Targeted District Review Report

Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District

Review conducted January 17–19, 2017

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

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

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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner
Published June 2017

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

Executive Summary

The Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District is a Level 2 district[1] that now has stable school and district leadership after several years of administrative turnover. District leaders have analyzed 2016 MCAS data and recognized that more work is needed to strengthen students' performance in ELA, math, and science. To that end, the superintendent, central office staff, principals, and teachers are upgrading instructional strategies and increasing professional development support for educators in ELA, math, and special education. This focus on improving students' achievement is reinforced by an aligned district and school planning and improvement process.

The superintendent and the school committee have several obstacles to overcome to maintain stability and create a highly effective school district. The district has three budgets, a regional budget for secondary expenditures and two town budgets, rather than one regional budget as required by law.[2] The two towns that make up the regional district have expressed dissatisfaction with the regional agreement and funding by the two towns. Officials from one town have discussed the possibility of ending the agreement, which could destabilize the schools. Also, disagreement between the towns has resulted in lost opportunities for funding for school repairs. At the time of the onsite in January 2017, the district was working with ESE's Office of Regional Governance to amend and update its regional agreement.

A second issue facing the district is the relationship between the district and the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional Teachers' Association. Since ratification of a three-year collective bargaining agreement in June 2016, the positive working relationship between the administration and the teachers' association has declined, which has slowed the pace of implementing instructional strategies that can raise students' academic achievement. At the time of the onsite in January 2017, the district and the teachers' association were struggling with communication, collaboration, and the interpretation of management rights.

Instruction

The team observed 50 classes throughout the district: 17 at the elementary schools, 16 at the middle schools (grades 5–8), and 17 at the high school. The team observed 17 ELA classes, 17 mathematics classes, 8 science classes, 1 combined mathematics and science class, 1 Response to Intervention (RtI) class, 5 history/social studies classes, and 1 psychology class. 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.

[1] Dighton-Rehoboth is a Level 2 district because all its schools are classified as Level 2.

[2] Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71, Section 16B: Budgets; apportionment of expenses

In most observed classes, the review team found that teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content and were implementing appropriate instructional strategies. Classroom climate was positive and conducive to teaching and learning and most students were motivated and engaged in the lesson. These characteristics of effective instruction were particularly evident K–4.

Compared with K–8 instruction, observed classes at the high school reflected a lower incidence of teachers using appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs and appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding. Although in focus groups differentiation was described as a district priority, in observed classrooms at all levels differentiated instruction to meet students' specific learning needs was the least developed characteristic of effective instruction.

Strengths

Through his collaborative and transparent leadership style, the superintendent has built strong relationships with his staff and town officials, which has contributed to an improved communication with the two district towns. This is best evidenced by the district's transparent, inclusive, and constructive budget development process. The budget is built through collaboration by administrators, school committee members, town officials, and the public.

District and school leaders have worked collaboratively to align the School Improvement Plans (SIPs), the budget, and the professional development (PD) handbook with the District Improvement Plan (DIP). This alignment enhances implementation of instructional and support strategies and promotes shared responsibility for improvement. To support teachers, the district has implemented a multi-year mentoring plan that supports most teachers for two years. In addition, the district provides new principals with mentors for two years. The district has approximately 45 trained mentors. As an additional support for teachers, the district provides PD aligned with school initiatives during the school year and the summer.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

The district has not achieved consistency in its educator evaluation system; most teachers' formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations do not include high-quality feedback that would promote professional growth or improve the quality of classroom instruction. The team was told that evaluators provide teachers with oral recommendations during conversations after observations and walkthroughs. Also, the district does not have a long-range capital plan for the repair and replacement of schools.

Recommendations

- The district and the teachers' association should jointly design and implement activities for improving and sustaining positive and productive labor-management communications and collaboration.
- The district should improve instruction by building teachers' capacity, particularly at the high school, to deliver differentiated instruction and to use appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs.
- Evaluators should provide teachers with written high-quality actionable feedback as part of the evaluation process.
- A capital facilities master plan should be developed.
- The regional agreement needs to be updated and brought into compliance with current state law about a single budget.

Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District 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). All targeted reviews include finding(s) about instruction based on classroom observations. 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 review 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.

This targeted review by the Office of District Reviews and Monitoring focused on the following standards: Leadership and Governance, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Financial and Asset Management.

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 Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District was conducted from January 17–19, 2017. The site visit included 20 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 50

stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 8 elementary-school teachers, 5 middle-school teachers, and 1 high-school teacher.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 50 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Dighton has a town manager form of government and Rehoboth has a town meeting form of government. The chair and vice-chair of the regional school committee are elected. The 10 members of the school committee (5 from each town) meet twice monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since June 2, 2014. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent, the business manager, the interim director of special education, and the six principals. Central office positions have been mostly stable over the past three years. The district has six principals leading five schools; pre-kindergarten is housed in the high school and is led by an interim principal. There are seven other school administrators: six assistant principals and the director of career and technical education. In 2015–2016 there were 237 teachers in the district.

In the 2016-2017 school year, 2,883 students were enrolled in the district's 5 schools:

Table 1: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2016–2017

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Palmer River	ES	K–4	564
Dighton Elementary	ES	K–4	420
Dighton Middle School	MS	5–8	396
Dorothy L. Beckwith	MS	5–8	575
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School	EES, HS	Pre-K, 9–12	928
Totals	**5 schools**	**Pre-K–12**	**2,883**
*As of October 1, 2016			

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment decreased by 5.1 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 lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for K–12 districts of similar size (2,000–2,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: $12,442 as compared with

$13,342 (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

Dighton-Rehoboth 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.

Table 2: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Accountability Level
		2013	2014	2015	2016			
Dighton Elementary	All	50	63	50	69	60	44	2
	High Needs	63	75	75	50	64		
Palmer River	All	31	25	75	69	58	35	2
	High Needs	13	38	81	75	63		
Dighton Middle	All	30	55	25	85	56	47	2
	High Needs	55	30	40	75	54		
Beckwith	All	45	55	40	65	54	62	2
	High Needs	55	50	50	75	61		
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	All	71	79	96	82	85	77	2
	High Needs	68	68	93	46	67		
District	All	46	57	50	82	64	--	2
	High Needs	50	50	50	75	60		

Between 2013 and 2016, in ELA the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced improved by 2 percentage points for all students and students with disabilities, and by 4 percentage points for high needs students.

Table 3: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
ELA Proficiency by Subgroup 2013–2016

Group		2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State (2014)
All students	District	72%	73%	72%	74%	2	4
	State	69%	69%	--	--	--	
High Needs	District	44%	46%	48%	48%	4	-4
	State	49%	50%	--	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	62%	62%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	34%	36%	--	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	23%	24%	26%	25%	2	-6
	State	29%	30%	--	--	--	

Between 2013 and 2016, in math the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced declined by 1 percentage point for all students, and improved by 1 percentage point for high needs students and by 3 percentage points for students with disabilities.

Table 4: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Math Proficiency by Subgroup 2013–2016

Group		2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State (2014)
All students	District	63%	58%	58%	62%	-1	-2
	State	61%	60%	--	--	--	
High Needs	District	33%	32%	31%	34%	1	-8
	State	40%	40%	--	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	41%	44%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	35%	35%	--	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	17%	14%	16%	20%	3	-9
	State	23%	23%	--	--	--	

Between 2013 and 2016, in science the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced improved by 4 percentage points for all students, by 2 percentage points for high needs students, and did not improve for students with disabilities. In 2016, the science proficiency rate was equal to the 2016 state rate for the district as a whole and 6 percentage points above the 2016 state rate for students from economically disadvantaged families. The science proficiency rate was 1 percentage point below the 2016 state rate for high needs students and 5 percentage points below the 2016 state rate for students with disabilities.

Table 5: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Science Proficiency by Subgroup 2013–2016

Group		2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State (2016)
All students	District	50%	56%	54%	54%	4	0
	State	53%	55%	54%	54%	1	
High Needs	District	28%	31%	29%	30%	2	-1
	State	31%	33%	31%	31%	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	38%	38%	--	6
	State	--	--	34%	32%	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	19%	18%	19%	19%	0	
Students with disabilities	District	16%	20%	16%	16%	0	-5
	State	21%	21%	22%	21%	0	

The district did not reach its 2016 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for any group except for students from economically disadvantaged families in math and science.

