Targeted District Review Report

Danvers Public Schools

Review conducted March 28-31, 2016

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

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

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

Executive Summary

The district's 2013-2018 strategic plan is a foundational document that was developed collaboratively by administrators, teachers, students, school committee members, and community stakeholders. The strategic plan's "goals and success measures guide annual planning, goal setting and evaluation of progress accomplished." Teams of administrators, teachers, and community members work collaboratively to implement, monitor, and evaluate initiatives included in the strategic plan.

In its District Improvement Plan, the district annually develops plans and actions related to all the strategic plan's objectives. Further, the district does a mid-year and an end-of-year measure of progress on each objective's actions. All the actions and reports of progress, including previous years' goals, actions, and results, are available on the district's web site. The district is a dynamic, collaborative, and disciplined learning organization; a district teacher described it well: "We absorb new initiatives; we are always looking for a better way to do what we are doing."

Strengths

Curriculum and Instruction

The district has created and is implementing an ongoing plan for curriculum development, refinement, and implementation guided by objectives in its strategic plan. In its District Improvement Plan (DIP) the district sets and assesses annual goals for curriculum that are aligned with the objectives in the strategic plan. Resources such as curriculum leadership, common planning time, and professional development are in place to ensure support for implementation and fidelity to curriculum goals.

The district has acted strategically to ensure that researched-based instructional practices are consistently understood and implemented. Since 2009 the district has offered the 42-hour Skillful Teacher course to district teachers. Interviews and classroom observations indicated that the district's teaching staff has a common understanding of high-quality, evidence-based instruction. In most observed classrooms, lessons were aligned to learning objectives, students were engaged and took responsibility for their learning, classroom environments were supportive, and instruction was appropriately differentiated to meet diverse students' needs.

The Chromebook 1:1 initiative supports the district's goal in the strategic plan which calls for students to develop 21st century learning skills. The district launched the program at the start of 2014-2015 at the middle school and plans to expand the initiative to the high school in 2016-2017.

Assessment

Assessment in the district is marked by systems of continuous collection, timely dissemination, and productive uses of data to improve teaching and learning. Driven by objectives in the strategic plan, understanding and using data is a district priority. A balanced set of assessments, well-organized teams, consistently used protocols, and professional development are in place to ensure effective use of data. Professional staff use student achievement data regularly to make mid-course corrections and adjust

instructional practices. Using a range of formative and benchmark assessments, educators assign students support such as Title I reading or math services (in the three Title I schools), small-group support from the reading specialist, or intervention classes at the middle school.

Student Support

One of the objectives in the DIP and the strategic plan is that the needs of all students will be consistently anticipated, planned for, and addressed. To that end, the district has established systems at all levels to identify and provide interventions for students who are not performing at grade level. Response to Intervention (RtI) meetings at the elementary grades, interdisciplinary team meetings at the middle school, and grade 9 interdisciplinary teams meet regularly to better understand students' strengths and challenges and create plans for intervention. The district has Student Study Teams in place in each school to help teachers access additional support for struggling students. Professional development in Universal Design for Learning (UDL), an instructional framework with the goal of reaching all learners including students with disabilities and English language learners, has been provided to all staff. Additionally, the district has established practices to support career awareness for students K-12. Activities begin with a series of experiences that introduce elementary students to occupations. Students engage in role playing of notable or influential adults (in the Biography Unit), and role playing the jobs of individuals in different cultures (in the World of Difference Unit).

Students move to more structured activities at the middle and high schools. Their work with Naviance, a career-interest assessment tool, begins in grades 6, 7, and 8 with career exploration and interest assessment activities, and continues in high school with college and career exploration and planning. The district provides an annual career day, academic exploratory classes, and extra-curricular clubs in, for example, engineering and business.

The high school provides further career exploration through direct participation in career-related activities. All high-school students are required to complete 40 hours of community service over four years. In addition, high-school seniors are strongly encouraged to participate in a five-week internship in businesses in the community during May and June.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

District planning documents and reports do not consistently cite disaggregated data for student subgroups or include SMART goals (strategic; measureable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and result oriented; and timed and tracked) for closing the performance gaps of student subgroups.

Recommendations

The review team recommends that the district disaggregate and analyze student performance data and include in all planning documents SMART goals based on disaggregated student performance data. Danvers Public Schools Targeted District Review Overview

Purpose

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, targeted 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 three district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). Targeted reviews address one of the following sets of three standards: **Governance and Administrative Systems** (Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management standards) or **Student-Centered Systems** (Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support standards). A targeted review identifies systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results. In addition, the targeted district reviews is designed to promote district reflection on its own performance and potential next steps.

 Districts whose performance level places them in Level 2 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance will typically participate in a targeted district review (Level 3 and Level 4 districts typically receive a comprehensive review). Other relevant factors are taken into consideration when determining if a district will participate in a targeted or comprehensive review.

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the three district standards identified as the focus of the targeted review. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a three-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. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE.

Site Visit

The site visit to the Danvers Public Schools was conducted from March 28- 30, 2016. The site visit included 22 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 88 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 11 elementary school teachers, 10 middle-school teachers, and 4 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 54 classrooms in 7 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Danvers has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected by members. The five members of the school committee meet monthly.

The superintendent has been in the position since 2004. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent, the business manager, the director of K-12 curriculum, the director of technology, the director of student services, and the athletic director. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past five years. The district has seven principals leading seven schools. There are seven other school administrators, including one high-school, one middle-school and one elementary curriculum director and four assistant principals. In 2015-2016, there were 271 teachers in the district.

In the 2015-2016 school year, 3,608 students were enrolled in the district's 7 schools:

Table 1: Danvers Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015-2016

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Riverside Elementary	ES	Pre-K-05	335
Highlands Elementary	ES	K-5	405
Great Oak Elementary	ES	K-5	371
Smith Elementary	ES	K-5	293
Thorpe Elementary	ES	K-5	342
Holten Richmond Middle School	MS	6-8	842
Danvers High School	HS	9-12	1,020
Totals	**7 schools**	**Pre-K-12**	**3,608**
*As of October 1, 2015			

Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment decreased by 0.2 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged

students, 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 33 K-12 districts of similar size (3,000-3,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: $12,619 as compared with $12,721 (see District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing &Finance). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

District and Subgroup Results

Danvers is a Level 2 district because all its schools are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and or high needs students.
- The district has low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for African-American/black students.
- Highlands Elementary has low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for economically disadvantaged students.

Table 2: Danvers Public Schools
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2012–2015

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Account ability Level
		2012	2013	2014	2015			
ES: Highlands	All	25	40	70	60	56	32	2
	High Needs	6	56	63	63	56		
ES: Great Oak	All	40	110	45	75	70	52	2
	High Needs	31	75	31	81	60		
ES: Riverside	All	70	60	70	15	46	28	2
	High Needs	69	44	94	94	81		
ES: Ivan G. Smith	All	85	60	40	20	41	40	2
	High Needs	-	0	50	50	39		
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	All	50	70	55	55	58	50	2
	High Needs	0	13	75	75	55		
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	All	35	55	30	0	24	29	2
	High Needs	35	55	35	35	39		
HS: Danvers High	All	64	89	50	75	69	60	2
	High Needs	54	46	46	79	60		
District	All	39	68	39	36	44	--	2
	High Needs	21	46	43	43	41		

Between 2012 and 2015 the ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) did not improve for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities. However, the ELA CPI for all students was 2.3

points higher than the state's CPI and 1.5 to 3.6 points higher for high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities.

**Table 3: Danvers Public Schools
ELA CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	89.9	90.6	89.3	89.1	-0.8	2.3
	State	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.8	0.1	
High Needs	District	78.5	79.0	78.1	77.8	-0.7	1.5
	State	76.5	76.8	77.1	76.3	-0.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	80.9	--	3.3
	State	--	--	--	77.6	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	61.2	67.2	--	-1.7
	State	66.2	67.4	67.8	68.9	2.7	
Students with disabilities	District	71.1	72.1	69.6	71.0	-0.1	3.6
	State	67.3	66.8	66.6	67.4	0.1	

Between 2012 and 2015 the math CPI declined for the district as a whole by 3.1 points and by 1.9 points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively. The math CPI for all students was 1.3 points lower than the state's CPI, and 0.8 to 3.2 points lower for high needs students, economically disadvantaged, English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs, and students with disabilities.

**Table 4: Danvers Public Schools
Math CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	82.5	82.8	81.0	79.4	-3.1	-1.3
	State	79.9	80.8	80.3	80.7	0.8	
High Needs	District	66.6	66.4	66.4	64.7	-1.9	-3.2
	State	67.0	68.6	68.4	67.9	0.9	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	68.4	--	-0.8
	State	--	--	--	69.2	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	62.2	--	-2.3
	State	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.5	2.9	
Students with disabilities	District	58.4	57.6	58.0	56.5	-1.9	-0.8
	State	56.9	57.4	57.1	57.3	0.4	

Between 2012 and 2015 the science CPI improved for all students in the district by 0.4 points and by 1.3 and 3.1 points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively. The science CPI was above the state's CPI by 0.3 points for all students and by 1.3 points for economically disadvantaged students and below the state's CPI by 1.4 points for students with disabilities.

Table 5: Danvers Public Schools
Science CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	79.3	82.1	81.3	79.7	0.4	0.3
	State	78.6	79.0	79.6	79.4	0.8	
High Needs	District	64.1	67.8	68.1	65.4	1.3	-0.9
	State	65.0	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	65.7	--	1.4
	State	--	--	--	67.1	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	51.4	54.0	54.0	53.9	2.5	
Students with disabilities	District	58.4	60.8	61.7	61.5	3.1	1.3
	State	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	

The district did not reach its 2015 CPI targets for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities in ELA, math, and science. ELLs and former ELLs did not reach their CPI targets in ELA and math.

Table 6: Danvers Public Schools
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup

	ELA			Math			Science		
Group	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating
All students	89.1	94.4	No Change	79.4	89.2	No Change	79.7	88.5	No Change
High Needs	77.8	87.6	No Change	64.7	78.5	No Change	65.4	79.7	Declined
Economically Disadvantaged[1]	80.9	--	--	68.4	--	--	65.7	--	--
ELLs	67.2	82.7	Improved Below Target	62.2	78.9	No Change	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	71.0	83.1	Improved Below Target	56.5	72.8	No Change	61.5	76.5	No Change

---

[1] The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group and will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

Students' growth in ELA and math was slower than that of their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities.

Table 7: Danvers Public Schools
2015 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup

Group	Median ELA SGP			Median Math SGP		
	District	State	Growth Level	District	State	Growth Level
All students	39.0	50.0	Low	36.0	50.0	Low
High Needs	37.0	47.0	Low	34.0	46.0	Low
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs	--	53.0	--	--	51.0	--
SWD	34.0	43.0	Low	32.0	43.0	Low

In 2015 the out-of-school suspension rate for all students was 2.9 percent, equal to the state rate, and the in-school suspension rate for all students was 1.2 percent, below the state rate of 1.8 percent. The out-of-school suspension rates for high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities were 1.1 to 1.5 percentage points higher than the state rates.

Table 8: Danvers Public Schools
Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2015

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	4.8%	6.7%	6.2%	4.8%
	ISS	1.4%	1.6%	2.7%	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	5.1%	6.7%	6.5%	5.4%
	ISS	1.3%	1.9%	2.9%	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	7.6%	9.8%	7.6%	6.1%
	ISS	1.4%	2.1%	3.6%	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	--	--	--	3.8%
	ISS	--	--	--	1.8%
All Students	OSS	2.5%	3.3%	2.9%	2.9%
	ISS	0.6%	0.9%	1.2%	1.8%

*Low income students' suspension rates used for 2013 and 2014

Between 2012 and 2015 the four-year cohort graduation rate improved for all students by 3 percentage points and by 3.5 to 8 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. The four-year cohort graduation rate was above the state rate by 5.7 percentage points for all students and by 1.5 to 3.5 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities.

