

District Review Report

Freetown-Lakeville Regional School District



Review conducted May 28-31, 2013

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

Organization of this Report

| | |
|---|----|
| Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Overview | 1 |
| Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Findings | 11 |
| Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Recommendations | 36 |
| Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit | 45 |
| Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance | 47 |
| Appendix C: Instructional Inventory | 60 |

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 April 2014

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2014 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

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



Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2012-2013 school year included those classified into Level 3¹ of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance in each of the state's six regions: Greater Boston, Berkshires, Northeast, Southeast, Central, and Pioneer Valley. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Freetown-Lakeville Regional School District was conducted from May 28 to May 31, 2013. The site visit included 38 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 111 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 4 elementary school teachers, 11 middle school teachers, and 8 high school teachers. The review team also met with the new interim superintendent appointee.

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

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 62 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

The towns of Freetown and Lakeville each have a town manager, selectman, and open town-meeting form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. Before 2011-2012 the towns had separate districts for their elementary schools and a regional district for grades 5-12 with a grade 5 intermediate school, a middle school, and a high school. In 2011-2012 Freetown-Lakeville became a full regional district.

Because of the regionalization, the governance structure has undergone a transition from three separate school committees, to a thirteen-member transitional school committee in June 2012, to (beginning in March 2013) an eight-member school committee with four representatives from each town. The transitional committee met once each month; the eight-member committee began in March 2013 to meet twice each month.

The interim superintendent at the time of the review had been in the position since July 2012 and was to leave the district in June 2013. A new interim superintendent had been hired for the 2013-2014 school year. The new interim superintendent appointee served as a superintendent for seven years in a former district.

The new interim superintendent appointee told the review team that she submitted a “pre-entry plan” to the school committee outlining a series of meetings over a four-week period before July 1, 2013. Subsequent to the meetings, the new interim superintendent appointee planned to develop and submit a formal entry plan to the school committee as is customary for newly hired superintendents of schools.

The district leadership team includes the superintendent, one assistant superintendent of student and professional learning (at the time of the review, this position, formerly occupied by the interim superintendent, was vacant), a curriculum and grants coordinator, a director of student services, a director of finance and operations, and five school principals. There has been turnover in central office positions in recent years, including four interim superintendents since 2007. The district has five principals leading five schools; three of the five principals were to leave the district in June 2013, one had begun a maternity leave at the time of the team visit, and the fifth was to return in September 2013 to his position as middle school principal from his interim high school principal position. There are three other school administrators, including assistant principals; the assistant principals are members of a bargaining unit. At the time of the review team visit, there were 195.4 teachers in the district.

As of October 1, 2012, there were 3,055 students enrolled in the district’s 5 schools:

**Table 1: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment**

| School Name | School Type | Grades Served | Enrollment |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Freetown Elementary School | Elementary | PK-3 | 423 |
| Assawompset Elementary School | Elementary | K-3 | 497 |
| George R. Austin Intermediate School | Elementary | 4-5 | 493 |
| Freetown-Lakeville Middle School | Middle School | 6-8 | 785 |
| Apponequet Regional High School | High School | 9-12 | 857 |
| Totals | 5 schools | PK-12 | 3,055 |
| *As of October 1, 2012 | | | |

Before September 2012, one group of 4th grade students was housed at the Austin Intermediate School because of overcrowding in one elementary school. In September 2012, all 4th grade students became permanently housed at the grade 4-5 intermediate school. The district considers grades 4 and 5 to be part of their elementary program and not a separate “intermediate” program.²

Student enrollment, which had been decreasing slightly, increased by 62 percent from 1,920 in 2011 to 3,106 in 2012. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for all 35 school districts of the same size (3,000-3,999 students) in fiscal year 2012: \$11,234 compared with a median of \$13,121 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)).³ Actual net school spending has been above required, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B. At the time of the site visit in May 2013, voters in the town of Lakeville had just approved a 1.5 million dollar override by a 90 vote margin. Freetown was then required to fund a proportionate increase but did not require an override vote. In September 2012, Freetown and Lakeville voters supported a \$903,000 debt exclusion to fund a technology infrastructure overhaul for the schools.

Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district’s level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6)

² Before 2011-2012 grades 4 and below were not part of the Freetown-Lakeville Regional School District.

³ In-district per-pupil expenditures statewide were \$12,890 in 2011.

annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for the district and for schools and student subgroups that have at least four years of sufficient data and are therefore eligible to be classified into an accountability and assistance level (1-5). “Sufficient data” means that at least 20 students in a district or school or at least 30 students in a subgroup were assessed on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests for the four years under review.

