them focus more productively in school and help them take advantage of the rich academic program that the district is creating

6. The district should prioritize the integration of technology more into teaching and learning at all levels.

A. As more hardware and software is acquired and installed, teachers should be supported in learning how to use educational technologies appropriately through professional development and, if possible, by visiting nearby school districts to observe exemplary practices in lessons.

B. In-district expertise from teachers and leaders can also be harnessed to share successful strategies and best practices at each school level.

1. Faculty meetings and grade-level/content-level meetings can showcase good practices. Teachers can observe peers at their own school or within the district who have established models for both teacher and student use of technology.

2. At the elementary level, the new literacy program, "Journeys," was chosen partly because it provides opportunities to use technology in instruction. The district should provide the needed hardware, software and professional development so that teachers and students will have the capacity to maximize this feature of the literacy program.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Office of Digital Learning* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/) supports the expansion of digital learning capacity and literacy to advance learning for every student in the Commonwealth by providing policies, guidance, professional development and support in the following areas: district technology and infrastructure capacity; classroom level instructional tools; assistive technology resources; virtual schools and online courses; and emerging digital learning trends.
- The *Digital Learning Tools* web page (http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/teacher/) lists several links to digital learning resources.
- The *Technology Self-Assessment Tool* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/odl/standards/sa_tool.html) allows teachers to determine their own levels of technology proficiency and professional development needs. TSAT also allows schools and districts to access aggregated data from their teachers in order to better focus their professional development efforts.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation can include a more widespread, refined and effective use of instructional technology and digital learning in the district. This can help ensure that Chelsea's students experience learning and teaching using technology in ways similar to students from other districts and in other countries. A more widespread and effective use of technology in lessons will help prepare students for study, life, and work in the 21st century.

Human Resources and Professional Development

7. The district should consider expanding the 2015–2016 strategic plan with a goal to improve teacher retention.

A. The district should follow through on the DIP strategy to research reasons for teacher turnover and develop a strategic long-range plan to stabilize staffing.

1. The plan should include the creation of a retention and hiring committee that conducts exit interviews with all teachers leaving the district and creates a database that catalogues why teachers leave Chelsea.

2. The plan should include an aggressive campaign to recruit Hispanic and Spanish speaking teachers. The following three retention and recruitment strategies are suggested by the National Education Association[8]:

    - Early prospective teacher identification initiatives through secondary school surveys, counseling, motivational workshops, summer college preparatory courses, courses in educational theory and practice, and promise of financial aid.

    - Aggressive recruitment activities, such as holding orientations, recruiting transfer students from two-year colleges, sponsoring future teachers clubs, organizing media campaigns in minority communities, and recruiting minorities to teaching from business and the military sectors.

    - Financial aid, including fellowships, scholarships, and forgivable loans, targeted to minority students who intend to teach.

3. The district should consider developing co-operative and internship programs with universities to provide training opportunities for prospective teachers.

4. The district should provide support to current teachers for dual certification as an ESL teacher. The district should also provide incentives for high performing paraprofessionals to obtain a teaching license.

B. The district should create supports and incentives for teachers to remain in the district.

1. The district should create a systematic teacher leadership program that provides opportunities for teachers at various stages of growth.

2. As recommended by ESE "Guidelines for Induction Programs," the district should extend the mentoring/induction program to three years to address new teacher burnout and to help the district and teachers meet professional development goals.

3. The district should follow through on the development of professional learning academies, which will "provide a cohesive professional development program to support the professional growth of educators."

C. The district should annually survey teachers to determine which initiatives influence teachers' decision to remain in the district.

Benefits: When the district is increasingly able to retain quality teachers, it will have in place a staff that has benefitted from supervision and professional development and so can implement effective instruction for students. As well, students will have the sense that there is meaningful continuity in their school experience as they maintain ongoing relationships with teachers and administrators.

[8]NEA and Teacher Recruitment: An Overview, http://www.nea.org/home/29031.htm

Student Support

8. The district should develop and clarify its approach to effectively addressing the learning needs of all students.

A. The district should provide the guidance, support, and systems necessary to ensure effective districtwide implementation of SEI classroom strategies (see Curriculum and Instruction recommendation above).