Table 9: Danvers Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012-2015

Group	Number Included (2015)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2012-2015		Change 2014-2015		State (2015)
		2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	100	74.0%	70.8%	87.2%	82.0%	8.0	10.8%	-5.2	-6.0%	78.5%
Low income	71	75.7%	80.4%	88.5%	81.7%	6.0	7.9%	-6.8	-7.7%	78.2%
SWD	56	67.9%	60.0%	89.4%	71.4%	3.5	5.2%	-18.0	-20.1%	69.9%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.0%
All students	286	90.0%	88.6%	93.2%	93.0%	3.0	3.3%	-0.2	-0.2%	87.3%

Between 2011-2014 the five-year cohort graduation rate for all students improved for all students by 4.2 percentage points and by 14.6 to 21.1 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. In 2014 the district's five-year cohort graduation rate was above the state rate by 5.5 percentage points for all students and by 6.9 to 15.9 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities.

Table 10: Danvers Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2011-2014

Group	Number Included (2014)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State (2014)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	86	72.6%	77.9%	76.4%	87.2%	14.6	20.1%	10.8	14.1%	80.3%
Low income	61	67.4%	78.4%	86.3%	88.5%	21.1	31.3%	2.2	2.5%	79.6%
SWD	47	72.7%	73.6%	67.3%	89.4%	16.7	23.0%	22.1	32.8%	73.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69.8%
All students	250	89.8%	91.3%	90.8%	94.0%	4.2	4.7%	3.2	3.5%	88.5%

Danvers' dropout rates for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities were lower than the state rates.

Table 11: Danvers Public Schools
Dropout Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	3.2%	3.0%	2.7%	2.3%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.[2]	4.4%	2.0%	3.0%	2.5%	3.3%
SWD	3.4%	3.9%	2.7%	2.3%	3.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	1.1%	2.3%	1.2%	0.9%	1.9%

Grade and School Results

Between 2012 and 2015 the ELA CPI declined for the district as a whole and in the 3rd, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades. However, the ELA CPI was above the state rate for the district as a whole and in the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 10th grades.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA CPI decreased by 0.8 points for the district as a whole, and by 5.7 points in the 7th grade, by 3.7 and 2.2 points in the 6th and 8th grades, respectively, and by 0.5 points in the 3rd grade.
  - ELA CPI was lower than the state CPI in 2015 by 2.7 points in the 6th grade, and by 1.1 and 0.1 points in the 8th and 7th grades, respectively.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA CPI improved by 4.2 points in the 5th, by 2.6 points in the 10th grade, and by 1.1 points in the 4th grade.
  - ELA CPI in the district was above the state CPI by 2.5 points for all students and by 8.7 and 7.1 points in the 4th and 3rd grades, respectively, and by 2.8 and 2.1 points in the 5th and 10th grades, respectively.

Table 12: Danvers Public Schools
ELA CPI by Grade 2012–2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	278	90.1	89.3	85.9	89.6	82.5	-0.5	3.7
4	280	85.4	82.7	84.6	86.5	77.8	1.1	1.9
5	257	85.6	89.2	85.5	89.8	87.0	4.2	4.3
6	279	87.6	88.1	88.9	83.9	86.6	-3.7	-5.0
7	295	92.0	92.2	91.5	86.3	86.4	-5.7	-5.2
8	292	93.1	94.1	92.4	90.9	92.0	-2.2	-1.5
10	258	96.2	97.6	96.9	98.8	96.7	2.6	1.9
All	1,970	89.9	90.6	89.3	89.1	86.6	-0.8	-0.2

---

[2] Low income dropout rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014.

In 2015 the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA was above the state rate in the 3rd and 4th grades in all five elementary schools and below the state rate in the 5th grade in three of five elementary schools. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at Holten Richmond Middle. The proficiency rate in grade 10 at Danvers High was 97 percent compared with the state rate of 91 percent.

Table 13: Danvers Public Schools
ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectation by School and Grade 2014-2015[3]

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Highlands	63%	77%	61%	--	--	--	--	68%
ES: Great Oak	69%	66%	74%	--	--	--	--	70%
ES: Riverside	59%	68%	54%	--	--	--	--	60%
ES: Ivan G. Smith	61%	60%	51%	--	--	--	--	57%
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	72%	88%	63%	--	--	--	--	75%
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	--	--	--	51%	53%	53%	--	52%
HS: Danvers High	--	--	--	--	--	--	97%	97%
District Total	65%	72%	62%	51%	53%	53%	96%	--
State	54%	57%	63%	60%	61%	64%	91%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 the ELA CPI improved in three out of five elementary schools by between 1.2 and 6.9 points, and by 1.7 points at Danvers High.
- ELA CPI for high needs students improved in three out of five elementary schools by 1.0 to 8.6 points and by 5.9 points at Danvers High.
- ELA CPI for economically disadvantaged students improved by 2.8 and 7.8 points at Great Oak Elementary and Danvers High, respectively.
- ELA CPI for students with disabilities improved by 3.5 and 6.6 points at Highlands Elementary and Danvers High, respectively.

Table 14: Danvers Public Schools
ELA CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ES: Highlands	84.2	84.3	84.1	89.5	5.3
High Needs	73.3	73.9	72.0	81.9	8.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	85.1	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	73.4	66.7	63.6	76.9	3.5
ES: Great Oak	83.0	89.1	84.2	89.9	6.9
High Needs	72.5	79.3	69.8	73.5	1.0
Economically disadvantaged	79.9	86.0	--	77.1	-2.8
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Riverside	87.7	85.4	87.1	85.9	-1.8
High Needs	78.2	72.9	76.6	73.2	-5.0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	76.0	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Ivan G. Smith	92.6	91.4	87.9	85.5	-7.1

---

[3] 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

High Needs	80.0	73.5	69.4	71.8	-8.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	79.3	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	90.6	89.1	88.0	91.8	1.2
High Needs	81.9	69.7	69.1	84.0	2.1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	85.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	91.4	92.2	91.8	87.1	-4.3
High Needs	79.5	81.7	82.2	73.9	-5.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	77.8	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	70.1	74.2	74.2	64.9	-5.2
HS: Danvers High	97.1	98.0	97.1	98.8	1.7
High Needs	89.6	93.2	91.5	95.5	5.9
Economically disadvantaged	91.4	95.1	--	99.2	7.8
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	85.5	89.4	85.7	92.1	6.6

Between 2012 and 2015 the math CPI declined for the district as a whole and in the 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades. The math CPI in the district was below the state rate for the district as a whole and in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades.

- Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI decreased by 3.1 points for the district as a whole, and by 10.1 and 7.8 points in the 8th and 7th grades, respectively, by 4.6 and 3.3 points in the 6th and 4th grades, respectively, and by 0.2 points in the 10th grade.
  - In 2015 math CPI was lower than the state CPI by 1.3 points for all students, by 8.1 and 7.9 points in the 8th and 6th grades, respectively, and by 3.1 points in the 7th grade.

- Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI improved by 3.2 points in the 5th grade and by .9 points in the 3rd grade.
  - In 2015 math CPI in the district was above the state CPI by 3.7 and 3.4 points in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, and by 1.2 points in the 5th grade.

Table 15: Danvers Public Schools
Math Composite Performance Index by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	286	86.1	91.0	91.1	89.0	85.3	2.9	-2.1
4	283	83.8	83.9	84.0	80.5	77.1	-3.3	-3.5
5	262	81.2	82.2	84.2	84.4	83.2	3.2	0.2
6	280	77.9	77.9	73.9	73.3	81.2	-4.6	-0.6
7	299	77.2	74.7	67.2	69.4	72.5	-7.8	2.2
8	296	80.1	77.6	77.2	70.0	78.1	-10.1	-7.2
10	260	93.3	93.6	91.1	93.1	89.9	-0.2	2.0
All	1,972	82.5	82.8	81.0	79.4	80.7	-3.1	-1.6

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math was below the state rate in the 3rd and 4th grades in two of the five elementary schools and in the 5th grade in three of the five elementary schools. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at Holten Richmond Middle. The math proficiency rate in grade 10 at Danvers High was 86 percent compared with the state rate of 79 percent.

Table 16: Danvers Public Schools
Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2014-2015[4]

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Highlands	53%	57%	52%	--	--	--	--	55%
ES: Great Oak	65%	53%	56%	--	--	--	--	58%
ES: Riverside	53%	40%	53%	--	--	--	--	48%
ES: Ivan G. Smith	64%	43%	55%	--	--	--	--	55%
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	69%	71%	50%	--	--	--	--	64%
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	--	--	--	30%	34%	35%	--	33%
HS: Danvers High	--	--	--	--	--	--	86%	86%
District Total	61%	53%	54%	30%	34%	34%	84%	--
State	55%	48%	55%	53%	45%	53%	79%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 the math CPI declined in three out of five elementary schools by 0.3, 3.1, and 5.2 CPI points, by 8.0 CPI points at Holten Richmond Middle, and by 1.5 CPI points at Danvers High.

- Math CPI for high needs students' declined by 1.6 and 6.7 points at Riverside Elementary and Smith Elementary, respectively, and by 8.1 and 8.2 points at Holten Richmond Middle and Danvers High, respectively.
- Math CPI for economically disadvantaged students declined by 7.8 points at Great Oak Elementary.
- Math CPI for students with disabilities declined by 0.9 points at Highlands elementary, by 3.1 points at Holten Richmond Middle, and by 15.4 points at Danvers High.

Table 17: Danvers Public Schools
Math CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ES: Highlands	80.2	80.7	85.7	83.1	2.9
High Needs	68.1	69.6	77.7	75.4	7.3
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	78.8	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	67.2	64.2	70.0	66.3	-0.9
ES: Great Oak	81.4	87.4	85.2	86.2	4.8
High Needs	67.5	69.6	69.0	69.6	2.1
Economically disadvantaged	75.7	71.2	--	67.9	-7.8
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Riverside	82.9	85.7	86.7	79.8	-3.1
High Needs	74.1	75.5	80.9	72.5	-1.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	75.0	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--

---

[4] 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

ES: Ivan G. Smith	89.7	89.4	87.2	84.5	-5.2
High Needs	77.5	69.9	75.0	70.8	-6.7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	78.4	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	88.9	89.2	90.8	88.6	-0.3
High Needs	78.8	77.3	84.6	82.4	3.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	85.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	78.9	77.2	73.8	70.9	-8
High Needs	59.7	58.6	55.6	51.6	-8.1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	56.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	47.4	48.0	47.4	44.3	-3.1
HS: Danvers High	95.0	94.6	91.8	93.5	-1.5
High Needs	87.7	80.6	77.7	79.5	-8.2
Economically disadvantaged	89.3	84.1	--	90.0	0.7
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	83.8	70.6	66.1	68.4	-15.4

Between 2012 and 2015 the science CPI improved by .4 point and was above the state rate in the district as whole and in the 8th and 10th grades.

- 5th grade science CPI decreased by 2.3 points from 76.0 in 2012 to 73.7 in 2015, 4.5 points below the state CPI of 78.2.

- 8th grade science CPI improved 0.9 points from 72.9 in 2012 and 73.8 in 2015, 1.4 points above the state CPI of 72.4.

- 10th grade science CPI increased 1.6 points from 91.6 in 2012 to 93.2 in 2015, and was 5.0 points above the state CPI of 88.2.