Table 6: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup

	ELA			Math			Science		
Group	**2016 CPI**	**2016 Target**	**Rating**	**2016 CPI**	**2016 Target**	**Rating**	**2016 CPI**	**2016 Target**	**Rating**
All students	89.3	94.4	Improved Below Target	82.6	90.3	Improved Below Target	81.2	89.1	Improved Below Target
High Needs	76.7	86.1	No Change	67.3	80.8	Improved Below Target	67.7	79.7	Improved Below Target
Economically Disadvantaged[3]	83.9	85.3	No Change	73.2	73.3	On Target	74.6	74.9	On Target
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	63.8	80.3	No Change	57.4	76.1	Improved Below Target	58.0	76.6	Improved Below Target

In 2016, students' growth in ELA and math was moderate compared with their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

Table 7: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup

Group	**2016 Median ELA SGP**			**2016 Median Math SGP**		
	District	**CPI Rating**	**Growth Level**	**District**	**CPI Rating**	**Growth Level**
All students	52.0	On Target	Moderate	56.0	On Target	Moderate
High Needs	48.0	Below Target	Moderate	58.0	On Target	Moderate
Econ. Disad.	49.0	Below Target	Moderate	52.0	On Target	Moderate
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	46.0	Below Target	Moderate	62.0	Above Target	Moderate

[3] 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; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

In 2016, the district's out-of-school suspension rates were below the state rates for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities. In 2016, the in-school suspension rate for all students was below the 2016 state rate, but was above the 2016 state rate for high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

Table 8: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)
High Needs	ISS	2.4%	2.8%	1.0%	3.3%	2.9%
	OSS	3.7%	2.8%	2.4%	2.6%	4.9%
Economically disadvantaged*	ISS	2.6%	3.0%	1.4%	4.1%	3.2%
	OSS	3.9%	3.0%	2.4%	2.5%	5.6%
ELLs	ISS	--	--	--	--	1.9%
	OSS	--	--	--	--	4.0%
Students with disabilities	ISS	2.6%	3.6%	1.2%	3.7%	3.5%
	OSS	4.2%	2.9%	3.4%	3.5%	5.9%
All Students	ISS	1.3%	1.9%	0.4%	1.8%	1.9%
	OSS	2.5%	1.6%	1.1%	1.7%	2.9%

*Suspension rates for students from low-income families used for 2013 and 2014

Between 2012 and 2015, the district's four-year cohort graduation rate declined by 3.2 percentage points for all students, by 14.8 percentage points for students with disabilities, and by 8.8 and 8.4 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income families, respectively. The district reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students and high needs students.[4]

Table 9: Dighton-Rehoboth 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	69	90.0	89.4	94.4	81.2	-8.8	-9.8%	-13.2	-14.0%	78.5
Low income	53	91.4	97.7	93.5	83.0	-8.4	-9.2%	-10.5	-11.2%	78.2
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.0
SWD	30	88.1	79.4	92.3	73.3	-14.8	-16.8%	-19	-20.6%	69.9
All students	225	95.6	95.1	97.1	92.4	-3.2	-3.3%	-4.7	-4.8%	87.3

[4] The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Students from low-income families did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

Between 2011 and 2014, the district's five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 3.9 percentage points for all students and by 14.0 to 20.7 percentage points for high needs students, students from low-income families, and students with disabilities. The district reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities.[5]

Table 10: Dighton-Rehoboth 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	72	81.8	90.0	92.4	95.8	14.0	17.1%	3.4	3.7%	80.3
Low income	46	75.0	91.4	97.7	95.7	20.7	27.6%	-2	-2.0%	79.6
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69.8
SWD	39	76.2	88.1	85.3	94.9	18.7	24.5%	9.6	11.3%	73.5
All students	205	93.7	95.6	96.3	97.6	3.9	4.2%	1.3	1.3%	88.5

In 2015, the district's drop-out rate for all students was one-third of the state rate and was below the 2015 state rate for high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

Table 11: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)
High Needs	1.8%	0.9%	2.1%	1.2%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.[6]	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%	2.2%	3.3%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	5.7%
SWD	2.4%	1.7%	3.5%	1.1%	3.5%
All students	1.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.6%	1.9%

[5] The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Students from low-income families did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

[6] Drop-out rates for students from low-income families used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 drop-out rates for students from economically disadvantaged families.

Grade and School Results

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA proficiency rates for all students improved by 2 percentage points and improved in the 3rd, 4th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades.

- In 2016, math proficiency rates improved by 1 percentage point in the 3rd grade, by 8 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 2 percentage points in the 6th grade, by 3 percentage points in the 7th grade, and by 5 percentage points in the 8th grade.
    - ELA proficiency in the 10th grade was 94 percent, 3 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 91 percent.

- Math proficiency rates declined by 6 percentage points in the 5th grade and by 2 percentage points in the 10th grade.

Table 12: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	207	55%	57%	66%	56%	--	1%	-10%
4	238	56%	50%	52%	64%	--	8%	12%
5	230	69%	64%	58%	63%	--	-6%	5%
6	228	69%	77%	75%	71%	--	2%	-4%
7	257	78%	77%	78%	81%	--	3%	3%
8	243	81%	88%	81%	86%	--	5%	5%
10	213	96%	93%	96%	94%	91%	-2%	-2%
All	1,616	72%	73%	72%	74%	--	2%	2%

In 2016, ELA proficiency rates were 54 percent and 63 percent in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, at Dighton Elementary and 58 percent and 67 percent in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, at Palmer River. ELA proficiency was 60 percent, 72 percent, 85 percent, and 87 percent in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively, at Dighton Middle and 66 percent, 70 percent, 78 percent, and 86 percent in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively, at Beckwith. In 2016, science proficiency in the 10th grade at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High was 94 percent, 3 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 91 percent.

Table 13: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
Dighton Elementary	54%	63%	--	--	--	--	--	59%
Palmer River	58%	67%	--	--	--	--	--	63%
Dighton Middle	--	--	60%	72%	85%	87%	--	77%
Beckwith	--	--	66%	70%	78%	86%	--	75%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	--	--	--	--	--	--	94%	94%
District	56%	64%	63%	71%	81%	86%	94%	74%
State	--	--	--	--	--	--	91%	--

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA proficiency rates improved by 7 percentage points at Dighton Elementary, by 4 percentage points at Palmer River, and by 3 percentage points at Dighton Middle, and declined by 2 and 3 percentage points at Beckwith and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, respectively.

- ELA proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 12, 3, and 11 percentage points at Dighton Elementary, Palmer River, and Dighton Middle, respectively, and declined by 2 and 11 percentage points at Beckwith and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, respectively.
- ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 14, 13, and 12 percentage points at Dighton Elementary, Palmer River, and Dighton Middle, respectively, and declined by 7 and 17 percentage points at Beckwith and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, respectively.

Table 14: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012–2015

	2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend
Dighton Elementary	52%	50%	57%	59%	7%
High Needs	23%	31%	33%	35%	12%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	43%	41%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	7%	6%	8%	21%	14%
Palmer River	59%	56%	61%	63%	4%
High Needs	29%	26%	32%	32%	3%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	48%	42%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	4%	5%	12%	17%	13%
Dighton Middle	74%	77%	71%	77%	3%
High Needs	47%	49%	49%	58%	11%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	63%	65%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	24%	29%	23%	36%	12%
Beckwith	77%	77%	76%	75%	-2%
High Needs	47%	50%	50%	45%	-2%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	67%	71%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	21%	26%	27%	14%	-7%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	97%	94%	97%	94%	-3%
High Needs	89%	79%	88%	78%	-11%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	97%	84%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	80%	58%	74%	63%	-17%

Between 2013 and 2016, math proficiency rates for all students declined by 1 percentage point and declined in the 5th, 7th, and 8th grades, and did not improve in the 10th grade.

- Math proficiency rates declined by 7 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 6 percentage points in the 7th grade, by 5 percentage points in the 8th grade, and did not improve in the 10th grade.
    - In 2016, math proficiency in the 10th grade was 83 percent in 2016, 5 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 78 percent.

- Math proficiency rates improved by 5 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 2 percentage points in the 4th grade, and by 3 percentage points in the 6th grade.

Table 15: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	208	65%	64%	67%	70%	--	5%	3%
4	238	54%	45%	39%	56%	--	2%	17%
5	231	67%	59%	53%	60%	--	-7%	7%
6	227	57%	59%	55%	60%	--	3%	5%
7	253	61%	49%	62%	55%	--	-6%	-7%
8	243	56%	48%	50%	51%	--	-5%	1%
10	213	83%	82%	86%	83%	78%	0%	-3%
All	1,613	63%	58%	58%	62%	--	-1%	4%

In 2016, math proficiency rates were 67 percent and 60 percent in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, at Dighton Elementary and 73 percent and 55 percent in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, at Palmer River. Math proficiency was 57 percent, 52 percent, 61 percent, and 45 percent in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively, at Dighton Middle and 62 percent, 66 percent, 50 percent, and 56 percent in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, respectively, at Beckwith. In 2016, science proficiency in the 10th grade at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High was 85 percent, 7 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 78 percent.

Table 16: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
Dighton Elementary	67%	60%	--	--	--	--	--	63%
Palmer River	73%	55%	--	--	--	--	--	64%
Dighton Middle	--	--	57%	52%	61%	45%	--	54%
Beckwith	--	--	62%	66%	50%	56%	--	59%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	--	--	--	--	--	--	85%	85%
District	70%	56%	60%	60%	55%	51%	83%	62%
State	--	--	--	--	--	--	78%	--

Between 2013 and 2016, math proficiency rates improved by 3, 5, and 2 percentage points at Dighton Elementary, Palmer River, and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional, respectively, and declined by 5 and 2 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively.