1. ELLs' progress should be carefully tracked and analyzed in order to inform instructional and programmatic decisions at the student, school, and district levels.
2. The district should clarify responsibility for coordination of ELL services and programs districtwide.
3. Newly hired teachers should be required to have an SEI endorsement or to have a plan for obtaining the endorsement.
4. The district should ensure that all educators have access to SEI training that meets their needs.

B. The district should articulate a model for special education services that schools will implement and sustain over time.

1. The district should provide the support necessary for inclusion classrooms, as appropriate.
2. The director of special education and the ELL coordinator need to work together to develop a consistent districtwide approach to accurately identify ELLs who need special education services.
    a. This includes ensuring a sufficient number of qualified bilingual evaluators and translators.

C. The district should implement the multiple and coordinated components of a multi-tiered support system. The district needs to expand staffing to address the growing Tier 2 and Tier 3 referrals requiring social-emotional support.

1. General education, special education, and ELL staff need to integrate tiered instruction. This would mean combining instructional interventions for ELLs and students with disabilities with tiered social-emotional supports.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/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.

  MTSS Self-Assessment Overview (includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*): http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/mtss/sa/default.html

- ESE's *RETELL: Extending the Learning* web page (http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/courses.html) provides a registry of SEI-related courses which have been reviewed and approved by the Department's Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. These courses provide opportunities for educators to extend their learning and practice beyond the Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) Endorsement course.

- *Transitional Guidance on Identification, Assessment, Placement, and Reclassification of English Language Learners* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/TransitionalGuidance.pdf) provides guidelines for using the results of the ACCESS for ELLs' assessment to make instructional decisions to support ELLs.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will establish and implement policies and practices to more effectively meet the needs of all learners. This will allow students to access the curriculum in ways that fit their learning strengths and needs, which will increase their chances for success in school and beyond.

Financial and Asset Management

9. District administrators and the school committee should develop and approve a complete annual budget that aligns with school and district improvement plans.

A. The superintendent and school committee should lead the district in making decisions based primarily on the district's improvement planning and on an analysis of student achievement data.

1. The superintendent and school committee should develop the annual budget so that it is closely aligned with the DIP and the SIPs and is based on the ongoing analysis of aggregated and disaggregated student assessment data.

2. The superintendent's recommended budget should address the demonstrated needs of the district and its schools related to staffing, instruction, supervision and administration, as well as operations and support to improve student achievement, as described in the DIP and SIPs.

B. To properly and efficiently spend the budget resources of the district, administrators should make current fiscal year budget monitoring a priority.

1. Since encumbered expenses have caused financial difficulties for the district for many years in the form of underspending, administrators should put in place a schedule for the regular review, at least monthly, of open purchase orders to determine their current status.

    a. A responsible person in a department, school, or business office should be held accountable for either obtaining delivery of the ordered item or service in a reasonable timeframe or cancelling the order, thus releasing the encumbered funds.

2. The district should consider a financial operations practice of encumbering fewer items and/or services throughout the fiscal year thus allowing a more accurate budget compared with actual accounting at any given time. The purchase order approval process should be a sufficient control to prevent overspending.

C. The final budget document should contain accurate, comprehensive, and historical financial data.

1. Actual expenses should be included for at least the two previous years for the general fund, grants, and revolving accounts along with budgeted funds for the current fiscal year to identify spending allocation and trends.

2. FTE staff data should also be included in the budget for those positions funded through grant and revolving funds.

3. A business administrator should create financial data in accounting software such as Excel, and the data should be reviewed by at least one other person to ensure its accuracy.