Table 18: Danvers Public Schools
Science Composite Performance Index by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	267	76.0	76.7	76.6	73.7	78.2	-2.3	-2.9
8	299	72.9	77.3	76.7	73.8	72.4	0.9	-2.9
10	249	91.6	93	92.3	93.2	88.2	1.6	0.9
All	815	79.3	82.1	81.3	79.7	79.4	0.4	-1.6

In 2015 science proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 5th grade in four out of five elementary schools, and above the state rate in the 8th grade at Holten Richmond Middle and in the 10th grade at Danvers High.

Table 19: Danvers Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Highlands	--	--	32%	--	--	--	--	32%
ES: Great Oak	--	--	54%	--	--	--	--	54%
ES: Riverside	--	--	23%	--	--	--	--	23%
ES: Ivan G. Smith	--	--	24%	--	--	--	--	24%
ES: Willis E. Thorpe	--	--	44%	--	--	--	--	44%
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	--	--	--	--	--	44%	--	44%
HS: Danvers High	--	--	--	--	--	--	81%	81%
District Total	--	--	37%	--	--	43%	80%	52%
State	--	--	51%	--	--	42%	72%	54%

Between 2012 and 2015 the science CPI improved by 1.6 and 8.5 points at Highlands Elementary and Great Oak Elementary, by 1.3 at Holten Richmond Middle, and 0.9 in Danvers High.
- Science CPI for high needs students' improved by 2.9 points at Holten Richmond Middle and by 3.7 points at Danvers High.
- Science CPI for students with disabilities CPI improved by 7.2 points at Holten Richmond Middle and by 2.3 points at Danvers High.

Table 20: Danvers Public Schools
Science CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ES: Highlands	69.9	64.7	70.7	71.5	1.6
High Needs	--	--	--	--	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Great Oak	73.0	84.1	81.0	81.5	8.5
High Needs	--	--	--	--	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Riverside	78.4	77.4	75.0	65.9	-12.5
High Needs	--	--	--	--	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Ivan G. Smith	80.4	80.2	81.0	69.4	-11.0
High Needs	--	--	--	--	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--

ES: Willis E. Thorpe	81.4	82.5	80.6	77.5	-3.9
High Needs	--	--	--	--	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--
MS: Holten Richmond Middle School	72.8	77.8	77.8	74.1	1.3
High Needs	54.0	64.4	64.3	56.9	2.9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	59.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	45.0	56.9	56.9	52.2	7.2
HS: Danvers High	92.6	93.4	92.4	93.5	0.9
High Needs	80.6	80.3	81.5	84.3	3.7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	88.8	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	76.5	70.7	74.5	78.8	2.3

Curriculum and Instruction

Contextual Background

Curriculum

Curriculum development and implementation in the district are guided by the Danvers Public Schools Strategic Plan 2013- 2018. The strategic plan contains four major themes, the first of which is student achievement. The following objectives in this theme provide the direction for the district's curriculum.

- "The needs of all learners across the spectrum of abilities and backgrounds are consistently anticipated, planned for and addressed by all staff."

- "A rigorous, research based, aligned curriculum that integrates real world applications is employed across the district."

Currently, the district is transitioning curriculum into an Understanding by Design (UbD) format employing Google Docs as its document management system. When this transition to a web-based curriculum is complete, district leaders expect to provide greater access to the curriculum for all teachers, administrators, and the community.

The development and revision of curriculum is done by the subject-area teachers and district and school administrators. Teachers are provided with common planning time by subject and/or with their grade-level peers in order to develop curriculum, plan lessons, analyze student achievement data, and synchronize lesson pacing. In addition to common planning time, the district also has monthly early-release days for teachers to work with their peers.

Curriculum support for the teachers is provided by the district K-12 curriculum director, and curriculum directors at the elementary, middle, and high schools. At the high school, subject- area teacher leaders also assist in the development and implementation of curriculum. Principals at all levels are actively involved with their teachers in implementing an effective curriculum. Fidelity to the curriculum is ensured by the common planning time meetings and walkthroughs by the curriculum directors, principals, and the superintendent.

The district has analyzed student performance and other data and has realized the need for improvement in certain areas. Specifically, the district has implemented a Writers Workshop program K-12, and implemented a Connected Math III curriculum in grades 7 and 8. In the district's self-assessment, district leaders stated that in the 2016-2017 school year the district will be reviewing the *Investigations* mathematics curriculum, and the Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Standards.

Instruction

The district has established clear instructional leadership to ensure that effective instructional practices are consistently implemented districtwide. The district's K-12 director of curriculum and curriculum directors at the elementary, middle, and high schools address the district's instructional needs. At the school level, principals and curriculum directors monitor instruction, conduct observations, and evaluate the teaching staff.

The team observed 54 classes throughout the district: 14 at the high school; 13 at the middle school; and 27 at the district's 5 elementary schools. The team observed 24 ELA classes, 21 mathematics classes, 7 science classes, and 2 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

Overall classroom observations indicated that the district's teaching staff has a common understanding of high-quality, evidence-based instruction. This common understanding has been achieved over a period of years by the district's adoption of researched-based instructional practices that are articulated in the Skillful Teacher and are linked to the Massachusetts Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice. Every new teacher in the district is required to take a 42-hour Skillful Teacher course and research- based practices are continually reinforced by instructional leaders throughout the educator evaluation process. In addition, the district has provided teachers with training in the principles of Universal Design for Learning and has set expectations for teachers to incorporate these principles in their instructional practices. At all levels, teachers have common planning time to share and discuss instructional practices. Overall, in most observed classrooms lessons consistently reflected high expectations and alignment to learning objectives, students took responsibility for their learning and were fully engaged as learners, the learning environment was supportive, and instruction was appropriately differentiated to meet students' diverse learning needs.

The district is addressing students' 21st century learning skills by planning and implementing a Chromebook 1:1 initiative at the middle school. Based on the success of this initiative, the district is in the process of expanding the initiative to the high school for the 2016-2017 school year.

Strength Findings

1. **The district has created and implemented a cohesive process to ensure that curriculum is carefully and consistently developed, reviewed, aligned, and effectively delivered.**

   A. Interviews with district leaders and teachers and a document review indicated that the district has developed and is implementing curriculum guided by its strategic plan.

      1. The Danvers Public Schools Strategic Plan 2013-2018 includes (in Theme I–Achievement) the following objectives that provide direction for the district's curriculum and instruction.

      a. "The needs of all students across the spectrum of abilities and backgrounds are consistently anticipated, planned for and addressed by all staff."

      b. "A rigorous, research based, aligned curriculum that integrates real world applications is employed across the district."

2. In its District Improvement Plan (DIP), the district develops action steps and assesses progress toward annual goals for curriculum aligned with objectives in the strategic plan.

      a. The DIP's action steps (for the school year 2015-2016) to achieve the first objective above (1.a) include: "K-12 teachers will apply Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles and *Skillful Teacher* strategies in curriculum alignment to the Common Core and in developing well-structured lessons as part of their standards-based units."

      b. The DIP's action steps (for the school year 2015-2016) to achieve the second objective above (1.b) include: "Through collaboration in Professional Learning Communities, K-12 teachers will develop standards-based units that are aligned to the Common Core standards that will include disciplinary writing and critical thinking/problem solving activities."

      c. Mid-year (for the 2015-2016 school year) progress toward each curriculum goal in the strategic plan is posted on the district's web site, as follows: "At the elementary and middle school level, teachers have developed, and will continue to revise three writing standards-based units for each writing type (Narrative, Opinion, and Information). The teachers used the *Units of Study in Argument Information, and Narrative* as resources for the units. Additionally, student progress will be measured by an on-demand prompt administered at the beginning and end of each unit. All Danvers High School teachers worked to update their standards-based units. Danvers High School teachers will continue this process through the end of the school year."

3. The district is transitioning curriculum to an Understanding by Design (UbD) format using Google Docs as its document management system.

      a. Lesson unit plans are being developed in a UbD format.

B. The superintendent stated that based on student performance data and survey data from high school graduates indicating the need for better writing skills, the district is implementing a unified writing program K-12.

1. The superintendent said that the Writers Workshop program is being implemented across the district.

      a. The implementation of the Writers Workshop was supported by teachers' study group over a two-year period.

2. The units in the new K-12 writing program are standards based.

C. District leaders have recognized the need to improve middle-school math achievement, and to that end are working to increase rigor with the use of Connected Math III in grades 7 and 8.

D. Time and resources are available for curriculum development and implementation.

1. Teachers have common planning time and monthly early-release days. At the elementary level, teachers meet with their school-based team, and every other month with grade-level teachers across the district. At the middle and high schools, teachers meet with subject-area peers.

2. Middle-school grade 6 teachers meet with elementary grade 5 teachers and high- school grade 9 teachers meet with middle school grade 8 teachers in order to plan curriculum transitions.

3. A study team in mathematics for grades 7-10 has been formed to address curriculum and instruction in relation to a current analysis of achievement data.

4. District leaders told the team that they are beginning to look at the Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Standards in relation to current science curriculum.

5. The superintendent stated that staff are continually reviewing curriculum, noting that "nothing gets five years away without taking a look at it."

   a. The district has transitioned the elementary curriculum from the Treasures ELA basal program to the 2011 Frameworks incorporating information from the Basal Alignment Project, and to Readers Workshop standards-based units using Treasures as a resource.

   b. The district has transitioned the middle-school mathematics curriculum from Connected Math Project II to Connected Math Project III in order to provide greater scaffolding and rigor.

   c. Interviews and a document review indicated that in the 2016-2017 school year district leaders are planning to review the Investigations math curriculum and the Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Standards.

6. Teachers and administrators stated that classroom instructional resources to support the curriculum are supplied.

E. In the district's self-assessment, district leaders noted that the high school is revamping curriculum in preparation for the upcoming NEASC School Accreditation review.

F. A K-12 curriculum director and curriculum directors at the elementary-, middle-, and high schools assist with curriculum development and ensure fidelity to the curriculum. The respective

school principals provide further assistance and monitoring. High-school subject-area teachers also assist in the development and implementation of curriculum.

Impact: A comprehensive, cohesive, aligned curriculum supported by leadership that ensures consistent use, alignment, and effective delivery of the curriculum means that students consistently receive high-quality instruction that promotes higher levels of achievement, which enables them to be college and career ready.

2. **Most lessons observed districtwide reflected a common understanding of high-quality, evidence-based instruction characterized by high expectations and alignment to learning objectives. In these classes, students were engaged and took responsibility for their learning while classroom environments were supportive and instruction was appropriately differentiated to meet students' diverse needs.**

   A. In most lessons observed, team members found that teachers demonstrated knowledge of their subject matter and planned well-structured lessons that reflected high expectations aligned to learning objectives.

      1. In 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 85 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 100 percent of high-school lessons observed, the team found strong or moderate evidence of teacher preparation and expertise in the subject matter. In these lessons, the team characterized teachers as demonstrating knowledge of subject matter and content and skilled in planning engaging lessons.

      2. Review team members observed strong or moderate evidence of teachers providing and reinforcing learning objectives in 94 percent of lessons observed districtwide.

         a. The team cited multiple examples of clear learning objectives at every level. For example, a grade 4 math objective read, "We can classify polygons by their attributes and combine polygons to create new polygons." In a grade 7 science lesson, the teacher reinforced the student learning goal as "Student will be able to (SWBAT) predict the traits of offspring by using Punnett squares." In a grade 9 ELA lesson, the learning objective was: "Breakdown how Eli Wiesel uses tone and imagery to communicate ideas."