- Math proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 6 and 8 percentage points at Dighton Elementary and Palmer River, respectively, and by 2 and 3 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, respectively, and declined by 3 percentage points at Beckwith.
- Math proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 4 and 11 percentage points at Dighton Elementary and Palmer River, respectively, and by 9 and 11 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, respectively, and declined by 3 percentage points at Beckwith.

Table 17: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016

	2013	2014	2015	2016	3- or 4-Year Trend
Dighton Elementary	60%	60%	52%	63%	3%
High Needs	31%	47%	37%	37%	6%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	47%	44%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	13%	26%	13%	17%	4%
Palmer River	59%	53%	55%	64%	5%
High Needs	29%	26%	26%	37%	8%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	38%	45%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	15%	10%	14%	26%	11%
Dighton Middle	59%	52%	52%	54%	-5%
High Needs	29%	19%	24%	31%	2%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	30%	33%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	16%	5%	14%	25%	9%
Beckwith	61%	56%	58%	59%	-2%
High Needs	32%	28%	26%	29%	-3%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	34%	45%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	14%	10%	11%	11%	-3%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	83%	83%	88%	85%	2%
High Needs	59%	59%	69%	62%	3%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	86%	73%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	31%	35%	42%	42%	11%

Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates improved by 4 percentage points in the district as whole, from 50 percent in 2013 to 54 percent in 2016, equal to the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates declined by 11 percentage points from 51 percent in 2013 to 40 percent in 2016, 7 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.

- 8th grade science proficiency rates improved by 2 percentage points from 37 percent in 2013 to 39 percent in 2016, 2 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.

- 10th grade science proficiency rates improved by 22 percentage points from 66 percent in 2013 to 88 percent in 2016, 15 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

Table 18: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	231	51%	51%	41%	40%	47%	-11%	-1%
8	242	37%	47%	40%	39%	41%	2%	-1%
10	199	66%	75%	87%	88%	73%	22%	1%
All	672	50%	56%	54%	54%	54%	4%	0%

In 2016, science proficiency rates in the 5th grade were 54 and 36 percent at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively, compared with the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. In the 8th grade science proficiency rates were 42 percent and 37 percent at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively, compared with the 2016 state rate of 41 percent. In grade 10, science proficiency was 88 percent at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High, 15 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

Table 19: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015-2016

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
Dighton Elementary	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Palmer River	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Dighton Middle	--	--	47%	--	--	42%	--	44%
Beckwith	--	--	36%	--	--	37%	--	36%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	--	--	--	--	--	--	88%	88%
District	--	--	40%	--	--	39%	88%	54%
State	--	--	47%	--	--	41%	73%	54%

Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates for all students declined by 3 and 6 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively, and improved by 22 percentage points at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High.

- Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 5 and 10 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively, and improved by 33 percentage points at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High.
- Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 15 and 5 percentage points at Dighton Middle and Beckwith, respectively, and improved by 25 percentage points at Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High.

Table 20: Dighton-Rehoboth Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016

	2013	2014	2015	2016	3- or 4-Year Trend
Dighton Elementary	--	--	--	--	--
Palmer River	--	--	--	--	--
Dighton Middle	47%	52%	42%	44%	-3%
High Needs	32%	19%	23%	27%	-5%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	28%	31%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	29%	8%	13%	14%	-15%
Beckwith	42%	47%	41%	36%	-6%
High Needs	23%	29%	11%	13%	-10%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	21%	23%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	7%	25%	0%	2%	-5%
Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High	66%	76%	88%	88%	22%
High Needs	34%	49%	78%	67%	33%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	86%	72%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	20%	26%	61%	45%	25%

Leadership and Governance

Contextual Background

For several years, the district experienced frequent administrative turnover. These changes in leadership resulted in a district composed of five insular schools rather than a unified school district.

Since assuming leadership of the district in June 2014, the superintendent has increased coherence, transparency, and public confidence—most notably in the district's budget development process—through effective team building, communications, and extensive community networking (see the Financial and Asset Management Strength finding below). The two towns that compose the regional district are dissatisfied with the regional agreement and funding issues. Officials from one town have expressed interest in ending the agreement; this "de-regionalizing" could return more instability to the schools. District and school leaders have linked district planning and budget development. They use district and school improvement plans to accomplish a clearly defined set of improvement goals, to evaluate progress, to adjust instructional strategies, and to allocate resources. Aligned planning processes have further increased consistency among the schools.

On June 14, 2016, the Dighton Rehoboth Regional Teachers' Association and the district's school committee ratified a three-year teachers' collective bargaining agreement (CBA), after six months of negotiations, which included mediation, informational picketing, and the teachers' association "working to rule." Since ratification of the CBA, the positive working relationship between the administration and the teachers' association has declined, and there are issues of trust and communication and ongoing differences about the interpretation of management rights.

Strength Findings

1. **The superintendent effectively promotes a culture of collaboration and transparency.**

   A. School committee members observed that the superintendent's "strong collaboration approach" has increased teamwork among staff members and said that his high visibility has improved staff culture and climate.

   B. Interviews and a document review indicated that the superintendent has helped to improve the district's annual budget development process by working closely with school committee members and officials from both towns.

      1. School committee members noted that the superintendent has helped to repair the strained trust that previous budget development processes had produced.
      2. A town official referred to the superintendent as a "shining light" when describing his leadership in developing and completing a balanced 2016–2017 district budget.

3. A district leader characterized the superintendent as a master at building relationships with the region's two towns. He described the superintendent as having worked "very hard" to establish partnerships with the Rehoboth finance committee members and the Dighton finance committee members as well as selectmen from both towns "to advocate for money to support the schools in the community."

C. The superintendent has increased transparency by providing town officials and the public with school department documents and information about the budget.

1. The superintendent has attended meetings with the towns' boards of selectmen, finance committees, the town administrator, and the school committee budget advisory subcommittee in order to provide information and answer questions about district finance and operation.

2. So that "all [regional district] residents know where their dollars are going," the superintendent posted on the district's website a detailed Power Point presentation on the fiscal year 2017 budget that he and district staff had presented to the school committee.

Impact: Through collaboration, transparency, and visibility among the district's staff and stakeholders, the superintendent has helped develop a positive climate and culture and has improved the budget development process.

2. The school committee, superintendent, district, and school staff have developed and use data-rich and aligned planning processes and documents focused on accomplishing a clearly defined set of improvement goals.

A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district's 2016–2020 District Improvement Plan (DIP) and the 2016–2017 School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are closely aligned.

1. The DIP and the five SIPs address five school improvement goals, called strategic objectives: continuously improving student achievement; using data and technology; strengthening teaching and learning; creating safe schools/culture and climate; and infrastructure [providing the tools, infrastructure, and systems to support district initiatives and learning environments].

B. In general, DIP and SIP goals are SMART: Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results focused; and Timed and Tracked.[7]

1. Specific and Strategic: As a result of analysis of 2016 MCAS data, district staff included in plans specific intervention strategies, including:

[7] Source: *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf)

a. To improve students' math performance at the middle schools, align math curriculum vertically and horizontally using new EnvisionMATH resources;

b. To improve the math performance of students with disabilities at the middle schools, continue training in a co-teaching program; and

c. To increase elementary students' performance on open-response/multiple-choice questions and short answers in ELA and math, develop writing rubrics.

2. Measurable: The DIP and the SIPs contain a section called Assessment and Measures of Attainment which details student performance goals for the year, specifies the assessment/measurement tools that staff are using to gauge progress, and indicates when teachers review data during the school year. For example, one goal states: "MOY (Middle of Year) data collected from DIBELS and STAR ELA and Math will show an increase of 20% of students at proficiency or benchmark from BOY (Beginning of Year) data."

   a. When developing plans' activities and measured outcomes, district staff use multiple sources of formative and summative data, including MCAS scores, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), PALS (Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening), district learning walks, parents' surveys, teachers' feedback, and reports from external agencies---for example, NEASC (New England Association of Schools and Colleges).

   b. At the school level, teachers measure students' achievement using multiple data sources (e.g., DIBELS, PALS, and MCAS) three times during the school year. Based on data analysis, teachers adjust instructional strategies.

3. Action Oriented: The DIP and the SIPs list specific, action-oriented implementation elements, including: action plan activities, person(s) responsible, budget implications, mid-year and end-of-year review and professional development activities. Principals reported that SIPs are guides and "living documents" that they use during faculty meetings for benchmarking progress, for adjusting activities as needed, and for developing their annual budgets.

4. Rigorous, Realistic, and Results focused: Most outcome statements in the Assessment and Measures of Attainment sections of the planning documents are results focused. Some are also rigorous. For example, the high school SIP includes the following goals: "5% increase in AP course enrollment; 80% of AP students achieve a 3, 4, or 5." Also, the Beckwith Middle School SIP includes the following goal: "Increase Open [-Response] proficiency by 8% in ELA and Math on MCAS."

5. Timed and Tracked: The plans indicate timelines for achieving desired progress. For example, the DIP includes the following goal: "MOY (Middle of Year) data from DIBELS, PALS, and STAR ELLA and Math will show an increase of 20% of students at proficiency or

benchmark from BOY (Beginning of Year) data." Some SIPs contain a section called the SIP Progress Statement, which reports on the outcomes achieved in the previous year's SIP.