Recommended resource:

- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. It includes a link to a detailed guide for each best practice.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation will include a transparent and accurate annual budget that is aligned with the district's specific goals. Developing an educationally sound budget, based primarily on the district's and schools' achievement plans and student achievement data, will help to foster the allocation of resources based on identified need. Aligning the budget with district and school achievement plans will assist in determining whether the plans have been effective in improving achievement for all students.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from June 8–11, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Richard Silverman, leadership and governance
2. Dr. Linda Greyser, curriculum and instruction
3. Patricia Williams, assessment, *review team coordinator*
4. James Hearns, human resources and professional development
5. Dr. Janet Smith, student support
6. Marge Foster, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel:

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chair, vice-chair, 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: superintendent, assistant superintendent, executive director of administration and finance, director of human resources, business manager, assistant business manager, grants manager, coordinator of literacy and humanities K–4, coordinator of literacy and humanities 5–12, STEM coordinator, intervention coordinator, ELL coordinator, special education coordinator.

The team visited the following schools: Shurtleff Early Elementary Center (PK–K), Berkowitz Elementary (grades 1–4), Hooks Elementary (grades 1–4), Kelly Elementary (grades 1–4), Sokolowski Elementary (grades 1–4), Browne Middle School (grades 5–8), Clark Avenue Middle School (grades 5–8), Wright Middle School (grades 5–8), and Chelsea High School (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 8 principals and focus groups with 10 elementary school teachers, 22 middle school teachers, and 26 high school teachers. Days 2 and 3 on the site visit schedule were interchanged to accommodate testing that was taking place.

The team observed classes in the district: 34 at the high school, 20 at the middle schools, and 32 at the 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 June 8, 2015	**Tuesday** June 9, 2015	**Wednesday** June 10, 2015	**Thursday** June 11, 2015
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association; and visit to Wright Middle School for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff, principals, and school staff; review of personnel files; school committee interviews; parent focus group; and visits to Berkowitz, Hooks, Sokolowski, and Kelly elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; focus groups with students and with elementary, middle, and high school teachers; interview with superintendent's wraparound group; visits to Chelsea High School and Clark Middle School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Chelsea High School and Browne Middle School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

Table B1a: Chelsea Public Schools
2014–2015 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	405	6.4%	83,556	8.7%
Asian	116	1.8%	60,050	6.3%
Hispanic	5,272	83.0%	171,036	17.9%
Native American	14	0.2%	2,238	0.2%
White	492	7.7%	608,453	63.7%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	930	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	51	0.8%	29,581	3.1%
All Students	6,350	100.0%	955,844	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2014

Table B1b: Chelsea Public Schools
2014–2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	812	--	12.5%	165,060	--	17.1%
Economically disadvantaged	3,032	66.8%	47.7%	251,026	61.5%	26.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	1,530	33.,7%	24.1%	81,146	19.9%	8.5%
All high needs students	4,541	--	--	408,200	--	--

Notes: As of October 1, 2014. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 6,490; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391.

Table B2a: Chelsea Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2011–2014

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	379	73.6	68.3	69.4	66	82.6	-7.6	-3.4
	P+	379	37.0%	34.0%	28.0%	25.0%	57.0%	-12.0%	-3.0%
4	CPI	369	71.3	68.2	67.3	64	79.1	-7.3	-3.3
	P+	369	37.0%	35.0%	35.0%	26.0%	54.0%	-11.0%	-9.0%
	SGP	329	51	46	53	50	49	-1	-3
5	CPI	247	74.3	64.7	65.5	57.2	84.5	-17.1	-8.3
	P+	247	41.0%	30.0%	30.0%	23.0%	64.0%	-18.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	211	34	34	29	19	50	-15	-10
6	CPI	266	71.5	73.5	67	64.4	85.8	-7.1	-2.6
	P+	266	43.0%	42.0%	34.0%	33.0%	68.0%	-10.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	223	41	42	34	41	50	0	7
7	CPI	288	81	75.8	77.4	72.1	88.3	-8.9	-5.3
	P+	288	56.0%	48.0%	49.0%	42.0%	72.0%	-14.0%	-7.0%
	SGP	250	51	50	49	45.5	50	-5.5	-3.5
8	CPI	286	84.3	80.8	76	71.6	90.2	-12.7	-4.4
	P+	286	63.0%	57.0%	55.0%	49.0%	79.0%	-14.0%	-6.0%
	SGP	245	50	45	43	35	50	-15	-8
10	CPI	287	80.9	86.5	90.3	89	96	8.1	-1.3
	P+	287	60.0%	68.0%	74.0%	77.0%	90.0%	17.0%	3.0%
	SGP	230	34	29.5	46	47.5	50	13.5	1.5
All	CPI	2,122	76.2	73.4	72.4	69.1	86.7	-7.1	-3.3
	P+	2,122	47.0%	44.0%	42.0%	39.0%	69.0%	-8.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	1,488	44	41	42	40	50	-4	-2