      3. The team found in 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 76 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 100 percent of high-school lessons observed, strong or moderate evidence of well-structured lessons aligned to learning objectives that reflected high expectations for the quality of student work.

         a. The team noted that in these lessons the teacher planned learning activities that consistently supported student mastery of the learning objective and provided students with exemplars, rubrics, or guided practice to help them understand what was expected of them. For example, in a grade 10 ELA lesson, the learning goal was to reach a deeper

level of reading comprehension through annotation. Before students began their close reading annotation exercise, the teacher provided the students with an exemplar of a completed annotation graphic organizer so that they could see the expected learning outcome.

4. In 98 percent of lessons observed districtwide, the team found strong or moderate evidence that instructional strategies were well matched to the learning objective to enable students to access and engage in content.

   a. Observers noted teachers providing students with multiple instructional strategies matched to the learning objectives. For example, in a grade 4 ELA opinion writing lesson students worked in small groups on their opinion writing, conferred with their teachers, and worked with a partner sharing their ratings on an opinion-writing checklist using evidence from their writing.

B. In lessons observed districtwide, most students took responsibility for their learning and were purposefully engaged in critical thinking tasks.

1. The team found strong or moderate evidence in 100 percent of lessons observed districtwide that almost all or all students actively participated in their learning experiences. The team noted that lessons observed were student centered with teachers acting as facilitators, giving students opportunities to be actively involved in their own learning in a range of learning activities.

   a. At the elementary and middle schools, observers noted that students worked on projects aligned to learning objectives, completed writing assignments on Chromebooks or iPads, and collaborated with partners using online math games or shared and reviewed writing with partners.

   b. At the high school, team members observed that students actively participated in science labs, brainstormed vocabulary for biology assignments, solved real-world problems in math lessons, and planned projects with authentic assessments in ELA classes.

2. In 96 percent of elementary lessons, in 77 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 100 percent of high-school lessons observed, the team found strong or moderate evidence of students engaged in tasks that required critical thinking.

   a. Elementary and middle-school teachers used Think Aloud and Think-Pair-Share strategies in ELA and math to strengthen students' critical thinking skills.

   b. At all levels, the team noted that teachers consistently asked students probing "How?" and "Why?" questions and required students to explain or demonstrate their answers. For example, in a grade 11 math lesson, students demonstrated their graphs on the interactive whiteboard.

3. In 97 percent of lessons observed districtwide, the team found strong or moderate evidence of students having the primary responsibility of doing the thinking in the classroom. In these lessons, the teacher often acted as a facilitator. Most students explored learning of content individually, in groups or in pairs in almost all lessons observed.

    a. For example, in a grade 7 social studies lesson, students collaborated with writing partners on their Chromebooks, sent each other their writing, provided constructive feedback to each other, and revised their writing based on their partners' feedback.

C. In most lessons observed districtwide, teachers created supportive and positive learning environments and appropriately differentiated instruction to meet students' diverse needs.

1. Districtwide, in 96 percent of lessons observed, the team found strong or moderate evidence that lessons were appropriately differentiated to account for differences in learning needs, interests, and levels of readiness of students.

    a. At the elementary level, the team noted processes and products that support differentiation. Students used leveled readers and Chromebooks for Writers Workshop; class assignments were structured with multiple entry points; and students collaborated in small, differentiated groups or rotated through stations with teachers leading small guided groups in ELA and math.

    b. At the middle and high schools, the team noted the use of technology as an effective tool to support differentiation and multiple modalities (for example, sight, hearing, touch). Teachers structured lessons and assignments to account for students' interests. For example, in a grade 7 ELA lesson, students used their Chromebooks to explore topics, including videos, speeches, and music from the 1960s as they rotated through 6 learning stations. In a grade 9 biology lesson, students were given a choice between describing cell mitosis in a narrative or pictorial form.

2. In 93 percent of lessons observed districtwide, the team saw strong or moderate evidence that appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs were available and used effectively.

    a. The team described observed elementary classrooms as being literacy/math rich with appropriate resources including interactive whiteboards.

    b. The team noted students using Chromebooks at all levels, but this was most evident in lessons observed at the middle school.

    c. Classrooms had word walls and content vocabulary was posted.

    d. In observed classrooms, support personnel effectively supported students' learning needs. The team observed lessons with the co-teaching model as well as lessons with

additional teachers, such as a Title I math specialist, working in small groups in classrooms.

3. Districtwide the team found strong or moderate evidence of a positive learning environment in 95 percent of lessons observed. The team noted that in most lessons observed across the district, students were self-regulating and focused on learning and teachers created positive, respectful learning environments allowing students to take academic risks.

4. In 83 percent of lessons observed districtwide, teachers conducted formative assessments to check for student understanding and to provide feedback to students. For example, the team noted teachers conferring with students and checking on students as they worked, using Chromebook technology to give students immediate feedback on their writing, and effectively questioning students including calling on them randomly. The team noted that teachers consistently used strategies such as Thumbs Up, Thumbs Down, Turn and Talk, Think-Pair -Share, and Exit tickets to conduct formative assessments and provide feedback.

    a. For example, in a grade 2 narrative writing lesson, after the teacher determined that students did not know how to properly use quotation marks, the teacher stopped the lesson and retaught the skill.

Impact: By establishing a positive, respectful learning environment for students districtwide, the district has met a critical and an essential condition to ensure student learning.   By developing a commonly shared understanding of high-quality evidence based instructional practices, the district is in a strong position to continuously improve student learning outcomes for all students. By appropriately and consistently differentiating instruction, the district is ensuring that all students are given what they need to fully access the curriculum.

3. **The district has acted strategically to ensure that its instructional model is commonly understood by staff and consistently implemented.**

    A. The district has taken steps to ensure that districtwide instructional practices are based on evidence from high-quality research and are commonly understood by teaching staff at all levels.

        1. When queried about the district's common instructional model, the superintendent identified the Skillful Teacher from Research for Better Teaching (RBT) as providing the common instructional model for the district and stated that standards-based lessons include Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies. The superintendent told the team that five years ago the district selected the Skillful Teacher as the instructional model after researching other models.

2. Interviews and a review of documents indicated that the district provides teachers with ongoing training in Skillful Teacher practices. In addition, administrators and supervisors also participate in the Skillful Leader course, the supervisor's version of the Skillful Teacher.

   a. Since 2009, the district has offered the 42-hour Skillful Teacher course to district teachers. Interviewees told the team that every new teacher is enrolled in the course and that the principles of the Skillful Teacher are continually emphasized.

   b. In September 2015, 30 teachers were enrolled in the Skillful Teacher course and the district offered the online RBT course ("Making Student Thinking Visible") for teachers who completed the initial course.

3. When school leaders were asked about the qualities of effective teaching in the schools, they cited the principles of the Skillful Teacher as the foundation for high-quality teaching and as the foundation for their evaluation system.

   a. The district's observation tool is aligned with the Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice in which the research-based practices of the Skillful Teacher are embedded. The observation tool is used to monitor the implementation of instructional practices during unannounced observations.

4. Teachers and school leaders consistently stated that the district's instructional expectations included objectives, active learning with content presented in diverse ways, varied strategies, formative assessments, and the integration of technology into the lesson.

   a. In observed classrooms districtwide, the team found these commonly shared instructional expectations implemented consistently across the district's schools. (See the Instructional Strength Finding above and Appendix C).

5. Interviews and a review of documents indicated that the district has also provided ongoing training to teachers and school leaders in the principles of UDL to make the curriculum more accessible for all learners. The move to UDL came about from an analysis of MCAS data which pointed to the district's need to better support students with disabilities.

   a. Interviewees reported that teachers received a three-day training in UDL and that UDL principles are periodically revisited by instructional leaders.

   b. Teachers reported that they design lessons with UDL principles in mind to reach all learners.

      i. In observed lessons districtwide, the review team found strong or moderate evidence that lessons were appropriately differentiated to address diverse learning needs in 96 percent of classrooms.

B. Clear instructional leadership and common planning time at every level support the consistent implementation of effective instructional practices.

1. Districtwide alignment of instructional goals is achieved through clear instructional leadership. The director of K-12 curriculum, whom interviewees described as the district's instructional leader, meets monthly with the elementary-, middle- and high-school curriculum directors and principals to align instructional goals.

2. Interviewees identified elementary-, middle- and high-school curriculum directors as the instructional leaders at each level, setting clear instructional expectations. Principals and curriculum directors set instructional expectations and monitor their implementation; they also conduct observations and evaluate teachers.

3. At each level, teachers have common planning time to collaborate on lessons and share instructional practices. At the elementary level, teachers have common planning time once a week in grade-level teams. Middle-school teachers have common planning time twice a cycle by team and by department. High-school teachers have common planning time by course once every seven days.

    a. Teachers at all levels described common planning time as an opportunity to collaborate with peers and discuss instructional practices. They use common planning time to plan instruction. At the middle school, the director and the principal attend common planning time team meetings.

Impact: By selecting and sustaining a research-based instructional model that builds teachers' ability to become more skillful teachers, the district has enabled its teachers to develop a common understanding of high-quality instructional practices. By providing clear instructional leadership and support for teachers, evidence-based instruction is more likely to be sustained and consistent districtwide. By infusing the principles of Universal Design for Learning into lessons districtwide, the district is ensuring that all students can learn to the best of their ability.

4. **The district has strategically planned and implemented a Chromebook 1:1 initiative at the middle school. The Chromebook 1:1 initiative supports the district's goal in its 2013-2018 strategic plan which calls for students to develop 21st century learning skills.**

   A. The district's adoption of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative at the middle school is aligned to district goals in its 2013-2018 strategic plan.

   1. The vision statement in the district's strategic plan calls for "up-to-date instructional space that incorporates current technology that enhances student engagement and learning in all schools." The superintendent told the team that to that end the district selected the middle school to incorporate more technology into instruction by replacing old laptops with Chromebooks.

B. Over a period of two years, before the launching of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative, the district took steps to increase its technological capacity.

    1. Interviews and a review of documents indicated that the district's director of technology and information services oversaw the upgrades to the district's wireless network and internet bandwidth from 2013-2015. This increase to the district's technological capacity was required for the Chromebook 1:1 initiative.

    2. In the summer of 2013, the district implemented Google Apps for Education (GAFE) districtwide enabling teachers and students to have access to Google's cloud-based services, including Google Docs, Sheets, and Slides, from any computer at home or at school. Chromebooks are highly compatible with GAFE.

C. After a successful pilot of Chromebooks in 2014, the middle school began a year-long professional development program to launch the Chromebook 1:1 initiative.

    1. In 2014, 2 faculty test groups piloted Chromebooks for 8 weeks to see how they would work for students and teachers at the middle school. Based on positive feedback from the pilot groups, the district moved to implement the Chromebook 1:1 initiative at the middle school; 5 Chromebook carts were purchased for students and faculty to use during the 2014-2015 school year.

    2. Interviewees said and a review of documents confirmed that teachers participated in professional development throughout the 2014-2015 school year to prepare for the Chromebook 1:1 initiative and for PARCC testing. In addition, teachers received ongoing technical support.

    3. At the end of the 2014-2015 school year, Chromebooks were provided to each faculty member for use over the summer.

        a. Each teacher's Chromebook has a classroom management tool app that enables teachers to see every student desktop.

D. The roll out of the middle school's Chromebook 1:1 initiative commenced in September 2015. Based on the successful implementation at the middle school, the district is taking steps to expand the initiative to the high school.