C. The SIPs and the district's annual budget are aligned with the DIP.

D. The SIPs, the district's professional development (PD) handbook are aligned with the DIP. For each goal, the DIP, the SIPs, and the PD handbook list appropriate professional development activities.

Impact: By collaboratively implementing data-driven and aligned planning processes, district educators are increasing consistency and shared responsibility for improvement. Clear connections among strategies listed in the DIP, the SIPs, and the district's budget also increase transparency and public confidence in district operations and improvement initiatives. The districts' compatible plans provide a road map for achieving its goals.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

3. At the time of the review in January 2017, the administration and the teachers' association had a strained relationship, and there were issues of trust and communication and ongoing differences about the interpretation of management rights.

A. Interviews and a document review indicated that after six months of negotiations, which included the teachers' association "working to rule," informational picketing, and meetings with a mediator, on June 14, 2016, the teachers' association and the district's school committee ratified a three-year teachers' collective bargaining agreement (CBA).

B. A diverse group of interviewees, including administrators and teachers' association representatives, described problems with labor-management collaboration.

1. Interviewees said that during negotiations, the administration and the teachers' association had been "allies," noting that the tone of communication has changed since the CBA was ratified.

2. The superintendent told the team that during the first two years of his tenure in the district the relationship with the teachers' association was "fantastic," but said that this year (2016–2017) was "rocky."

3. Teachers' association representatives said that the co-presidents used to meet with the superintendent monthly for 2 hours, but in 2016–2017 and 2015–2016, meetings have lasted for only 20 minutes.

4. Interviewees said that grievances have increased from 1 last year (2015–2016) to 10 this year (2016–2017). At the time of the onsite in January 2017, six grievances had been resolved, and four were moving forward.

C. Interviewees spoke of "unilateral decision making," "push-back," and "difficult negotiation."

D. Interviewees said that the administration and the teachers' association have ongoing differences about issues, including educator evaluation practices and the provision of professional development during principals' meetings.

Impact: Relationship difficulties and ongoing, unresolved labor-management conflicts lower morale and productivity. In a school setting with a negative climate, teachers' effectiveness and students' achievement are seriously compromised.

Recommendation

1. **The superintendent and the teachers' association co-presidents should jointly design and implement activities for improving and sustaining positive and productive labor-management communications and collaboration.**

   A. The superintendent and the association's co-presidents should commit to organizing a process to increase and maintain their capacity for communication, trust and collaboration.

   1. The superintendent and co-presidents should meet to share their perceptions on the current status of administration-association collaboration and willingness to improve relationships.

      a. The superintendent and co-presidents should consider making administration-association improvement a permanent agenda item during their regular meetings.

   2. The superintendent and co-presidents should research resources for effective practices in improving labor-management relations in public schools. (The Rennie Center is a respected source.)

   3. The superintendent and co-presidents should identify other administrators and teachers who can participate in a work group that plans activities to improve labor-management collaboration.

   4. The superintendent and the co-presidents should discuss and decide if their improvement initiatives need the assistance of a third-party facilitator with expertise in improving labor-management relationships.

   5. The superintendent and co-presidents should consider selecting a commonly used survey instrument that generates data about communications and collaboration among district employees.

   6. Based on feedback and/or survey data from district staff and administrators, the superintendent and co-presidents would identify areas and activities for improving

communications and collaboration. The superintendent should consider including in the DIP these joint activities for improving labor-management collaboration.

B. Apart from the labor-management improvement initiatives suggested above, the superintendent should consider inviting more association representatives to serve on existing and future district advisory committees.

Benefits: When employees with diverse interests, backgrounds, and experiences come together, they often develop solutions better than what they would have developed when working alone. By improving and sustaining positive communications and effective collaboration, the administration and the association will model for staff, students, and the community that everyone---including district and association leaders--is working together to achieve more.

Recommended resource:

- *Labor-Management-Community Collaboration in Springfield Public Schools* http://www.renniecenter.org/sites/default/files/2017-01/Labor-Management-Community%20Collaboration%20in%20Springfield%20Public%20Schools.pdf**)** is a case study from the Rennie Center describing how a district improved collaboration, communication, and relationships among adult stakeholders with the goal of improved student achievement.

Instruction

Contextual Background

The team observed 50 classes throughout the district: 17 at the elementary schools, 16 at the middle schools (grades 5–8), and 17 at the high school. The team observed 17 ELA classes, 17 mathematics classes, 8 science classes, 1 combined mathematics and science class, 1 Response to Intervention (RtI) class, 5 history/social studies classes, and 1 psychology class. 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.

In most observed classrooms at all levels, lessons reflected strong evidence of the following characteristics of high-quality instruction: teachers' knowledge of subject matter and content; motivated and engaged students; teachers' use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objectives; and a positive educational climate. These characteristics of effective instruction were particularly evident K–4. Compared with instruction at the elementary- and middle-school levels, observed lessons at the high school reflected a lower incidence of the use of appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs; and the use of appropriate formative assessments. Although in focus groups differentiation was described as a district priority, in observed classrooms at all levels differentiated instruction to meet students' specific learning needs was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction.

Strength Finding

1. **In most observed classes, lessons reflected a high incidence of teachers' knowledge of subject matter and content, of use of appropriate instructional strategies, of motivated and engaged students, and of a positive classroom climate. The incidence of these characteristics of high-quality instruction was particularly strong K–4.**

    A. Team members saw strong and moderate evidence that teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content (characteristic #1) in 46 of 50 classes or 92 percent of observed lessons (in 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 81 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 94 percent of high-school lessons).

    1. In a grade 6 mathematics lesson, the class was co-taught by two teachers on the topics of greatest common factor and lowest common multiple. One teacher explained the greatest common factor; the other teacher explained the lowest common multiple. The teachers then referred to the learning objective for the lesson: "I can use variables to write algebraic expressions."

2. In a grade 12 economics class, the teacher provided a PowerPoint presentation on macroeconomics and microeconomics. The teacher used a series of graphs to illustrate the difference between the two systems and provided an historical perspective on economics.

B. Team members noted strong and moderate evidence of the teacher's use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s) (characteristic #2) in 45 of 50 classes or 90 percent of observed lessons (in 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 88 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 82 percent of high-school lessons).

1. In a grade 8 science class on oxidation, the instructor planned an experiment using vinegar to generate oxidation on a penny to demonstrate the effect of acid rain on the Statue of Liberty, and the students conducted the experiment.

C. Team members noted strong and moderate evidence of student motivation and engagement (characteristic # 5) in 45 of 50 classes or 90 percent of observed lessons (in 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 88 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 82 percent of high-school lessons).

1. For example, in a grade 2 ELA lesson on nonfiction, students were concluding a multi-day, cross-curricular unit on animals. Students selected an animal to study further, completed research, created brochures, either located a stuffed animal or made one from a variety of materials, and wrote about the adopted pet, using sentence starters and participating in activities built around animal habitats. Students showed great enthusiasm when parents arrived to view the completed projects.

2. In a grade 7 lesson on the pharaohs and note taking, students took notes in their journals as the lesson was presented. The textbook was available for students to use, along with guided reading sheets and opportunities for research. Most students were fully engaged in note taking, completing guided-reading sheets, responding to and asking questions, and doing research.

3. In a grade 11 English lesson, students completed slide presentations about a book that they had read. During the presentations, the class members were attentive. At the conclusion of each presentation, the teacher and students asked a variety of questions about the book and the presentation.

D. Team members noted strong and moderate evidence of a classroom climate characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse (characteristic # 10) in 48 of 50 classes or 96 percent of observed lessons (in 100 percent of elementary lessons, in 100 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 88 percent of high-school lessons).

1. For example, elementary students said "please" and "thank you," observed silence while doing individualized activities, raised hands to gain attention, ceased an activity when the

teacher clapped her hands, and ended paired discussion when the teacher began counting backwards from "5" to "1."

2. In a grade 6 math lesson, students showed evidence of knowing routines by completing a warm-up activity upon entering the classroom, using available multiplication charts, showing their work without being reminded, and having individual whiteboards available during the lesson.

3. In many high-school lessons, students worked in groups quietly. Students raised hands and were respectful to the teacher and fellow students.

Impact: Teachers' knowledge of content and subject matter and use of appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objectives enable students to acquire complex knowledge and skills. When the environment is conducive to learning and students are motivated and engaged, they can become active learners. Students are able to investigate ideas, apply knowledge, increase skills, and expand thought processes to the best of their ability.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. Compared with observed lessons at the elementary and middle schools, lessons at the high school reflected a lower incidence of the use of appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs, and appropriate use of formative assessments. In observed classrooms at all levels, differentiated instruction to meet students' specific learning needs was the least developed characteristic of effective instruction.

A. Team members observed strong and moderate evidence of differentiated instruction to make lesson content accessible to all learners (characteristic # 8) in 31 of 50 or 62 percent of observed classrooms (in 64 percent of elementary classes, in 62 percent of middle-school classes, and in 59 percent of high-school lessons).

1. In a number of high-school lessons, instruction was "one-size-fits-all" and the teacher lectured throughout the entire observation. Occasionally questions were asked.