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

Table B2b: Chelsea Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2011–2014

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	379	81.7	71.5	80.8	79.2	85.1	-2.5	-1.6
	P+	379	54.0%	46.0%	58.0%	57.0%	68.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
4	CPI	366	76.8	79	76	77.9	79.6	1.1	1.9
	P+	366	41.0%	46.0%	41.0%	47.0%	52.0%	6.0%	6.0%
	SGP	330	55	61	58	59.5	50	4.5	1.5
5	CPI	248	71	64.7	61.4	59.2	80.4	-11.8	-2.2
	P+	248	42.0%	35.0%	31.0%	28.0%	61.0%	-14.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	217	30.5	32	19	14	50	-16.5	-5
6	CPI	264	67	74.4	61.9	59.9	80.2	-7.1	-2
	P+	264	37.0%	47.0%	32.0%	32.0%	60.0%	-5.0%	0.0%
	SGP	224	46	52	27	35.5	50	-10.5	8.5
7	CPI	288	65.3	57.3	58.5	47.7	72.5	-17.6	-10.8
	P+	288	38.0%	27.0%	31.0%	18.0%	50.0%	-20.0%	-13.0%
	SGP	248	66	47	24	28	50	-38	4
8	CPI	284	65.3	62.2	58.6	62.9	74.7	-2.4	4.3
	P+	284	39.0%	32.0%	29.0%	34.0%	52.0%	-5.0%	5.0%
	SGP	244	61.5	47	54	50.5	50	-11	-3.5
10	CPI	297	72.5	75.6	78.7	76.3	90	3.8	-2.4
	P+	297	51.0%	54.0%	57.0%	56.0%	79.0%	5.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	237	41	24	29	30	50	-11	1
All	CPI	2,126	71.8	69.4	68.3	67.4	80.3	-4.4	-0.9
	P+	2,126	43.0%	41.0%	40.0%	40.0%	60.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
	SGP	1,500	51	46	34	36	50	-15	2

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

Table B2c: Chelsea Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2011–2014

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	359	61.2	57.6	58.8	49.9	79	-11.3	-8.9
	P+	359	21.0%	20.0%	16.0%	12.0%	53.0%	-9.0%	-4.0%
8	CPI	402	52.9	55.1	50.5	49.3	72.4	-3.6	-1.2
	P+	402	15.0%	20.0%	12.0%	11.0%	42.0%	-4.0%	-1.0%
10	CPI	276	69	69.8	77.5	80.6	87.9	11.6	3.1
	P+	276	35.0%	40.0%	48.0%	59.0%	71.0%	24.0%	11.0%
All	CPI	1,037	60.6	60.2	60.5	57.8	79.6	-2.8	-2.7
	P+	1,037	23.0%	26.0%	23.0%	24.0%	55.0%	1.0%	1.0%