    1. In September 2015, every student in the middle school received a Chromebook, registered to the individual student for use at school or home. Students and parents were required to sign a Responsible Use Policy which outlines how to use the technology resource properly and ethically. In addition, parents were required to purchase an insurance policy, at a nominal fee, to cover damage or loss.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that once students log in to their Chromebooks, either at school or at home, the Chromebooks immediately navigate to the district's network to ensure that appropriate sites are used and all web filters as required by the Children's Internet Protection Act.

3. The superintendent told the team that middle-school teachers are using Chromebooks to improve students' writing. This was confirmed in the team's observations of lessons at the middle school.

   a. The district's Strategic Plan Achievement (for the 2015-2016 school year) mid-year report states that the district is using metrics from observations to record evidence on how technology is used to meet the learning needs of students.

4. When asked about what they were most proud of in their school, middle-school teachers named a positive school environment and staff and current technology, and noted that the Chromebook 1:1 initiative was an important move that supports students' learning.

5. Following the successful Chromebook implementation at the middle school, the high school is exploring the expansion of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative to the high school. During the 2015-2016 school year, each high school department has had a designated month to pilot the use of Chromebooks and to receive technical support during common planning time. After each month, feedback has been given.

   a. The high school's 2015-2016 SIP lists goal 2 as preparing to introduce the Chromebook 1:1 initiative and to provide ongoing training and professional development on Chromebooks and GAFE.

Impact: By strategically planning and implementing the Chromebook 1:1 initiative at the middle school, the district's middle-school students are more likely to be engaged in learning and experience the 21st century skills that will better prepare them for high school, college, career, and beyond. In addition, the planning and implementation of the Chromebook 1:1 initiative is a model for district development of 21st century learning opportunities for its high-school students.

Assessment

Contextual Background

Understanding and using student performance data to inform instruction is a district priority. The Curriculum, Planning and Assessment section in the district's strategic plan includes the following strategic objective: "A balanced system of assessments and related data is in use by all teachers to inform instructional decisions."

The district has established well-organized, effective systems and structures, including dedicated time, professional development, and procedural data protocols. These systems support district and school staff members in analyzing and using multiple sources of data to make decisions about improving instruction. In districtwide and school-based Professional Learning Communities, school and district staff collaborate about using data effectively. All professional staff members are trained, supported and expected to use student achievement data regularly to improve educators' pedagogy and students' performance. The district's educators consistently deploy a balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments to guide instruction and determine remedial and enrichment services for students. Central office and school-based educators effectively review, analyze, and discuss user-friendly, technology-based data reports.

The district's data-wise educators have progressed from mechanical to "organic" data use, from reliance on commercial tests to developing their own rubrics and formative assessments, and from external to internal accountability.

Strength Findings

1. **The district has established assessment practices characterized by the continuous collection, timely dissemination, and productive uses of data to improve teaching and learning.**

   A. The district's curriculum directors, members of the district's central management groups (Administrative Council, Level-Based Administrative Council, and District Data Leadership Team), coordinate assessment initiatives.

      1. The district administrators have developed and are implementing the calendar for conducting elementary school assessments.

      2. The district provided the team with a list of formative and summative assessments administered K-12 in ELA, mathematics, and science.

   B. District staff have organized and scheduled school-based teams that regularly meet to analyze, discuss, and use data.

      1. A district administrator noted: "PLCs [Professional Learning Communities] give time to teachers to analyze data."

2. Teachers said: "The data meetings are well organized and right to the point," and noted that data meetings used to be "listening" and now are "working meetings with good discussion."

3. Schools also convene Student Study Teams (SSTs) and Response to Intervention (RtI) meetings at which staff members use student performance data to provide appropriate instructional services and supports for students.

C. When analyzing and discussing student data, district staff follow clear protocols.

1. Curriculum directors and school staff told the review team that they have adapted the Data Driven Dialogue protocols and procedures developed by Nancy Love, *Using Data to Improve Learning for All: A Collaborative Inquiry Approach.*

   a. The agenda for a January/February 2016 data meeting provided specific protocols in order to "identify specific intervention needs of students who are performing below grade level."

D. Curriculum staff provide principals and teachers continuous and timely professional development and training in assessment and data analysis.

1. The district's 2015-2016 professional development calendar lists the following data-focused presentations: "Organizing the local data and data collection process for student learning goals and logic model strategies" and "Student-led portfolio."

2. Data team meetings provide training for understanding assessment changes (e.g., PARCC).

E. District and school staff members have access to user-friendly, districtwide, and school-based reports on student achievement and other relevant data.

1. District staff receive a range of reports about summative, diagnostic, and benchmark assessments. (See the following Assessment finding.)

2. Elementary teachers indicated that DIBELS and Test Wiz reports are useful for adjusting instruction and improving students' knowledge and skills.

   a. Interviews told the team that Test Wiz has been most useful at the elementary level. Teachers have created their own assessments to measure progress and generate reports such as item analysis for a student and for the class as a whole.

3. In order to increase the coherence and timeliness of reports, district curriculum directors and a consultant have designed the Digital Data Wall, a customized, computer-based program for displaying assessments' results. The Digital Data Wall displays a single chart showing results for each assessment given. By clicking on the assessments' summary results, teachers can access a roster of tested students, with results for each child.

4. District personnel rely on data generated from unannounced observations which assess how well teachers used effective instructional techniques during lessons.

   a. Principals said that unannounced observations help them "hear what students are thinking and doing, see who [student] is behind, and see the level of differentiation."

5. The district has set up and implemented a fully SIF-enabled student information system and principals, data teams, and curriculum directors access EWIS and Edwin Analytics data.

F. Professional staff use student achievement data regularly to make mid-course corrections in instruction to improve students' performance.

1. District staff indicated the various ways in which they use assessment-based data to adjust their instructional practices.

   a. Teachers meet in groups where they are revising lesson plans all the time.

   b. During their mid-year check-in at the February early release meeting, an elementary principal and teachers completed data self-assessments. Principals told the team: "If all students are getting [MCAS] questions 2, 4, and 7 wrong, we would then retrofit our instruction."

   c. Using results from pre- and post- unit tests, grade 5 teachers re-teach low-score concepts.

   d. Because of the language skills required for answering PARCC math questions, middle-school educators said that they will teach math students disciplinary reading skills and the 3-read protocol for solving word problems.

G. Through "data support conversations," principals, classroom teachers, and instructional support specialist (Title I, reading specialists, and special education teachers) use assessment data to develop tiered instructional strategies and/or intervention services for students.

1. District staff provided examples of how they use assessment data to "progress monitor," group students by skills, provide supports, and reassess progress for all students.

   a. Using Running Records assessments, elementary teachers "meet with students one on one and work on skills, comprehension, or whatever they need."

   b. Elementary teachers develop and review "watch" lists which identify students who need support.

   c. Elementary teachers meet three times a year and look at data to determine class reading groups and reading specialist groups.

d. Using data analysis to assess students' needs for intervention/support services, middle-school staff initiated a Math Intervention course for 30 students with identified math skills challenges.

Impact: District leaders, principals, and teachers consistently provide and support the key technical and adaptive components of an effective assessment system: communicating clear goals and expectations; scheduling collaborative structures where data teams dedicate time for in-depth data analysis; providing curriculum staff who train and coach school-based teams; and integrating assessments into curriculum development. Most importantly, using multiple assessments, district educators use student performance data to improve their classroom practices and instructional interventions/supports for their students.

2. **The district ensures that each school uses a balanced system of summative, formative, diagnostic, and benchmark assessments to guide instruction and determine how teachers can support learning.**

   A. Interviews and a document review indicated that district staff are using a range of summative,[5] benchmark,[6] and diagnostic assessments.[7]

   B. Teachers use formative assessments frequently.

      1. District curriculum templates include a section for listing assessments. In the curriculum documents reviewed, most assessments listed are formative.

      2. In 83 percent of lessons observed districtwide, teachers conducted appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.

   C. In addition to the assessments listed in the District Self-Assessment, district teachers have created formative, performance-based assessments based on teacher-developed rubrics. Examples include: writing rubrics/assessment process at Thorpe Elementary School middle-school art rubrics and student reflection forms; high-school Spanish common oral-proficiency assessments; high-school social studies' Document Based Questions (DBQs) protocols; and in writing, student-teacher conferencing and using Google docs for immediate feedback.

   D. During the December 9, 2015, PARCC Analysis Workshop, middle-school ELA teachers began reflecting on the changes necessary to increase the rigor of formative assessments so that they better addressed and measured the content and skills in the district's curriculum.

---

[5] Summative assessments: MCAS, PARCC, AP, SAT, and common mid-terms and finals in each grade, for ELA, math, and science.

[6] Benchmark assessments: math, grades 1-5.

[7] Diagnostic assessments: TCWRP, grade 1; DIBELS, K-2; DAZE, grades 3-5; Running Records, K-5; PSAT, grade 10; and Mock, AP English.

1. In a document titled Workshop Reflections, a middle-school teacher considered how she could improve the rigor of her formative assessments, noting: "I want to think more about how to monitor students' independent abilities to take on rigorous tasks and figure out check-ins with them for when they find they are stuck or having a challenge with a task."

Impact: Using a range of assessments provides multiple data which contribute to a more valid profile of students' academic progress. When using frequent formative assessments, teachers obtain timely student-performance information which they then use to re-teach content and/or revise their instructional practices. Through developing and using more formative assessments, district teachers have made assessing students a central practice in teaching and learning.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

3. **District planning documents and reports do not consistently cite current disaggregated student data or include SMART goals for closing students' achievement gaps.**

   A. Districtwide plans cite and monitor performance targets for teachers' performance but do not consistently provide similar measureable targets for improving students' achievement.

      1. One 2015-2016 district goal states: "By June 2016 eighty-five percent of our teachers will demonstrate use of an accessibility strategy in their instruction as noted during the unannounced observation process.

      2. The district's 2015-2016 mid-year report indicated that "seventy-five percent of teachers had demonstrated the use of an accessibility strategy in their instruction."

   B. Most planning documents do not contain disaggregated student-achievement data and accompanying SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked) to improve proficiency.

      1. While the 2015-2016 middle school SIP contains the following data on the proficiency gaps for high needs students, the SIP does not contain SMART goals to close the stated achievement gaps among the school's high needs students.

         a. Fifty-seven percent of students categorized as high needs students scored proficient or higher on the 2014 ELA MCAS test versus ninety percent of students categorized as "non high needs."

         b. Twenty-two percent of students categorized as high needs students scored proficient or higher on the 2014 Math MCAS test versus sixty-one percent of students categorized as "non high needs."

   C. Logic Models, the district's planning format, does not include SMART goals for improving the performance of student groups that have achievement gaps.

D. District reports on student academic achievement provide limited disaggregated data.

1. The October 19, 2015 school committee PowerPoint presentation does not provide disaggregated MCAS data.

2. The January 2016 school committee PowerPoint presentation does not contain PARCC data disaggregated by student groups, e.g., all male and female students and high needs students (including students with disabilities).

3. The April 2014 AP results report does provide information on the AP exams taken and the qualifying scores for male and female students.

E. ESE's 2015-2016 PARCC data reports indicated noteworthy academic performance differences between groups of district students and their state peers.

1. For example, in ELA 51 percent of the district's grade 6 students scored at Achievement Levels 4 and 5 (Met or Exceeded Expectations), compared with 60 percent of their state peers.

2. When disaggregated by gender, the 2015-2016 PARCC data indicated that in ELA 68 percent of all grade 6 female students and 33 percent of all grade 6 male students scored at Achievement Levels 4 and 5. While in ELA the district's grade 6 females scored at Levels 4 and 5 at the same rate as grade 6 females across the state (68 percent), only 33 percent of the district's grade 6 males rate scored at Levels 4 and 5, compared with 53 percent of their state peers.

   a. ESE's 2015-16 PARCC ELA results showed similar performance gaps between male and female students in grades 7 and 8.

   b. ESE's 2015-2016 PARCC math results also showed Transitional Composite Performance Index gaps between district students and their state peers in grades 6, 7, and 8.