2. In contrast, in a grade 9 physical science class the teacher used scaffolding, or using different levels of activities and resources, to help students balance chemical formulas.

B. Team members observed strong and moderate evidence that the teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs (characteristic #9) in 9 of 17 classrooms or in 53 percent of high-school lessons.

1. In an example of a lesson in which appropriate resources were not aligned to students' diverse learning needs, in a grade 9 Algebra 1 class, the support staff person sat at the rear

of the class throughout the lesson and did not work to support students with diverse learning needs, leaving the class on one occasion to make copies of a handout.

2. In contrast, in a grade 11 English class discussing a book by Thoreau, the instructor used a white board and a PowerPoint presentation to explain the lesson.

C. The review team found strong and moderate evidence that the teacher conducted appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students (characteristic # 11) in 11 of 17 classes or in 65 percent of high-school lessons.

1. In an example in which an opportunity to adjust instruction and give students feedback was lost, a history teacher did not check in periodically with or provide feedback to students.

2. In an example of the use of appropriate formative assessments, in a grade 9 science class, team members observed frequent "dip-sticking" to assess students' understanding.

Impact: Students are more likely to improve their knowledge and skills when lessons are designed with students' diverse learning needs in mind, rather than as a "one size fits all" whole-class, teacher-centered lesson. Without the use of a repertoire of appropriate resources, teachers lose the opportunity to impart knowledge to students with a variety of learning styles and needs. Without consistent use of appropriate formative assessments, teachers cannot effectively identify instructional strengths and needs.

Recommendation

1. The district should improve instruction by building teachers' capacity, particularly at the high school, to deliver differentiated instruction and to use appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs.

A. The district should consider making differentiated instruction and use of appropriate resources a focus for planning professional development.

1. The high school staff should focus less on lecture and more on approaches that more effectively engage students in learning.

2. Professional development opportunities could include sharing best practices at faculty meetings, professional development days, and reporting on lessons learned from out-of-district workshops and classes. Teacher-led workshops are an excellent way of sharing and networking.

B. Teachers should be given the opportunity to observe peers who demonstrate expertise in these areas.

C. When conducting observations and learning walks, evaluators should provide feedback to teachers on how to improve their skills in differentiated instruction and the use of appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse needs.

1. It might be helpful to conduct a review of data from educators' evaluations to ensure that Indicator IIA (lessons "engage all students and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and level of readiness") and IID (make "knowledge accessible to all students") are being addressed in classrooms and through professional development opportunities.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. Students will benefit from lessons that meet their specific learning needs. As a result, they will be better able to demonstrate what they truly understand. A district that supports high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement that can lead to professional growth and increased student achievement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

Contextual Background

The district has in place a multi-year mentoring program for first- and second-year teachers. Mentors and mentees follow month-by-month curricula and meet regularly each month, and mentors observe mentees in the classroom monthly. The district mentoring coordinator is supported by school mentoring coordinators who implement the program at each school and pair mentors and mentees. The district has approximately 45 trained mentors.

The district has a coordinated professional development (PD) program. Using multiple forms of data, the district has determined specific focus areas for PD in 2016–2017, including co-teaching, Keys to Literacy, and the new K–8 mathematics program. The PD goals in the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are aligned with DIP goals. PD is delivered during the summer and on two PD days in October and November. The district has a PD committee that meets twice a year to formalize the district's PD for the year. The committee also produces a PD handbook, which outlines the district's PD and the procedures that teachers need to access the PD portal to sign up for classes. The PD outlined in the handbook is consistent with the PD needs outlined in the DIP and the SIPs.

To enable teachers to attend PD offerings during the school day, principals hire substitute teachers. Teachers also have the option of pursuing individual PD in support of their professional development plans (IPDPs) for recertification. The district has a limited number of academic coaches and some of these positions depend on grant funding. Because the teachers' collective bargaining agreement prevents PD activities from taking place during faculty meetings, administrators have limited options as deliverers of PD.

The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system; a review of educators' formative assessment/evaluations and summative evaluations showed that evaluators generally did not provide teachers with feedback that would enhance professional growth or improve classroom instruction. In contrast, most administrators' formative assessment/evaluations and summative evaluations included recommendations that could promote professional growth and improve instruction.

Strength Findings

1. **The district has a multi-year mentoring program to support new teachers in the district.**

   A. Interviews and a document review indicated that teachers new to teaching (three or fewer years of teaching) are assigned a mentor during their first two years of employment in the district and experienced teachers new to the district are assigned a mentor for one year.

1. All mentors receive training in the Mentoring in Action month-to-month curriculum course. Teachers' association representatives told the team that using this training has strengthened mentoring in the district. Mentees follow a companion curriculum.

2. Mentors are required to attend three mentor program meetings per year and receive professional development points for attending the meetings.

    a. Teachers new to teaching meet with their mentor two hours per month and are observed by the mentor monthly. Experienced teachers meet with their mentor once monthly and may also be observed by the mentor. New teachers and mentors are provided release time for the required observation.

        i. Mentors and mentees are required to document mentoring activities.

3. The mentoring program is overseen by a district mentoring coordinator who is responsible for mentor training, meetings, and professional development activities.

    a. The district has approximately 45 trained mentors; approximately 33 are active. Mentors receive a stipend.

    b. The district mentoring coordinator is supported by school mentoring coordinators who implement the program at each school and pair mentors with mentees. The CBA states that mentors and mentees should be matched as closely as possible by "grade level and discipline."

    c. Principals told the team that the mentor/mentee pairing is important, noting that the quality of mentors is excellent and mentors regularly meet with the teachers they are mentoring. Principals stated that new teachers "are being guided on everything."

B. Principals are assigned formal mentors for two years and meet as needed during the first year and every other month during the second year.

Impact: A high-quality mentoring program supports educators at all levels of expertise and stages in their careers to build teaching and leadership skills. Investing in new staff has the potential to lead to a culture of continuous professional growth, lower rates of teacher turnover, and an increasing recognition of the shared responsibility among all staff for students' learning.

2. The district has implemented a professional development program aligned with district initiatives.

A. The District Improvement Plan (DIP), School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and professional development handbook are aligned and provide a coordinated approach to professional development.

1. Goal 3 of the DIP includes the rationale for professional development (PD) activities and offerings, the PD initiatives for the year, an action plan to implement the initiatives, and budgetary implications.

2. Each SIP lists the PD activities appropriate to that school as well as action plans and budgetary implications.

3. The PD handbook includes district goals and PD course descriptions.

B. The district's PD committee produces the PD handbook.

1. The PD committee meets twice a year. Administrators, teachers, and a paraprofessional make up the committee. Principals stated that they saw the committee as a sounding board rather than as a planning committee.

C. The district uses multiple forms of data to determine PD activities and offerings.

1. Interviewees stated that PD is driven by student performance data, classroom observations, learning walks, and surveys. The assistant superintendent administers surveys to determine teachers' needs for PD and to assess the quality and effectiveness of the PD offered. The surveys are distributed on a Google drive allowing easy completion and compilation of results.

D. The district embeds professional development into the school year.

1. PD activities take place during the summer and on two days in October and November.
2. Embedded PD takes many forms.
    a. A consultant was hired to train staff in co-teaching. This program is entering its third year and the middle school teachers spoke highly of it and offered that it is working.
    b. The vendor for the new math program, enVision, has provided professional development.
    c. At the school level, principals bring in substitute teachers to enable cohorts of teachers to attend PD sessions.
    d. The district has hired extra specialist teachers, which has freed up time for teachers to have common planning time in three schools.

E. Teachers have access to the SMART PD software to organize and record their PD activities.

Impact: A coordinated PD program that is based on multiple forms of data and is aligned with the district's initiatives ensures that available resources are focused on the district's priorities. This enhances the professional learning of educators and likely has a positive impact on student achievement.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

3. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system and has not taken action on the more recent components of the Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence.

A. Overall implementation of the state's Educator Evaluation Framework has been uneven and inconsistent.

1. The team reviewed the evaluative documents of 21 teachers randomly selected from all schools in the district.

2. Teachers' evaluative folders reviewed in Baseline Edge, the district's evaluation management tool, generally included supporting documentation (for example, educator plans, evaluative observations, summative evaluations, formative assessments/evaluations, and evidence folders.

3. Most teachers' formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations were informative,[8] in that they included evidence and narrative on making progress or meeting goals and information about the instruction observed; however, most did not include feedback or recommendations that were specific, actionable, or of sufficient quality to contribute in any meaningful way to improved instruction or professional growth.

    a. Schools leaders told the team that high-quality feedback is provided to teachers during post-evaluation or walkthrough conversations. The team was told that evaluators are careful about what they write about a teacher because they receive "pushback" from the teachers' association if anything negative is written about the teacher in an evaluation.

    b. School and district leaders told the team that they are starting to look at what constitutes effective feedback but the district does not consistently deliver high-quality feedback. They expressed concern that being overly negative in a formal evaluation could build a wall between the teacher and principal and said that change can be made through more informal methods.

4. The team reviewed the evaluation folders of nine administrators, including the school committee's evaluation of the superintendent. In contrast with teachers' evaluations, administrators' evaluations included recommendations capable of contributing to improved instruction and professional growth.