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

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	1,914	74.7	71.9	70.9	67.2	-7.5	-3.7
		P+	1,914	44.0%	41.0%	39.0%	35.0%	-9.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	1,326	45	41	42	40	-5	-2
	State	CPI	241,069	77	76.5	76.8	77.1	0.1	0.3
		P+	241,069	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	183,766	46	46	47	47	1	0
Econ. Disadv.	District	CPI	1,815	75.2	72.4	71.2	67.6	-7.6	-3.6
		P+	1,815	45.0%	42.0%	40.0%	36.0%	-9.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	1,269	45	41	42	40	-5	-2
	State	CPI	189,662	77.1	76.7	77.2	77.5	0.4	0.3
		P+	189,662	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	51.0%	2.0%	1.0%
		SGP	145,621	46	45	47	47	1	0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	340	55.6	53.5	52.5	48	-7.6	-4.5
		P+	340	12.0%	8.0%	6.0%	6.0%	-6.0%	0.0%
		SGP	180	38	35	33	35.5	-2.5	2.5
	State	CPI	90,777	68.3	67.3	66.8	66.6	-1.7	-0.2
		P+	90,777	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	66,688	42	43	43	43	1	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	455	60.2	55.6	55.3	50.3	-9.9	-5
		P+	455	25.0%	19.0%	19.0%	15.0%	-10.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	265	53	44	43.5	44	-9	0.5
	State	CPI	47,477	66.2	66.2	67.4	67.8	1.6	0.4
		P+	47,477	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,239	50	51	53	54	4	1
All students	District	CPI	2,122	76.2	73.4	72.4	69.1	-7.1	-3.3
		P+	2,122	47.0%	44.0%	42.0%	39.0%	-8.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	1,488	44	41	42	40	-4	-2
	State	CPI	488,744	87.2	86.7	86.8	86.7	-0.5	-0.1
		P+	488,744	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	390,904	50	50	51	50	0	-1

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

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	1,914	70.3	68.1	66.9	66.1	-4.2	-0.8
		P+	1,914	40.0%	39.0%	38.0%	38.0%	-2.0%	0.0%
		SGP	1,334	51	47	33	36	-15	3
	State	CPI	241,896	67.1	67	68.6	68.4	1.3	-0.2
		P+	241,896	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	184,937	46	46	46	47	1	1
Econ. Disadv.	District	CPI	1,815	70.7	68.5	67.2	66.6	-4.1	-0.6
		P+	1,815	41.0%	39.0%	38.0%	40.0%	-1.0%	2.0%
		SGP	1,278	51	47	33	36	-15	3
	State	CPI	190,183	67.3	67.3	69	68.8	1.5	-0.2
		P+	190,183	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	41.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	146,536	46	45	46	47	1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	337	53.1	49.2	49	50.9	-2.2	1.9
		P+	337	11.0%	9.0%	7.0%	12.0%	1.0%	5.0%
		SGP	186	42	42.5	26	29.5	-12.5	3.5
	State	CPI	91,181	57.7	56.9	57.4	57.1	-0.6	-0.3
		P+	91,181	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	67,155	43	43	42	43	0	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	459	58.3	54.4	51.7	52.5	-5.8	0.8
		P+	459	22.0%	22.0%	20.0%	23.0%	1.0%	3.0%
		SGP	271	51	52	33	36	-15	3
	State	CPI	47,847	62	61.6	63.9	63.8	1.8	-0.1
		P+	47,847	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	32,607	52	52	53	52	0	-1
All students	District	CPI	2,126	71.8	69.4	68.3	67.4	-4.4	-0.9
		P+	2,126	43.0%	41.0%	40.0%	40.0%	-3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	1,500	51	46	34	36	-15	2
	State	CPI	490,288	79.9	79.9	80.8	80.3	0.4	-0.5
		P+	490,288	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	392,953	50	50	51	50	0	-1

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

]

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2011	2012	2013	2014	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	904	59	59	58.6	55.4	-3.6	-3.2
		P+	904	20.0%	24.0%	21.0%	21.0%	1.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	100,582	63.8	65	66.4	67.3	3.5	0.9
		P+	100,582	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Econ. Disadv.	District	CPI	849	59.3	59.5	59	55.7	-3.6	-3.3
		P+	849	21.0%	24.0%	21.0%	22.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	State	CPI	79,199	62.8	64.5	66.1	66.8	4	0.7
		P+	79,199	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	33.0%	5.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	148	50.9	42.6	42.8	41.9	-9	-0.9
		P+	148	8.0%	5.0%	2.0%	3.0%	-5.0%	1.0%
	State	CPI	38,628	59.2	58.7	59.8	60.1	0.9	0.3
		P+	38,628	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	2.0%	2.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	179	46.8	42	40.6	36.6	-10.2	-4
		P+	179	8.0%	7.0%	4.0%	7.0%	-1.0%	3.0%
	State	CPI	16,871	50.3	51.4	54	54	3.7	0
		P+	16,871	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
All students	District	CPI	1,037	60.6	60.2	60.5	57.8	-2.8	-2.7
		P+	1,037	23.0%	26.0%	23.0%	24.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	State	CPI	211,440	77.6	78.6	79	79.6	2	0.6
		P+	211,440	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	3.0%	2.0%