F. A district administrator indicated that the district needs to "get stronger" in disaggregating student data.

Impact: Without analysis of disaggregated and aggregated data, teachers do not have sufficient information to adjust instruction and provide support and interventions to all students.

Recommendation

1. **The district should enhance its assessment system by disaggregating student performance data and include in all planning documents SMART goals based on disaggregated student performance data.**

   A. District and school based staff should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of disaggregated data districtwide.

   B. All planning documents should contain SMART goals which are based on disaggregated student achievement data.

Benefits: Implementing these recommendations will mean a substantially expanded ability to monitor students' academic progress and to accurately measure achievement, which will lead to improved classroom instruction and student support services, enhanced curriculum, and more well-informed educational policy and decision making.

Student Support

Contextual Background

One of the strategic objectives listed in the strategic plan and in the District Improvement Plan (DIP) is that the needs of all learners will be consistently anticipated, planned for, and addressed by all staff. To that end, the district has consistently used systems across all levels to identify and provide support for students who are not performing at grade level. Further, the district has clearly communicated its expectations for meeting the needs of all learners and has provided teachers with support and professional development.

Response to Intervention (RtI), also referred to as data meetings in this district, are held in the elementary schools three times per year after the administration of benchmark assessments. During these meetings, students are identified for support and interventions such as Title I reading or math (in the three Title I schools), small-group pull-out by reading specialists, and small in-class support from the classroom teachers.

Middle-school teachers meet twice per seven-day cycle in interdisciplinary teams that include a special educator to plan instruction for different developmental levels. The middle school offers intervention classes in reading, math, and study skills.

Grade 9 teachers at the high school meet three times per cycle during the first semester, and twice per cycle in the second semester. These interdisciplinary teams include a special educator and are designed to enable teachers to focus on students' needs and provide the support and confidence necessary for students to be successful.

The middle school and the high school offer after-school support for students as needed. In addition, the district provides a late school van twice a week for students who need transportation.

Student Study Teams (SSTs) meet regularly in each school. Teams at the middle school include the principal, the assistant principal, the referring teacher, the school psychologist, a social worker, the school nurse, and a guidance counselor. These meetings provide all teachers with another opportunity to refer students who continue to struggle. Teachers work with the team to develop new strategies to try in-class and to obtain additional interventions.

Professional development in Universal Design for Learning (UDL), an instructional framework with the goals of reaching all learners, including students with disabilities and English language learners, has been provided to all staff. Principals now look for and are beginning to notice more elements of UDL being used in classrooms. Additionally, in 96 percent of the classrooms observed districtwide the review team found moderate and strong evidence of appropriate differentiation of instruction Also, the DIP states that, as a measure of progress, by June 2016 85 percent of teachers will demonstrate "use of an accessibility strategy (UDL and/or Skillful Teacher strategies) in their instruction" during unannounced observations.

The district has established policies and practices to support the career readiness of its graduates. Students K-12 learn about the world of work, vocations available to them, skills needed in industry, and respect for the dignity of work. The career development process is provided by guidance counselors, classroom teachers, advisors, and the self-responsibility of students.

Students participate in a wide range of career awareness, exploratory, and immersion activities that enable them to make more informed decisions about college and career. The activities begin with a series of age-appropriate experiences that introduce elementary-school children to occupations that exist in the community. Students progress through more structured career awareness, exploratory, and immersion experiences as they move through middle school and into high school. Interests and specific career options are identified through exploratory classrooms, clubs, and after- school activities. This process is supported by Naviance, a web-based career-interest assessment tool. Immersion experiences provide high-school students with direct hands-on participation in community-based volunteer work and internships.

The creation of many high-quality career development opportunities by the district at the elementary, middle, and high schools has enabled students to be career ready upon graduation. The district's student support system for career readiness should be considered best practice and is worthy of replication.

Strength Findings

1. **The district has systems in place at all levels to identify and provide interventions for students who are not performing at grade level.**

   A. There are common practices at each level to identify and provide support for students who are not working at grade level.

      1. Interviewees reported and documents confirmed that there are Response to Intervention (RtI) data meetings, Student Study Teams (SSTs), and interventions for reading at the elementary level.

         a. RtI meetings take place three times per year and include the elementary curriculum director, the reading specialist, the literacy coach, and Title I teachers at three of the five elementary schools.

         b. Using the results of benchmark data, students receive Title I reading and math support, small group in-class support from classroom teachers, or small-group targeted support from the reading specialist.

         c. Elementary teachers can refer students to SSTs when students continue to struggle after interventions have been tried through the RtI process. The SST process, outlined in documents provided by the district, gives elementary teachers another opportunity to refer struggling students and get suggestions for additional interventions.

d. The SST Documentation Form lists a range of curriculum and instruction modifications; it also refers teachers to the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan on the district website for more accommodations.

2. Interviewees reported and a document review indicated that middle-school teachers have multiple avenues to discuss and receive support for struggling students.

    a. In grade-level meetings twice per seven-day cycle teachers from interdisciplinary teams plan instruction for students at different developmental levels

    b. Members of the middle-school's SST include the referring teacher, the principal, the assistant principal, the school psychologist, a social worker, the school nurse, and a guidance counselor.

    c. The review team was told that in addition to the SST a "status" meeting, conducted with all support personnel including the school psychologist, addresses students' academic and non-academic needs.

    d. Interviewees said and a document review confirmed that the middle school offers intervention classes in reading, math, and study skills. A sample student schedule provided to the review team included academic support classes, study skills, and reading lab periods.

3. The high school has processes in place to identify and support students who are struggling academically.

    a. High-school teachers reported and a document review confirmed that grade 9 teachers, including special educators, meet three times per seven-day cycle during the first semester and twice per cycle during the second semester to focus on students' needs and get to know students well. The high school Program of Studies states that the goal of the grade 9 team is to provide grade 9 students with additional support, skills, and confidence necessary for a successful high school experience. One of the team's goals is to identify and support "at risk" students by developing accurate student profiles, determining appropriate placement, and reviewing and monitoring student progress regularly.

    b. The high school also conducts status meetings and SSTs to discuss students' academic and non-academic needs.

    c. A document review indicated that the high school offers a range of courses to meet students' needs including academic support classes, college prep, honors, and advanced placement courses. Interviewees reported and review team members observed that many classes are co-taught with special educators to ensure students with disabilities are accessing the full curriculum.

d. The Danvers High School Student Handbook describes after-school help sessions. This time after school, when teachers are contractually required to stay for 45 minutes, can be used to provide additional support to students. The district provides a late van two days a week for students who need a ride home.

e. High-school students can also obtain individual tutoring from National Honor Society students in the school library Monday through Thursday from 2:15 – 3:15 pm.

Impact: Effective and consistently used systems to identify, monitor, and provide support for students who are struggling is likely to raise student achievement. By providing targeted interventions, ongoing monitoring, and flexible groupings the district ensures that all students are receiving appropriate supports.

2. **The district has communicated and documented its expectations that teachers plan and develop lessons that meet students' diverse learning needs and has provided educators with support, professional development, and ongoing monitoring.**

   A. The district has communicated its expectations for meeting the needs of all students.

      1. One strategic objective in the district's District Improvement Plan (DIP) is that the needs of all learners will be consistently anticipated, planned for, and addressed by all staff.

      2. The district has documented in the DIP its expectation that, by June 2016, 85 percent of teachers will demonstrate the use of an accessibility strategy such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), an instructional framework with the goal of reaching all learners including students with disabilities and English language learners.

   B. The district has provided training for teachers in Universal Design for Learning (UDL).

      1. Elementary teachers reported that as a result of their UDL training they design lessons keeping students with disabilities in mind and are including lesson activators and guiding questions.

      2. When middle-school teachers were asked about differentiation they spoke about the UDL training they received, and noted that certain manipulatives that were once only used with some students are now benefitting everyone.

      3. Other interviewees gave an example of UDL in a high school science class where teachers would create multiple entry points to a problem for students so that everyone could access the problem.

      4. Principals reported that they look for differentiation in their unannounced visits and that they are seeing more UDL principles used.

5. Review team members found moderate and strong evidence that teachers appropriately differentiate instruction so lessons can be accessible for all learners in 96 percent of classrooms observed districtwide.

C. The district is proactive in ensuring that students with disabilities are accessing the full curriculum.

1. When asked about the challenge Danvers has in closing the proficiency gap, the superintendent noted that district leaders are looking closely at special education and at the district level the general education curriculum director and the special education director are working together to enhance the co-teaching model.

2. The superintendent reported that a new program has been adopted to enhance the learning of students with disabilities.

a. The Highland Elementary School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2015-2016 includes a goal to implement the Language-Based Learning program, specialized instruction in literacy, for grades 4 and 5 students with language-based needs.

b. The Highland Elementary SIP indicates that planning and professional development for this program began in 2014-2015 and continued through the summer with support from an outreach consultant.

3. Interviewees reported and a document review indicated inclusion, pull-out services, and some specialized programs throughout the elementary schools and co-teaching, self-contained classes, life skills, and academic support classes at the middle and high schools.

4. Middle-school teachers reported that general education and special education teachers have common planning time. High- school teachers reported that grade 9 teams have a special educator assigned to meet with each team every cycle.

Impact: Clearly articulated and documented expectations of high achievement for all students by the district accompanied by resources, professional development, and ongoing monitoring help ensure that all students' diverse learning needs are being met**.**

3. **The district and the community provide high-quality work and career development education at all levels.**

A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district and the community support the career readiness of graduates.

1. District policy recognizes the need to inform students K-12 about the world of work, possible vocations, skills needed in industry and technology, and the dignity of work.

2. District policy requires guidance services to provide occupational and career assistance and information for all students.

3. The strategic plan's Vision Statement for the Danvers Public Schools describes graduates as well prepared to continue their learning in a wide range of college and career options available to them. The superintendent identified the Vision Statement as the driving force to provide career development education.

4. School committee members stated that the town of Danvers is well managed and is very supportive of its schools. This enables the school committee to provide program options to students, including those programs that can lead to a job.

5. Principals described career-development activities, including the Danvers Educational Enrichment Program (DEEP), community service, internships, career fairs, Danvers Cable Access Television, and school visits to present occupations of community and family members. They told the team that the district considered students' suggestions in adding DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America) classes and an engineering club, and in expanding students' media/publications projects.

B. Elementary schools begin the career-development process by providing a variety of career awareness experiences that introduce children to occupations in the community.

1. As part of the Community Helpers Unit, speakers include firemen, police, and mystery guest speakers who provide clues to help students figure out their occupations.

2. Elementary students visit the library, post office, police station, fire station, and grocery store.

3. Role playing of notable or influential adults in the Biography Unit and role playing of different cultures in the World of Difference Unit explore the jobs of individuals.

4. Various community service projects in the schools, including can goods collection, hospice walks, and recycling, expose students to businesses and organizations in the community.

C. The Holten Richmond Middle School provides structured career awareness and exploratory activities and initial career-immersion experiences.

1. The Vision Statement from the middle school's Program of Studies describes a learning environment where students can attain knowledge and skills to prepare for meaningful work. The school's "Exit Outcomes" includes essential knowledge that is demonstrated through the student's ability to understand career options and requirements.