[8] An informative evaluation is factual and cites instructional details such as methodology, pedagogy, Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice or instruction of subject-based knowledge that is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. It does not commit to improvement strategies. An instructive evaluation includes comments intended to improve instruction.

5. District and school leaders told the team that the district implemented its educator evaluation system in 2012 shortly after they signed a new collective bargaining agreement , but the system was not agreed to contractually until the 2016–2017 school year.

6. An educator evaluation committee meets regularly to discuss educator evaluation topics, such as evaluative evidence criteria and evaluation training requirements.

B. District and school leaders told the team that evaluators' caseloads are an issue, noting that the quality of evaluations would be better if evaluators had smaller caseloads. The district is considering adding additional "contributing evaluators," and has been in discussions with the teachers' association about this.

1. The district's 14 evaluators receive training.

2. Evaluators calibrate feedback expectations using the ESE's observation training videos as a resource.

    a. Teachers' association members told the team that calibration training has meant that evaluators assign ratings more consistently.

C. The more recent components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework require districts to collect multiple measures of evaluative evidence in the evaluation of teachers and administrators. [9]

1. As of the 2015–2016 school year, state regulations call for all districts to collect and include student feedback as a source of evidence in determining an educator's summative performance rating. Similarly, the district should collect and use staff feedback to inform administrators' evaluations. Feedback may also be used to inform an educator's self-assessment, goal setting, and as evidence to demonstrate changes in practice over time. The district is out of compliance with this state requirement.

2. The other recent component of the state Educator Evaluation Framework requires school districts to develop and use multiple measures of student learning, including common assessments and other statewide student growth measures, to assess student growth and achievement. These assessments are intended to provide reliable feedback about student learning and educator efficacy across all grade levels and content areas. They also serve as a component of an educator's summative performance rating.

[9] On Tuesday, February 28, 2017, after collecting public comment since November 2016, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted 9-1 to amend the educator evaluation regulations. The most significant change in the regulations is the elimination of a separate student impact rating. Under the amended regulations, evaluators do not have to make a separate judgment about an educator's impact on student learning. Instead, student learning is embedded as an indicator within one of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework's four standards.

3. Administrators and school leaders said that the district has not taken action to implement these components of the Educator Evaluation Framework.

    a. District leaders reported that although the district has included language about developing and using multiple measure of student learning in a recently ratified collective bargaining agreement and has developed and purchased several assessments, at the time of the visit (January 2017), the district had not collected data or assigned student growth ratings.

Impact: By not systematically expanding the competencies of and enhancing the professional skills of teachers, the district is missing a critical opportunity to improve students' academic achievement.

Recommendation

1. The district should provide teachers with written, high-quality, consistent, actionable feedback.

A. The district should continue providing professional development to evaluators to improve evaluation quality and consistency.

1. Evaluators should continue to calibrate expectations using ESE observational videos.

    a. Using ESE videos or other sources, evaluators should practice generating high-quality feedback and should calibrate this feedback to increase consistency.

B. The district should develop expectations for what constitute recommendations capable of contributing to improved instruction and professional growth.

C. The district should annually survey educators to learn about the quality of evaluations, observations, and feedback, and provide the results to the evaluation committee.

1. The evaluation committee might consider conducting an annual quality review of a sample of educators' evaluations and observations.

D. The district should implement the student and staff feedback requirements of the educator evaluation system as soon as possible.

Benefits: Providing high-quality feedback to educators can enhance professional growth, improve educators' skills, and lead to improved student achievement. Providing professional development for evaluators in evaluation/observation calibration will be helpful in ensuring that educators are evaluated effectively and equitably.

Recommended resource:

- The Working Group for Educator Excellence (WGEE) offers an *Electronic Clearinghouse* (http://wgee.org/electronic-clearinghouse-with-promising-practices/), which includes exemplars for teachers, school administrators, district leaders and evaluators that clarify particular Indicators on the Classroom Teacher Rubric from the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation.

Financial and Asset Management

Contextual Background

In the 2016–2017 school year, the Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District served 2,883 students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Between 2013 and 2017, enrollment decreased by 5.1 percent; in 2013 the New England School Development Council (NESDEC) projected that slight but continuous declines in enrollment would continue until 2023.

The district has an open and collaborative budget development process. Principals told the review team that the district has had balanced budgets in recent years and credited the superintendent with achieving this.

At the time of the onsite in January 2017, the district had three budgets, a regional budget for secondary expenditures and two town budgets, rather than one regional budget as required by Chapter 71, Section 16B, of the Massachusetts General Laws. The district has been working with ESE's Office of Regional Governance to amend and update its regional agreement. It is critically important that the district continue to work with ESE to ensure that the required changes are made to the regional agreement and to its financial operations.

The district does not have a long-range capital plan for building repairs or replacement. Deferred maintenance is an issue in several school buildings in the district. To conserve energy and save money, the district is replacing boilers and upgrading HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) units. The district also has hired a facilities manager and an electrician to perform in-house maintenance.

Strength Finding

1. **The district's budget development process has been collaborative and transparent, and includes participation by administrators, school committee members, town officials, and the public in the consideration of district priorities that are based on the needs of schools and students.**

    A. The budget development process includes opportunities for all principals and other cost center managers to meet with the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and the business administrator to discuss and explain their budgetary needs.

        1. The district's budget timeline designates that November through February be used for administrative budget meetings.

            a. The business administrator reported that principals and directors have been able to use these meetings to advocate for adjustments and reallocations in staffing and other needs. Student performance data is presented and discussed in order to support budgetary requests.

2. Principals reported that SIPs and the DIP are key documents in the development of the district budget, because they link budgetary expenditures to school and district priorities.

B. The superintendent supplements written budgetary requests with an extensive Power Point presentation, which delineates the district's mission, core values, budget priorities, enrollment trends, and proposed changes in spending from the previous year. This presentation is prepared for school committee, administrators, town officials, and other stakeholders. Slides from the presentation are also included in the paper copies of the budget document.

C. The superintendent and the school committee work together to leverage resources in order to achieve the best student performance outcomes.

1. The superintendent reported that the school committee had a high degree of trust in him and his business administrator with regard to their budgetary decisions. He said that he meets once a month with town officials in both towns and that this frequent communication has brought "trust, honesty, and transparency" in both communities.

Impact: The frequent and open communication in the budget development process has resulted in high levels of cooperation and trust as stakeholders consider district initiatives based on students' needs.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The district has three budgets, a regional budget for secondary expenditures and two town budgets, rather than one regional budget as required by Chapter 71, Section 16B, of the Massachusetts General Laws.

A. The business administrator reported that the budget is prepared in three sections: the Pre-K – 8 education programs in each community and the regional high school educational program with district central office functions.

1. Some Rehoboth selectmen and finance committee members expressed agreement that the district is currently not functioning as a "true regional district," because each town supports its own elementary and middle school.

   a. Some selectmen and finance committee members reported that several years ago a "massive dispute" caused large cuts to the Rehoboth budget. Some Dighton selectmen told the team that this dispute arose when it was discovered that Dighton was overpaying its assessment.

   b. Some Dighton and Rehoboth selectmen reported that a Regional Agreement Committee (RAC) was formed to update the regional agreement. They noted that the Committee met for two years without progress, and was recently disbanded.

B. An article posted in the *Metrowest Daily News* on April 14, 2014, stated that a Rehoboth town meeting ballot question to approve a $6,698,587 project to fix the roof at the shared regional high school was voted down by just two votes. The Massachusetts School Building Authority had previously approved this project for state financial assistance, but the failed vote eliminated any chance of state aid.

1. The article further stated that the vote against the roof project came after a problem with town assessments came to light, showing that Dighton was paying $1 million more annually than it should have. In its own town meeting, Dighton approved the project to repair the high school roof. Without the majority of Rehoboth voters approving the project, the ballot question was defeated.

Impact: Without one regional budget as required by law, the district does not have an efficient budget and assessment process and has lost opportunities to obtain revenue for school building repairs.

3. The district does not have a long-range capital plan for building repairs or replacement.

A. The city and the district have taken steps to renovate and repair school buildings.

1. The business administrator reported "major facilities issues," especially at the high school and the Palmer Elementary School. A facilities manager and an electrician have been hired to address these issues.

    a. A tour of the high school and Palmer River Elementary School showed extensive water damage in some classrooms and in the high school computer lab because of leaks in the roof. Also, windows in the Palmer school are single-paned, and as a result, contribute to significant heat loss.

2. To conserve energy and save money, the district is in the process of replacing boilers and upgrading heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning units.

B. The superintendent told the team that the district "is running out of space." He said that he is planning to purchase a number of modular classrooms to provide more space. He also acknowledged that the district does not have a capital plan, and that it needs to develop one.

1. The superintendent's budget presentation summarizes the capital improvements needed for each school building. They include security, window replacement, boilers, lockers, septic system, roofs, energy management systems, and additional classrooms at selected schools. These improvements, however, have not been cost estimated or itemized as they would be in a capital plan.