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

Table B4: Chelsea Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2011–2014

	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	5.8%	7.9%	6.5%	6.7%	0.9	15.5%	0.2	3.1%	2.0%

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

Table B5a: Chelsea Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2011–2014

Group	Number Included (2014)	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	344	54.8%	58.0%	63.4%	62.2%	7.4	13.5%	-1.2	-1.9%	76.5%
Econ. Disadv.	339	55.1%	58.1%	63.3%	62.2%	7.1	12.9%	-1.1	-1.7%	75.5%
Students w/ disabilities	63	32.4%	22.4%	38.2%	44.4%	12.0	37.0%	6.2	16.2%	69.1%
English language learners or Former ELLs	73	39.5%	51.3%	53.4%	35.6%	-3.9	-9.9%	-17.8	-33.3%	63.9%
All students	371	54.6%	58.3%	64.3%	63.6%	9.0	16.5%	-0.7	-1.1%	86.1%

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

Table B5b: Chelsea Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010–2013

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010–2013		Change 2012–2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	314	58.8%	60.0%	67.0%	69.4%	10.6	18.0%	2.4	3.6%	79.2%
Econ. Disadv.	313	59.0%	60.3%	67.1%	69.3%	10.3	17.5%	2.2	3.3%	78.3%
Students w/ disabilities	55	32.3%	33.8%	38.8%	45.5%	13.2	40.9%	6.7	17.3%	72.9%
English language learners or Former ELLs	58	49.0%	45.7%	60.2%	62.1%	13.1	26.7%	1.9	3.2%	70.9%
All students	328	59.0%	59.7%	67.5%	70.1%	11.1	18.8%	2.6	3.9%	87.7%

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

Table B6: Chelsea Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2011–2014

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	94.4%	94.5%	93.9%	94.3%	-0.1	-0.1%	0.4	0.4%	94.9%

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

Table B7: Chelsea Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2011–2014

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	8.2%	4.3%	2.2%	2.5%	-5.7	-69.5%	0.3	13.6%	2.1%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	7.5%	9.9%	8.0%	7.5%	0.0	0.0%	-0.5	-6.3%	3.9%

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

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

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	$63,941,678	$65,426,294	$67,699,587	$67,538,004	$73,245,387	$72,021,675
By municipality	$4,980,124	$4,642,870	$6,223,114	$6,092,763	$7,241,619	$8,290,740
Total from local appropriations	$68,921,802	$70,069,163	$73,922,701	$73,630,768	$80,487,006	$80,312,415
From revolving funds and grants	--	$13,483,792	--	$13,436,482	--	$13,675,397
Total expenditures	--	$83,552,956	--	$87,067,250	--	$93,987,812
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$52,765,195	--	$56,040,644	--	$61,454,106
Required local contribution	--	$13,330,761	--	$13,370,489	--	$14,359,088
Required net school spending**	--	$66,095,956	--	$69,411,133	--	$75,813,194
Actual net school spending	--	$64,249,756	--	$67,045,798	--	$72,214,423
Over/under required ($)	--	-$1,846,199	--	-$2,365,335	--	-$3,598,771
Over/under required (%)	--	-2.8	--	-3.4	--	-4.7

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

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

Sources: FY12, FY13, FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved April 27, 2015

Table B9: Chelsea Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2011–2013

Expenditure Category	2011	2012	2013
Administration	$485	$511	$600
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$890	$854	$846
Teachers	$4,726	$4,673	$4,647
Other teaching services	$778	$787	$885
Professional development	$438	$238	$276
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$258	$197	$252
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$366	$356	$356
Pupil services	$1,504	$1,512	$1,385
Operations and maintenance	$1,042	$1,107	$1,011
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$2,479	$2,561	$2,347
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$12,968	$12,797	$12,605