2. The guidance department provides a, grade-appropriate developmental curriculum at grades 6, 7, and 8, using Naviance, a web-based career-interest assessment tool. Career development topics include: at grade 6, goal setting; at grade 7 ,introduction to career development and self-awareness, and career exploration; and at grade 8, interest inventory assessments, career awareness research, and career day. Grade 8 students are also provided

with a deeper approach to career awareness through an interest inventory, a skill inventory, and profiles of learning styles.

3. Each year on Career Day 15 adults in different occupations visit the middle school and students rotate to hear from each participant.

4. Academic -exploratory classes at all three grades include problem solving activities, skill development, and project-based learning. Classes include: Art, Computer Education, Drama & Public Speaking, Music, and Technology Education.

5. Co-curricular activities support further career exploratory activities and initial career immersion through after-school hands-on learning. The Engineering Club enables the application of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). The Business Club, which is managed by high school DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America), teaches business and marketing, and the DCAT Club, sponsored by Danvers Community Access Television, provides instruction in video and television production. The Middle School Theater Organization develops skills in the performing arts through a stage production.

D. Danvers High School provides further career exploration supported by guidance counselors, classroom and co-curricular teachers, and workplace supervisors. Career-immersion experiences are provided through direct participation in career-related activities.

1. The guidance department provides students and parents with assistance on transition issues and the career/college search process.

2. Students and parents use Naviance as a planning and advising tool. Each freshman student completes a personality profile. Sophomores are exposed to careers and majors that match their interests and goals. Juniors begin college searches and visits, explore career training options, and develop a resume. Seniors work individually and in groups to match interests with colleges and careers. In the fall, students schedule college visits.

2. Forty hours of community service, completed over four years, are required for graduation. One of the learning objectives of this immersion activity is to provide students the opportunity to understand the skills related to a positive work experience and work ethic.

3. All seniors are strongly encouraged to participate in May and June in a five-week internship managed by two ELA teachers. Students are assisted or find their own jobs. They are immersed in a non-paid job every day to experience a real-world workplace.

   a. Students work in various sectors of the economy including service, health, education, engineering, and manufacturing.

   b. Students are required to complete a six-page paper that includes a description of the internship and reflection on the experience. A tri-fold board must be made to showcase

the experience at the internship fair, conducted in the field house, which is open to parents and the school community.

4. High-school classes are provided and required in Applied Technology Education and Fine Arts–Visual/Music.

   a. Applied Technology Education classes are in-depth, career-related immersion experiences that prepare students to be ready to meet the demands of college and today's high tech workforce. Students are involved in project-based learning experiences in engineering, communications, computers, and business technologies.

   b. The Applied Arts classes provide students with knowledge and experience in order to develop an appreciation for the arts.

5. DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America) prepares emerging leaders and entrepreneurs in marketing, finance, hospitality and management in high schools and colleges. Danvers had over 200 members last year. Students compete in knowledge and skill events at Career Development Conferences at the regional, state, national, and international levels.

6. "Reality Check" is a program sponsored by People's United Bank to assist seniors to realize the benefits of financial literacy. It is a one-day financial decision-making simulation that teaches basic personal financial management skills.

7. Other career-development opportunities are Armed Forces Awareness Day, Tomorrow's Teachers, which provides opportunities for classroom experience, and Project AMP-Up, an introduction of women to careers in engineering.

8. The town of Danvers is a member of the Essex Agricultural and Technical Regional High School. Programs are offered in specific agriculture, trade and technical occupations that are designed to educate and prepare students for both employment and continuing education. Programs integrate academic and vocational education and include competency based applied learning. Approximately 80 Danvers students attend the school in grades 9-12.

E. The Danvers Educational Enrichment Program (DEEP) provides significant community support to the school system

1. DEEP is a 501 (C) 3 organization whose mission is to enrich the district's educational process through a unique partnership of schools, community volunteers, and businesses.

2. DEEP provides $500 teacher and administrator grants awarding almost $20,000 annually.

3. DEEP contributes to special school projects such as the technology campaign and tech labs.

Impact: By creating many high-quality career-development opportunities at the elementary, middle, and high schools, the district has enabled students to be career ready upon graduation. The career awareness, exploratory, and immersion activities have enabled students to gain knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to successfully navigate career pathways. The student support system established by the district for career readiness should be considered best practice and is worthy of replication.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from March 28- 30, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Charles Burnett, curriculum and instruction

2. Dr. James Caradonio, assessment

3. Sue Kelly, curriculum and instruction

4. Lenora Jennings, student support and *review team coordinator*

5. Dr. Wilfrid Savoie, student support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

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

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: the chair and one member.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the business manager, the director of student services, and the K-12 curriculum director.

The team visited the following schools: Danvers High School (grades 9-12), Holten Richmond Middle School (grades 6-8), Highland Elementary (K-5), Great Oak Elementary (K- 5), Riverside Elementary (Pre-K-5), Smith Elementary (K-5), and Thorpe Elementary (K-5).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 7 principals and focus groups with 11 elementary-school teachers, 10 middle-school teachers, and 4 high-school teachers.

The team observed 54 classes in the district: 14 at the high school, 13 at the middle school, and 27 at the 5 elementary schools.

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

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

- o Data on the district's staffing and finances.

- o 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).

- o 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.

- o All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

Site Visit Schedule

.

Monday 03/28/2016	Tuesday 03/29/2016	Wednesday 03/30/2016
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association; elementary and high school teachers focus groups and visits to Holten Richmond Middle School, and Danvers High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; school committee; middle school teacher focus group; parent focus group; and visits to Danvers High School, Holten Richmond Middle School, and Riverside and Highlands elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews students; follow-ups with district staff; visits to Thorpe, Great Oak, Highlands, and Smith elementary schools for classroom observations.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

Table B1a: Danvers Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	74	2.1%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	93	2.6%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	242	6.7%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	8	0.2%	2,179	0.2%
White	3,106	86.1%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	85	2.4%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	3,608	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

Table B1b: Danvers Public Schools
2015–2016 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	573	51.6%	15.7%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	616	55.5%	17.1%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	43	3.9%	1.2%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	1,110	100.0%	30.3%	419,764	100.0%	43.5%

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 2,958; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B2a: Danvers Public Schools
English Language Arts MCAS/PARCC Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015*	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	284	90.1	89.3	85.9	89.6	82.5	-0.5	3.7
4	CPI	282	85.4	82.7	84.6	86.5	77.8	1.1	1.9
	SGP	264	42.0	49.0	45.0	57.0	50.0	15.0	12.0
5	CPI	264	85.6	89.2	85.5	89.8	87.0	4.2	4.3
	SGP	247	37.0	42.0	41.0	43.0	50.0	6.0	2.0
6	CPI	282	87.6	88.1	88.9	83.9	86.6	-3.7	-5.0
	SGP	269	39.0	45.0	34.0	28.0	50.0	-11.0	-6.0
7	CPI	298	92.0	92.2	91.5	86.3	86.4	-5.7	-5.2
	SGP	283	52.0	49.0	47.5	29.0	50.0	-23.0	-18.5
8	CPI	296	93.1	94.1	92.4	90.9	92.0	-2.2	-1.5
	SGP	281	45.0	49.0	48.0	29.0	50.0	-16.0	-19.0
10	CPI	258	96.2	97.6	96.9	98.8	96.7	2.6	1.9
	SGP	234	49	55	50.5	58	51.0	9.0	7.5
All	CPI	1,970	89.9	90.6	89.3	89.1	86.8	-0.8	-0.2
	SGP	1,582	44.0	49.0	45.0	39.0	50.0	-5.0	-6.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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 statewide assessments for the first time.
* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

Table B2b: Danvers Public Schools
English Language Arts MCAS 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	P+	290	76%	73%	68%	63%	57%	-13	-5
4	P+	267	57%	64%	59%	60%	54%	3	1
5	P+	281	75%	63%	74%	67%	64%	-8	-7
6	P+	303	77%	70%	71%	71%	68%	-6	0
7	P+	292	78%	80%	80%	77%	72%	-1	-3
8	P+	294	84%	85%	84%	83%	79%	-1	-1
10	P+	255	91%	89%	91%	92%	90%	1	1
All	P+	1,982	77%	75%	76%	73%	69%	-4	-3

Table B2c: Danvers Public Schools
English Language Arts 2015 PARCC Performance Level

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
3	278	65	54	11	7	54	47	21	22	9	14	5	10
4	280	72	57	20	15	52	42	20	25	7	12	1	5
5	257	62	63	3	8	59	55	28	23	10	10	0	4
6	279	51	60	3	12	47	48	33	25	13	11	4	4
7	295	53	61	12	21	42	40	29	22	13	11	4	6
8	292	53	64	8	16	45	48	28	20	14	10	5	5

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations;
Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

Table B2d: Danvers Public Schools
Mathematics MCAS/PARCC Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015*	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	286	86.1	91	91.1	89.0	85.3	2.9	-2.1
4	CPI	283	83.8	83.9	84.0	80.5	77.1	-3.3	-3.5
	SGP	265	40.0	50.0	43.0	38.0	50.0	-2.0	-5.0
5	CPI	262	81.2	82.2	84.2	84.4	83.2	3.2	0.2
	SGP	244	44.0	43.0	49.0	43.0	50.0	-1.0	-6.0
6	CPI	280	77.9	77.9	73.9	73.3	81.2	-4.6	-0.6
	SGP	266	26.0	30.0	18.0	19.0	50.0	-7.0	1.0
7	CPI	299	77.2	74.7	67.2	69.4	72.5	-7.8	2.2
	SGP	283	50.5	52.0	40.0	41.0	50.0	-9.5	1.0
8	CPI	296	80.1	77.6	77.2	70.0	78.1	-10.1	-7.2
	SGP	283	55.0	48.0	56.0	32.0	50.0	-23.0	-24.0
10	CPI	260	93.3	93.6	91.1	93.1	89.9	-0.2	2.0
	SGP	238	54.0	36.0	52.0	52.0	50.0	-2.0	0.0
All	CPI	1,972	82.5	82.8	81.0	79.4	80.7	-3.1	-1.6
	SGP	1,582	44.0	44.0	42.0	36.0	50.0	-8.0	-6.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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 statewide assessments for the first time.
* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

Table B2e: Danvers Public Schools
Mathematics MCAS 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	P+	289	78%	65%	77%	80%	68%	2%	3%
4	P+	268	47%	54%	55%	57%	52%	10%	2%
5	P+	280	64%	57%	63%	62%	61%	-2%	-1%
6	P+	301	60%	56%	56%	47%	60%	-13%	-9%
7	P+	293	58%	54%	51%	40%	50%	-18%	-11%
8	P+	293	62%	61%	57%	51%	52%	-11%	-6%
10	P+	254	79%	85%	86%	81%	79%	2%	-5%
All	P+	1978	64%	61%	63%	59%	60%	-5%	-4%

Table B2f: Danvers Public Schools

Math 2015 PARCC Performance Level

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
3	280	61%	55%	11%	12%	50%	43%	24%	25%	12%	14%	3%	6%
4	280	53%	48%	6%	6%	48%	41%	30%	29%	15%	18%	2%	5%
5	253	54%	55%	4%	11%	50%	44%	26%	26%	18%	15%	2%	5%
6	276	30%	53%	1%	10%	29%	44%	43%	28%	22%	14%	5%	5%
7	296	34%	45%	1%	8%	33%	37%	42%	32%	21%	18%	3%	4%
8	292	34%	53%	2%	10%	32%	43%	29%	22%	27%	15%	10%	10%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations;
Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