C. School committee members and the business administrator reported that a capital plan committee has been established. This committee meets five times per year and is composed of regional school committee members, finance committee members from the towns, the facilities

director, and the business administrator. At the time of the onsite in January 2017, the committee had not developed a list of projects.

Impact: The absence of long-range capital planning inhibits the prioritization of needed school repair and renovation; postpones needed improvements in some schools; and means that a clean, safe, appropriate, and adequate learning environment is not available to all students and staff.

Recommendations

1. **The district should continue to work with ESE to change its regional agreement and financial operations as required by law.**

   A. Of primary importance is the need to change the budget and assessment process to ensure that the district has one regional budget as required by Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71, Section 16B, rather than three budgets.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will provide the school district with a foundation for allocating resources equitably throughout the district.

2. **The district should develop a capital facilities master plan and it should consider documenting preventive maintenance requirements for district buildings and infrastructure.**

   A. The district should base the capital plan on previous and ongoing reviews of all school building needs. The plan should include financial estimates of the costs involved, priorities for recommended renovations and major repairs, and a reasonable schedule for them.

      1. The proposed renovations for the high school should be among those considered as well as the technology infrastructure and any needed service contracts.

   B. The district should consider implementing a facilities condition assessment.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will establish sound planning practices that will ensure that clean, safe, appropriate, and adequate learning environments are available to all Dighton Rehoboth students and staff.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *School Building Issues* web page (http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/sbuilding/) includes funding opportunities, guidelines, and resources related to school buildings.
- *Planning Guide for Maintaining School Facilities* (http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003347), from the National Center for Education Statistics, is intended to help school districts plan for efficient and effective operations. It

addresses various topics, including conducting a facilities audit, planning and evaluating maintenance, and managing staff and contractors.

- *The Massachusetts School Checklist* (http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/gov/departments/dph/programs/environmental-health/exposure-topics/iaq/iaq-methods/the-mass-school-checklist.html) is a list of the most important environmental health and safety issues for schools to address. It includes regulations and industry standards/guidelines related to elements on the checklist, as well as additional resources.

- MassEnergyInsight (https://www.massenergyinsight.net/home) is a free, web-based tool made available by the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources as part of the Massachusetts Green Communities Program. The tool is designed to help communities learn about and monitor energy use and related costs, plan energy efficiency programs, and communicate this information.

- The Green Ribbon Schools Award honors schools that are exemplary in reducing environmental impact and costs, improving the health and wellness of students and staff, and delivering effective environmental and sustainability education. The district might find several related resources useful, including Massachusetts' *Green Ribbon Schools Award Resource Guide* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/sbuilding/GreenRibbon/ResourcesGuide.pdf) and the US Department of Education's *Green Strides* resource list (http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/green-strides/resources.html).

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 17–19, 2017, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. James A. Caradonio, Leadership and Governance
2. James L. Hearns, Human Resources, *review team coordinator*
3. Dr. Coral Grout, Instruction
4. John Retchless, Professional Development
5. John Crafton, Financial and Asset Management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the business administrator and the financial analyst.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: the vice-chair, the secretary, and three additional members. Three school committee members were from Rehoboth and two from Dighton.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent; the assistant superintendent; the director of career and technical education; the interim director of special education; the technology and network manager; the director of buildings, grounds, and operations; the business administrator; the treasurer; and the financial analyst.

The team visited the following schools: Palmer River (K–4), Dighton Elementary School (K–4), Dorothy L. Beckwith (grades 5–8), and Dighton Middle School (grades 5–8), and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School (Pre-K, grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted focus groups with 8 elementary-school teachers, 5 middle-school teachers, and 1 high-school teacher.

The team observed 50 classes in the district: 17 at the 1 high school, 16 at the 2 middle schools, and 17 at the 2 elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday **01/17/2017**	**Tuesday** 01/18/2017	**Wednesday** 01/19/2017
Orientation with district leaders and principals; review of personnel files; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; middle and high school teacher focus groups; interview with teachers' association; and visits to the Dighton Elementary and the middle schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; elementary teacher focus groups parent focus group; interview with school committee; interviews with town officials, and visits to Dorothy L. Beckwith, Palmer River, and Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; focus group with students; visits to Dighton-Rehoboth Regional High School, Palmer River, and Dighton Elementary School for classroom observations.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

Table B1a: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	22	0.8%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	36	1.2%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	113	3.9%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	--	--	2,179	0.2%
White	2,674	91.9%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	65	2.2%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	2,910	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

Table B1b: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
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	389	55.3%	13.2%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	392	55.8%	13.5%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	2	0.3%	0.1%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	703	100.0%	23.9%	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 2,936; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B2a: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	207	84.4	82.8	86.8	82.2	--	-2.2	-4.6
	P+	207	55%	57%	66%	56%	--	1%	-10%
4	CPI	238	82.4	78.8	80.5	83.7	--	1.3	3.2
	P+	238	56%	50%	52%	64%	--	8%	12%
	SGP	222	49.0	47.0	48.0	50.0	--	1.0	2.0
5	CPI	230	86.5	86.2	80.7	84.7	--	-1.8	4
	P+	230	69%	64%	58%	63%	--	-6%	5%
	SGP	221	44.0	39.0	35.0	40.0	--	-4.0	5.0
6	CPI	228	87.7	91.4	90.7	88.2	--	0.5	-2.5
	P+	228	69%	77%	75%	71%	--	2%	-4%
	SGP	216	53.0	60.5	52.0	50.0	--	-3.0	-2.0
7	CPI	257	92.2	91.6	91.9	94.1	--	1.9	2.2
	P+	257	78%	77%	78%	81%	--	3%	3%
	SGP	251	49.0	47.0	45.0	60.0	--	11.0	15.0
8	CPI	243	92.7	95.1	92.8	94.5	--	1.8	1.7
	P+	243	81%	88%	81%	86%	--	5%	5%
	SGP	227	57.0	59.0	50.0	52.0	--	-5.0	2.0
10	CPI	213	98.4	98.3	99.4	97.3	96.7	-1.1	-2.1
	P+	213	96%	93%	96%	94%	91%	-2%	-2%
	SGP	188	68.0	74.0	64.0	64.0	50.0	-4.0	0.0
All	CPI	1,616	89.3	89.3	89	89.4	--	0.1	0.4
	P+	1,616	72%	73%	72%	74%	--	2%	2%
	SGP	1,325	52.5	54.0	48.0	52.0	--	-0.5	4.0

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

Table B2b: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	208	83.5	84.1	84.1	85.8	--	2.3	1.7
	P+	208	65%	64%	67%	70%	--	5%	3%
4	CPI	238	82.1	77.4	76.1	82.7	--	0.6	6.6
	P+	238	54%	45%	39%	56%	--	2%	17%
	SGP	224	53.0	42.0	49.0	63.0	--	10.0	14.0
5	CPI	231	85.7	80.9	76.5	83.3	--	-2.4	6.8
	P+	231	67%	59%	53%	60%	--	-7%	7%
	SGP	221	50.0	37.0	46.5	61.0	--	11.0	14.5
6	CPI	227	79.1	81.6	78.7	80.8	--	1.7	2.1
	P+	227	57%	59%	55%	60%	--	3%	5%
	SGP	214	47.0	43.0	40.0	54.0	--	7.0	14.0
7	CPI	253	80.6	71.6	81.2	79	--	-1.6	-2.2
	P+	253	61%	49%	62%	55%	--	-6%	-7%
	SGP	248	58.0	50.0	53.5	66.0	--	8.0	12.5
8	CPI	243	77.9	75.2	73	74.8	--	-3.1	1.8
	P+	243	56%	48%	50%	51%	--	-5%	1%
	SGP	226	43.0	39.0	42.0	26.5	--	-16.5	-15.5
10	CPI	213	92.7	92.1	95.1	93.8	89.7	1.1	-1.3
	P+	213	83%	82%	86%	83%	78%	0%	-3%
	SGP	187	52.5	46.0	49.0	52.0	50.0	-0.5	3.0
All	CPI	1,613	82.8	80.2	80.4	82.6	--	-0.2	2.2
	P+	1,613	63%	58%	58%	62%	--	-1%	4%
	SGP	1,320	51.0	43.0	46.0	56.0	--	5.0	10.0

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

Table B2c: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	231	81.7	80.9	74.6	75.3	76.4	-6.4	0.7
	P+	231	51%	51%	41%	40%	47%	-11%	-1%
8	CPI	242	72.7	78	73.6	74.9	71.3	2.2	1.3
	P+	242	37%	47%	40%	39%	41%	2%	-1%
10	CPI	199	87.0	90.3	95.3	95.7	88.9	8.7	0.4
	P+	199	66%	75%	87%	88%	73%	22%	1%
All	CPI	672	79.8	82.5	80.4	81.2	78.7	1.4	0.8
	P+	672	50%	56%	54%	54%	54%	4%	0%