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment & Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful.	ES	0%	16%	84%
	MS	10%	15%	75%
	HS	3%	12%	85%
	Total #	3	12	71
	Total %	3%	14%	83%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	ES	0%	13%	88%
	MS	15%	10%	75%
	HS	9%	24%	68%
	Total #	6	14	66
	Total %	7%	16%	77%
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0%	9%	91%
	MS	15%	10%	75%
	HS	3%	12%	85%
	Total #	4	9	73
	Total %	5%	10%	85%
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time.	ES	3%	9%	88%
	MS	20%	15%	65%
	HS	15%	12%	74%
	Total #	10	10	66
	Total %	12%	12%	77%
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	3%	34%	63%
	MS	35%	25%	40%
	HS	35%	41%	24%
	Total #	20	30	36
	Total %	23%	35%	42%
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	0%	13%	88%
	MS	5%	15%	80%
	HS	3%	9%	88%
	Total #	2	10	74
	Total %	2%	12%	86%
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	9%	31%	59%
	MS	5%	20%	75%
	HS	15%	32%	53%
	Total #	9	25	52
	Total %	10%	29%	60%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.	**ES**	38%	0%	63%
	MS	10%	10%	80%
	HS	18%	9%	74%
	Total #	20	5	61
	Total %	23%	6%	71%
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content.	**ES**	22%	9%	69%
	MS	15%	10%	75%
	HS	18%	32%	50%
	Total #	16	16	54
	Total %	19%	19%	63%
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products.	**ES**	31%	31%	38%
	MS	45%	20%	35%
	HS	76%	6%	18%
	Total #	45	16	25
	Total %	52%	19%	29%
11. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	**ES**	25%	28%	47%
	MS	10%	25%	65%
	HS	32%	15%	53%
	Total #	21	19	46
	Total %	24%	22%	53%
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	**ES**	6%	25%	69%
	MS	30%	20%	50%
	HS	24%	15%	62%
	Total #	16	17	53
	Total %	19%	20%	62%
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas.	**ES**	16%	9%	75%
	MS	15%	10%	75%
	HS	15%	15%	71%
	Total #	13	10	63
	Total %	15%	12%	73%
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	**ES**	13%	16%	72%
	MS	20%	5%	75%
	HS	21%	26%	53%
	Total #	15	15	56
	Total %	17%	17%	65%
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	**ES**	9%	19%	72%
	MS	10%	25%	65%
	HS	21%	24%	56%
	Total #	12	19	55
	Total %	14%	22%	64%
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	**ES**	84%	9%	6%
	MS	45%	15%	40%
	HS	62%	21%	18%
	Total #	57	13	16
	Total %	66%	15%	19%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	6%	31%	63%
	MS	5%	25%	70%
	HS	15%	38%	47%
	Total #	8	28	50
	Total %	9%	33%	58%
18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing.	ES	6%	11%	63%
	MS	15%	15%	73%
	HS	23%	23%	54%
	Total #	13	21	53
	Total %	15%	24%	61%
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	22%	28%	50%
	MS	30%	15%	55%
	HS	38%	24%	38%
	Total #	26	20	40
	Total %	30%	23%	47%
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	25%	16%	59%
	MS	55%	10%	35%
	HS	50%	12%	38%
	Total #	36	11	39
	Total %	42%	13%	35%
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	25%	34%	41%
	MS	65%	0%	35%
	HS	44%	18%	38%
	Total #	36	17	33
	Total %	42%	20%	38%
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	94%	3%	3%
	MS	75%	5%	20%
	HS	79%	6%	15%
	Total #	72	4	10
	Total %	84%	5%	12%
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	9%	22%	69%
	MS	10%	20%	70%
	HS	38%	21%	41%
	Total #	18	18	50
	Total %	21%	21%	58%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	28%	28%	44%
	MS	20%	15%	65%
	HS	74%	3%	24%
	Total #	38	13	35
	Total %	44%	15%	41%