Table B2g: Danvers Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering MCAS Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	267	76	76.7	76.6	73.7	78.2	-2.3	-2.9
	P+	267	44%	45%	45%	37%	51%	-7%	-8%
8	CPI	299	72.9	77.3	76.7	73.8	72.4	0.9	-2.9
	P+	299	42%	44%	43%	43%	42%	1%	0%
10	CPI	249	91.6	93	92.3	93.2	88.2	1.6	0.9
	P+	249	76%	81%	80%	80%	72%	4%	0%
All	CPI	815	79.3	82.1	81.3	79.7	79.4	0.4	-1.6
	P+	815	53%	56%	55%	52%	54%	-1%	-3%

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

Table B3a: Danvers Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015*	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	621	78.5	79.0	78.1	77.8	-0.7	-0.3
		SGP	462	35.0	43.5	40.0	37.0	2.0	-3.0
	State	CPI	220,963	76.5	76.8	77.1	76.3	-0.2	-0.8
		SGP	164,300	46.0	47.0	47.0	47.0	1.0	0.0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	359	--	--	--	80.9	--	--
		SGP	260	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	151,741	--	--	--	77.6	--	--
		SGP	114,505	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	325	71.1	72.1	69.6	71.0	-0.1	1.4
		SGP	257	29.0	39.0	36.0	34.0	5.0	-2.0
	State	CPI	90,429	67.3	66.8	66.6	67.4	0.1	0.8
		SGP	65,886	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	48	78.8	74.0	61.2	67.2	-11.6	6.0
		SGP	30	--	--	40.0	--	--	--
	State	CPI	49,639	66.2	67.4	67.8	68.9	2.7	1.1
		SGP	32,850	51.0	53.0	54.0	53.0	2.0	-1.0
All students	District	CPI	1,970	89.9	90.6	89.3	89.1	-0.8	-0.2
		SGP	1,582	44.0	49.0	45.0	39.0	-5.0	-6.0
	State	CPI	490,449	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.8	0.1	0.1
		SGP	386,631	50.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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.
* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

Table B3b: Danvers Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Percentage of Selected Subgroups Scoring Proficient or Advanced on MCAS, 2011-2014

Group	Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	700	52%	50%	49%	49%	-3	0
Low Income	464	62%	57%	56%	56%	-6	0
Students w/ disabilities	369	38%	34%	33%	34%	-4	1
ELL or Former ELLs	38	72%	50%	38%	29%	-43	-9
All Students	1,982	77%	75%	76%	73%	-4	-3

Table B3c: Danvers Public Schools
ELA Grades 3 to 8 by Group 2015 PARCC Performance Level

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
High Needs	517	32%	38%	3%	4%	29%	34%	35%	30%	24%	20%	9%	11%
Econ. Disad.	319	40%	41%	3%	5%	36%	36%	34%	30%	20%	19%	7%	11%
Students with disabilities	251	18%	21%	1%	2%	16%	20%	35%	30%	33%	29%	14%	20%
ELL	45	27%	31%	2%	3%	24%	28%	29%	30%	36%	24%	9%	15%
All	1,681	59%	60%	9%	13%	50%	47%	26%	23%	11%	12%	3%	6%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations; Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

Table B3d: Danvers Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015*	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	622	66.6	66.4	66.4	64.7	-1.9	-1.7
		SGP	458	38.0	37.0	43.0	34.0	-4.0	-9.0
	State	CPI	221,202	67.0	68.6	68.4	67.9	0.9	-0.5
		SGP	165,003	46.0	46.0	47.0	46.0	0.0	-1.0
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	361	--	--	--	68.4	--	--
		SGP	263	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	151,816	--	--	--	69.2	--	--
		SGP	115,029	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	324	58.4	57.6	58.0	56.5	-1.9	-1.5
		SGP	249	34.0	34.0	45.0	32.0	-2.0	-13.0
	State	CPI	90,520	56.9	57.4	57.1	57.3	0.4	0.2
		SGP	66,285	43.0	42.0	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	49	71.1	73.0	62.5	62.2	-8.9	-0.3
		SGP	32	--	--	63.0	--	--	--
	State	CPI	49,969	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.5	2.9	0.7
		SGP	33,076	52.0	53.0	52.0	51.0	-1.0	-1.0
All students	District	CPI	1,972	82.5	82.8	81.0	79.4	-3.1	-1.6
		SGP	1,582	44.0	44.0	42.0	36.0	-8.0	-6.0
	State	CPI	490,466	79.9	80.8	80.3	80.7	0.8	0.4
		SGP	387,674	50.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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.
* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

Table B3e: Danvers Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Percentage of Selected Subgroups Scoring Proficient or Advanced on MCAS, 2011-2014

Group	Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	696	37%	35%	36%	35%	-2	-1
Low Income	460	43%	40%	42%	38%	-5	-4
Students w/ disabilities	364	25%	25%	23%	22%	-3	-1
ELL or Former ELLs	40	42%	47%	40%	33%	-9	-7
All Students	1,978	64%	61%	63%	59%	-5	-4

Table B3f: Danvers Public Schools
Math Grades 3 to 8 by Group 2015 PARCC Performance Level

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
High Needs	513	24%	31%	1%	3%	23%	28%	30%	31%	35%	26%	12%	11%
Econ. Disad.	320	28%	33%	1%	3%	27%	30%	32%	31%	32%	25%	8%	11%
Students with disabilities	246	13%	17%	1%	2%	12%	16%	26%	28%	43%	35%	17%	20%
ELL	45	27%	30%	2%	4%	24%	26%	24%	30%	31%	27%	18%	13%
All	1,677	44%	52%	4%	10%	40%	43%	32%	27%	19%	16%	4%	6%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations; Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

Table B3g: Danvers Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	270	64.1	67.8	68.1	65.4	1.3	-2.7
		P+	270	26%	31%	30%	29%	3	-1
	State	CPI	91,013	65	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	-1
		P+	91,013	31%	31%	33%	32%	1	-1
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	142	--	--	--	65.7	65.7	65.7
		P+	142	--	--	--	33%	33	33
	State	CPI	62,345	--	--	--	67.1	--	--
		P+	62,345	--	--	--	33%	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	156	58.4	60.8	61.7	61.5	3.1	-0.2
		P+	156	20%	19%	19%	20%	0	1
	State	CPI	38,520	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	0.1
		P+	38,520	20%	20%	22%	22%	2	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	21	--	--	50	48.8	--	-1.2
		P+	21	--	--	8%	19%	--	11
	State	CPI	17,516	51.4	54.0	54.0	53.9	2.5	-0.1
		P+	17,516	17%	19%	18%	18%	1	0
All students	District	CPI	815	79.3	82.1	81.3	79.7	0.4	-1.6
		P+	815	53%	56%	55%	52%	-1	-3
	State	CPI	210,454	78.6	79.0	79.6	79.4	0.8	-0.2
		P+	210,454	54%	53%	55%	54%	0	-1.0

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for Science and Technology/ Engineering (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: Danvers Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High Needs	3.2%	3.0%	2.7%	2.3%	-0.9	-28.0%	-0.4	-14.8%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	2.5%	--	--	--	--	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	3.4%	3.9%	2.7%	2.3%	-1.1	-32.4%	-0.4	-14.8%	3.5%
ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	1.1%	2.3%	1.2%	0.9%	-0.2	-18.2%	-0.3	-25.0%	1.9%

Notes: The annual drop-out 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. Drop outs 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 high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B5: Danvers Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2012–2015

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.3%	94.8%	95.6%	95.1%	-0.2	-0.2%	-0.5	-0.5%	94.7%

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 B6: Danvers 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	$32,060,514	$32,131,071	$33,372,357	$33,399,264	$34,444,125	$34,278,800
By municipality	$16,907,013	$34,787,545	$17,963,043	$24,043,271	$19,249,597	$19,796,554
Total from local appropriations	$48,967,527	$66,918,616	$51,335,400	$57,442,535	$53,693,722	$54,075,354
From revolving funds and grants	--	$4,428,709	--	$3,638,088	--	$4,844,404
Total expenditures	--	$71,347,325	--	$61,080,623	--	$58,919,758
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$4,269,013	--	$5,786,818	--	$6,079,019
Required local contribution	--	$27,692,459	--	$28,151,599	--	$29,050,571
Required net school spending**	--	$31,961,472	--	$33,938,417	--	$35,129,590
Actual net school spending	--	$42,479,789	--	$43,834,647	--	$44,611,171
Over/under required ($)	--	$10,518,317	--	$9,896,230	--	$9,481,581
Over/under required (%)	--	32.9%	--	29.2%	--	27.0%

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

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

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

Data retrieved 11/20/15

Table B7: Danvers Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2012–2014

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	$538	$573	$589
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$696	$723	$777
Teachers	$5,012	$5,144	$5,272
Other teaching services	$658	$549	$740
Professional development	$353	$429	$339
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$159	$189	$195
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$399	$404	$444
Pupil services	$958	$998	$1,062
Operations and maintenance	$1,124	$1,170	$1,149
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$1,983	$2,083	$2,053
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$11,879	$12,260	$12,619

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	ES	0%	0%	26%	74%	2.7
	MS	0%	15%	23%	62%	2.5
	HS	0%	0%	14%	86%	2.9
	Total #	0	2	12	40	2.7
	Total %	0%	4%	22%	74%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	ES	0%	0%	37%	63%	2.6
	MS	8%	15%	38%	38%	2.1
	HS	0%	0%	36%	64%	2.6
	Total #	1	2	20	31	2.5
	Total %	2%	4%	37%	57%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	ES	0%	0%	37%	63%	2.6
	MS	8%	15%	38%	38%	2.1
	HS	0%	0%	36%	64%	2.6
	Total #	1	2	20	31	2.5
	Total %	2%	4%	37%	57%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	ES	0%	0%	33%	67%	2.7
	MS	0%	8%	46%	46%	2.4
	HS	0%	0%	36%	64%	2.6
	Total #	0	1	20	33	2.6
	Total %	0%	2%	37%	61%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	ES					10.6
	MS					9.5
	HS					10.9
	Total					10.4

Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.	ES	0%	0%	41%	59%	2.6
	MS	0%	0%	38%	62%	2.6
	HS	0%	0%	43%	57%	2.6
	Total #	0	0	22	32	2.6
	Total %	0%	0%	41%	59%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	ES	0%	4%	48%	48%	2.4
	MS	0%	23%	46%	31%	2.1
	HS	0%	0%	21%	79%	2.8
	Total #	0	4	22	28	2.4
	Total %	0%	7%	41%	52%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	0%	4%	41%	56%	2.5
	MS	8%	0%	38%	54%	2.4
	HS	0%	0%	50%	50%	2.5
	Total #	1	1	23	29	2.5
	Total %	2%	2%	43%	54%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	ES					7.6
	MS					7.1
	HS					7.9
	Total					7.5

Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.	ES	0%	4%	37%	59%	2.6
	MS	0%	8%	62%	31%	2.2
	HS	0%	0%	43%	57%	2.6
	Total #	0	2	24	28	2.5
	Total %	0%	4%	44%	52%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	ES	0%	4%	41%	56%	2.5
	MS	0%	15%	31%	54%	2.4
	HS	7%	0%	36%	57%	2.4
	Total #	1	3	20	30	2.5
	Total %	2%	6%	37%	56%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	ES	0%	4%	11%	85%	2.8
	MS	8%	8%	15%	69%	2.5
	HS	0%	0%	29%	71%	2.7
	Total #	1	2	9	42	2.7
	Total %	2%	4%	17%	78%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	ES	0%	15%	33%	52%	2.4
	MS	0%	23%	38%	38%	2.2
	HS	0%	14%	21%	69%	2.5
	Total #	0	9	17	28	2.4
	Total %	0%	17%	31%	52%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	ES					10.3
	MS					9.2
	HS					10.2
	Total					10.0