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: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	434	75.8	76.8	76.7	76.8	1	0.1
		P+	434	44%	46%	48%	48%	4%	0%
		SGP	327	50.5	46.0	44.0	48.0	-2.5	4.0
	State	CPI	--	76.8	77.1	79.5	--	--	--
		P+	--	48%	50%	55%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	47.0	47.0	47.0	--	--	--
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	257	--	--	84.0	83.9	--	-0.1
		P+	257	--	--	62%	62%	--	0%
		SGP	192	--	--	46.0	49.0	--	3.0
	State	CPI	--	--	--	80.9	--	--	--
		P+	--	--	--	59%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	--	--	47.0	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	227	64.1	64.5	64.4	64.1	0.0	-0.3
		P+	227	23%	24%	26%	25%	2%	-1%
		SGP	165	57.0	42.0	43.0	46.0	-11.0	3.0
	State	CPI	--	66.8	66.6	71.6	--	--	--
		P+	--	30%	31%	39%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	43.0	43.0	44.0	--	--	--
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	--	67.4	67.8	70.1	--	--	--
		P+	--	35%	36%	41%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	53.0	54.0	54.0	--	--	--
All students	District	CPI	1,616	89.3	89.3	89.0	89.4	0.1	0.4
		P+	1,616	72%	73%	72%	74%	2%	2%
		SGP	1,325	52.5	54.0	48.0	52.0	-0.5	4.0
	State	CPI	--	86.8	86.7	89.3	--	--	--
		P+	--	69%	69%	75%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	51.0	50.0	50.0	--	--	--

Table B3b: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	431	65.3	63.4	64.2	67.5	2.2	3.3
		P+	431	33%	32%	31%	34%	1%	3%
		SGP	321	46.0	38.0	44.0	58.0	12.0	14.0
	State	CPI	--	68.6	68.4	70.2	--	--	--
		P+	--	40%	40%	43%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	46	47	47	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	253	--	--	70.9	73.2	--	2.3
		P+	253	--	--	41%	44%	--	3%
		SGP	187	--	--	46.0	52.0	--	6.0
	State	CPI	--	--	--	71.9	--	--	--
		P+	--	--	--	47.0%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	--	--	46	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	226	54.5	52.6	53.9	57.7	3.2	3.8
		P+	226	17%	14%	16%	20%	3%	4%
		SGP	161	42.0	36.0	41.0	62.0	20.0	21.0
	State	CPI	--	57.4	57.1	60	--	--	--
		P+	--	22.0%	22.0%	27.0%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	42	43	44	--	--	--
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	6	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	--	63.9	63.8	64.4	--	--	--
		P+	--	35.0%	36.0%	37.0%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	53	52	50	--	--	--
All students	District	CPI	1,613	82.8	80.2	80.4	82.6	-0.2	2.2
		P+	1,613	63%	58%	58%	62%	-1%	4%
		SGP	1,320	51.0	43.0	46.0	56.0	5.0	10.0
	State	CPI	--	80.8	80.3	83.1	--	--	--
		P+	--	61.0%	60.0%	66.0%	--	--	--
		SGP	--	51	50	50	--	--	--

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

Table B3c: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	184	67.3	69.1	66.1	67.7	0.4	1.6
		P+	184	28%	31%	29%	30%	2%	1%
	State	CPI	89,857	66.4	67.3	66.3	65.4	-1	-0.9
		P+	89,857	31%	33%	32%	31%	0%	-1%
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	117	--	--	72.6	74.6	--	2
		P+	117	--	--	38%	38%	--	0%
	State	CPI	61,476	--	--	67.1	65.8	--	-1.3
		P+	61,476	--	--	33.0%	29%	--	-4%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	87	58.4	62.1	56.9	58	-0.4	1.1
		P+	87	16%	20%	16%	16%	0%	0%
	State	CPI	38,109	59.8	60.1	60.2	59.7	-0.1	-0.5
		P+	38,109	20%	22%	22%	21%	1%	-1%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,594	54	54	53.9	54.1	0.1	0.2
		P+	18,594	19%	18%	18%	19%	0%	1%
All students	District	CPI	672	79.8	82.5	80.4	81.2	1.4	0.8
		P+	672	50%	56%	54%	54%	4%	0%
	State	CPI	208,262	79	79.6	79.4	78.7	-0.3	-0.7
		P+	208,262	53%	55%	54%	54%	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: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
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	1.8%	0.9%	2.1%	1.2%	-0.6	-33%	-0.9	-43%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.[10]	1.4%	0.0%	1.8%	2.2%	0.8	57%	0.4	22%	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	2.4%	1.7%	3.5%	1.1%	-1.3	-54%	-2.4	-69%	3.5%
ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	1.4%	0.5%	1.0%	0.6%	-0.8	-57%	-0.4	-40%	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.

[10] Low income numbers used for economically disadvantaged for 2012, 2013, 2014

Table B5: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Attendance Rates, 2013–2016

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2013–2016		Change 2015–2016		State (2016)
	2013	2014	2015	2016	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	94.9%	95.6%	95.4%	95.2%	0.3	0.3%	-0.2	-0.2%	94.9%

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

Table B6: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016

	FY14		FY15		FY16	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From school committee budget	$35,580,480	$35,863,972	$37,329,615	$41,309,062	$38,299,764	$37,518,925
From revolving funds and grants	---	$3,450,373	---	$3,123,563	---	$3,265,122
Total expenditures	---	$39,314,345	---	$44,432,625	---	$40,784,047
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	---	$12,390,171	---	$12,463,021		$12,536,246
Required local contribution	---	$17,936,311	---	$18,051,150		$18,028,977
Required net school spending**	---	$30,326,482	---	$30,514,171		$30,565,223
Actual net school spending	---	$32,901,697	---	$33,753,795		$35,600,911
Over/under required ($)	---	$2,575,215	---	$3,239,624	---	$5,035,688
Over/under required (%)	---	8.5%	---	10.6%	---	16.5%

*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: FY13, FY14, and FY15 District End-of-Year Reports; Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website.

Data retrieved 11/4/16 and 4-24-17

Table B7: Dighton-Rehoboth Regional School District
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2013–2015

Expenditure Category	2013	2014	2015
Administration	$445	$413	$357
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$614	$678	$784
Teachers	$4,884	$4,969	$5,143
Other teaching services	$977	$1,059	$971
Professional development	$91	$85	$58
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$300	$289	$441
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$354	$379	$403
Pupil services	$944	$1,159	$1,227
Operations and maintenance	$1,156	$957	$1,110
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$1,940	$1,864	$1,948
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$11,704	$11,853	$12,442

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%	0%	100%	3.0
	MS	6%	12%	12%	69%	2.4
	HS	0%	6%	18%	76%	2.7
	Total #	1	3	5	41	2.7
	Total %	2%	6%	10%	82%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	**ES**	18%	12%	35%	35%	1.9
	MS	6%	12%	44%	38%	2.2
	HS	0%	0%	47%	53%	2.5
	Total #	4	4	21	21	2.2
	Total %	8%	8%	42%	42%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	**ES**	6%	18%	35%	41%	2.1
	MS	6%	19%	56%	19%	1.9
	HS	6%	24%	41%	29%	1.9
	Total #	3	10	22	15	2.0
	Total %	6%	20%	44%	30%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	**ES**	0%	0%	35%	65%	2.6
	MS	0%	12%	44%	44%	2.3
	HS	0%	18%	59%	24%	2.1
	Total #	0	5	23	22	2.3
	Total %	0%	10%	46%	44%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	**ES**					9.6
	MS					8.8
	HS					9.2
	Total					9.2

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%	12%	56%	31%	2.2
	HS	0%	18%	59%	24%	2.1
	Total #	0	5	26	19	2.4
	Total %	0%	10%	52%	38%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	**ES**	6%	0%	76%	18%	2.1
	MS	6%	12%	56%	25%	2.0
	HS	12%	18%	35%	35%	1.9
	Total #	4	5	27	14	2.0
	Total %	8%	10%	54%	28%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	**ES**	0%	6%	65%	29%	2.2
	MS	0%	12%	50%	38%	2.3
	HS	6%	18%	41%	35%	2.1
	Total #	1	6	26	17	2.2
	Total %	2%	12%	52%	34%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	**ES**					6.9
	MS					6.5
	HS					6.1
	Total					6.5

Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture		Insufficient (0)	Minimal (1)	Moderate (2)	Strong (3)	Avg Number of points (0 to 3)
8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.	**ES**	0%	35%	35%	29%	1.9
	MS	12%	25%	31%	31%	1.8
	HS	18%	24%	47%	12%	1.5
	Total #	5	14	19	12	1.7
	Total %	10%	28%	38%	24%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	**ES**	0%	18%	76%	6%	1.9
	MS	6%	25%	38%	31%	1.9
	HS	18%	29%	35%	18%	1.5
	Total #	4	12	25	9	1.8
	Total %	8%	24%	50%	18%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	**ES**	0%	0%	35%	65%	2.6
	MS	0%	0%	44%	56%	2.6
	HS	0%	12%	59%	29%	2.2
	Total #	0	2	22	26	2.5
	Total %	0%	4%	44%	52%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	**ES**	0%	0%	59%	41%	2.4
	MS	6%	19%	25%	50%	2.2
	HS	12%	24%	47%	18%	1.7
	Total #	3	7	22	18	2.1
	Total %	6%	14%	44%	36%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	**ES**					8.8
	MS					8.5
	HS					6.9
	Total					8.1