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

1. The district is Level 3 because the Freetown Elementary School is Level 3.⁴

A. The Freetown Elementary School’s high needs students are among the lowest performing 20% of subgroups.⁵

B. The district’s five schools place between the 31st percentile and the 74th percentile based on each school’s four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other schools serving the same or similar grades: Freetown Elementary School] (31st percentile of elementary schools); Assawompset Elementary School (61st percentile of elementary schools); George R. Austin Intermediate School] (72nd percentile of elementary schools); Freetown-Lakeville Middle School ([66th percentile of middle schools); and Apponequet Regional High (74th percentile of high schools).

2. The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.

A. The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students and for high needs⁶ students is less than 75 for the district. The district’s cumulative PPI ⁷⁸ is 80 for all students and 59 for high needs students. The district’s cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 57 (low income students); 54 (students with disabilities); and 77 (White students).

⁴ Due to the district’s Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of “Needs Technical Assistance (NTA).” This serves as an indication that while areas of the district’s performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues.

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

⁶ The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

⁷ The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district’s, school’s or subgroup’s cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-

3. The district's English language arts (ELA) performance is moderate⁹ relative to other districts and its growth¹⁰ is moderate.¹¹

A. The district did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.¹²

B. The district met its annual growth for all students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities.

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

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

2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group's annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale.

⁸The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school's performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades.

⁹All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state's measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: "very high", "high", "moderate", "low" or "very low". In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts' CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools' CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department's School and District Profiles website: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx.

¹⁰Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student's or group of students' achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student's MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles ("academic peers"). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group's progress toward proficiency based on the group's current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group's progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates "moderate" or "typical" growth if the group's median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles.

¹¹ For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a.

¹² A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target.

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

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful¹³ declines in grades 6 and 7. The declines in grade 6 were attributable to its performance between 2011 and 2012 and the declines in grade 7 to its performance over both periods.

G. Freetown Elementary School's (PK-4) performance is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate.

H. Assawompset Elementary School's (K-4) performance is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate.

I. George R. Austin Intermediate School's (5) performance is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated gains in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher and declines in CPI and SGP. These gains were attributable to its performance between 2009 and 2012 and the declines to its performance between 2011 and 2012.

J. Freetown-Lakeville Middle School's (6-8) performance is high relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grades 6 and 7. The declines in grade 6 were attributable to its performance between 2011 and 2012 and the declines in grade 7 to its performance over both periods.

K. Apponequet Regional High's (9-12) performance is [high] relative to other high schools and its growth is [moderate]. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated gains in grade 10 in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance between 2011 and 2012.

¹³ The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa.

4. The district's mathematics performance is moderate relative to other districts and its growth is high.¹⁴

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and White students.

B. The district met its annual growth for all students and White students; the district did not meet its annual growth targets for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities.

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

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

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

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 5, 10 and overall. These gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

G. Freetown Elementary School's (PK-4) performance is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate.

H. Assawompset Elementary School's (K-4) performance is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate.

I. George R. Austin Intermediate School's (5) performance is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 5 in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher, CPI, and SGP. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

J. Freetown-Lakeville Middle School's (6-8) performance is [moderate] relative to other middle schools and its growth is [moderate]. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated [gains and declines] in grade 6 and 7. In grade 6 the school demonstrated variable performance in the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced and had gains in CPI. In grade 7 the school demonstrated gains in the percentage of students scoring proficient or high and CPI and variable performance in SGP.

¹⁴ For mathematics trends in the aggregate, see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b.

K. Apponequet Regional High's (9-12) performance is high relative to other high schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 10 in the percentage of students scoring proficient or higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

5. The district's science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is high relative to other districts.¹⁵

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

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

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

D. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 5. These gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

E. George R. Austin Intermediate School's (5) performance is high relative to other elementary schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 5. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

F. Freetown-Lakeville Middle School's (6-8) performance is moderate relative to other middle schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated variable performance in the percent of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* and in CPI in grade 8. Between 2009 and 2012 the school made gains in the percent of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* and in CPI. Between 2011 and 2012 the school had declines in the percent of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* and in CPI.

G. Apponequet Regional High's (9-12) performance is very high relative to other high schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated gains in grade 10 in the percentage of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* and in CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance between 2009 and 2012.

¹⁵ For STE trends in the aggregate, see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c.

6. In 2012, the district met its annual improvement targets for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate, the five-year cohort graduation rate, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate.¹⁶ Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available,¹⁷ the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate declined, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined.¹⁸

A. Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 2.7 percentage points, from 89.3% to 92.0%, an increase of 3.0 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 0.5 percentage points, from 92.5% to 92.0%, a decrease of 0.5 percent.

B. Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate increased 4.0 percentage points, from 89.0% to 93.0%, an increase of 4.5 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it increased 3.6 percentage points, from 89.4% to 93.0%, an increase of 4.0 percent.

C. Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined 0.6 percentage points, from 1.8% to 1.2%, a decrease of 33.3 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 0.5 percentage points, from 1.7% to 1.2%, a decrease of 29.4 percent.

7. The district's rates of in-school and out-of-school suspensions in 2011-2012 were significantly lower than the statewide rate.¹⁹

A. The rate of in-school suspensions for Freetown-Lakeville was 2.6 percent, compared to the state rate of 3.4 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Freetown-Lakeville was 3.3 percent, compared to the state rate of 5.4 percent.

B. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for in-school suspensions.²⁰ The in-school-suspension rate was 0.0 percent for African-American/Black students, 0.0 percent for Asian students, 12.5 percent for

¹⁶ All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state's federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher.

¹⁷ Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote.

¹⁸ For annual dropout rate trends from 2009 to 2012, see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available, see Tables B7a and B7b.

¹⁹ Statistical significance based on one sample T test. $P \leq .05$

²⁰ Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square. $P \leq .05$

Hispanic/Latino students, 4.8 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 2.4 percent for White students.

C. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for out-of-school suspensions. The out-of-school suspension rate was 19.0 percent for African-American/Black students, 0.0 percent for Asian students, 12.5 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 4.8 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, and 3.0 percent for White students.

D. There was a significant difference between the in-school suspension rates of high needs students and non high needs students (6.9 percent compared to 1.1 percent), low income students and non low income students (8.4 percent compared to 1.7 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (7.3 percent compared to 1.7 percent).

E. There was a significant difference between the rates of out-of-school suspension for high needs students and non high needs students (8.8 percent compared to 1.5 percent), low income students and non low income students (11.1 percent compared to 2.1 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (9.4 percent compared to 2.2 percent).

F. On average students in the Freetown-Lakeville Regional School District missed 2.4 days per disciplinary action,²¹ lower than the state average of 3.1.

²¹ Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting.

Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Findings

Strengths

Curriculum and Instruction

1. **At the time of the review the district had begun to move forward in its multi-year process to develop and implement a new curriculum aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks.**
 - A. Although work to realign curriculum to the 2011 state frameworks began in 2011, in 2012-2013 the district required teachers to develop two new curriculum units in all subjects and courses K-12, aligned to the 2011 state frameworks, and planned using the *Understanding by Design* (UbD) template.
 1. The new curriculum is managed interactively online using Atlas Rubicon curriculum mapping.
 2. The goal is to create six or seven units that will constitute a complete curriculum for each subject, course, and grade level for one academic year.
 3. Interviews with teachers and curriculum leaders and a review of the district's Atlas Rubicon website showed that many teachers K-3, mainly working in teams, had developed more than two units in ELA and mathematics. In grades 4-5, many have developed two or more units in ELA, mathematics, social studies, and science. At the middle and high schools, one or more units have been completed.
 4. A district leader noted that 60 percent of teachers had participated in the Atlas initiative during 2012-2013.
 5. The curriculum and grants coordinator and curriculum leaders have monitored progress and quality of the new units.
 - B. The district has set a new teaching and learning agenda by instituting a new curriculum and has aligned several resources to support it.
 1. The district has clearly articulated its vision, goals, and strategic objectives related to curriculum and instruction in the Strategic Educational Plan (2010-2015). Aligned School Improvement Plans are embedded in the strategic plan and build on the district's vision at each school.
 2. The recent regionalization has promoted the idea across the two towns that expectations for curriculum will now be consistent, especially at the Freetown and Assawompset elementary schools where previously students experienced two different reading programs before entering the intermediate school.
 3. The curriculum and grants coordinator and subject-based curriculum leaders in each school provide guidance to teachers, lead meetings, and monitor progress. Starting in the 2013-2014 academic year, there were to be department heads responsible for grades 6-12 who would provide guidance and oversight for curriculum.
 4. Funding has been made available to purchase new teaching materials, particularly at the elementary level.

- a. The change to full regionalization in 2012 provided additional funding to support the adoption of a new core elementary literacy program, *Reading Street*, to use as a tool in aligning ELA curriculum.
5. In 2012-2013 the district initiated daily common planning time at all schools to enable collaboration among teachers and leaders during the school day. Targeted release days with substitute coverage have also provided additional time during the school day for some teachers to participate in team-based professional development and time to work on curriculum development.
- C. Some professional development has taken place to promote teachers' understanding of the district's strategic objectives and how to develop the new UbD curriculum.
1. During several release days, the district offered professional development focused on conceptual understanding of the new curriculum. Sessions highlighted the shift from teaching content to teaching concepts, understanding, and skill development.
 2. Other release days were focused on horizontal and vertical alignment, mainly in ELA and mathematics; science was put on hold because of the anticipated revision of the science standards.
 3. A voluntary two-day professional development workshop in June 2012 introduced the UbD framework. Those attending were mainly K-5 teachers creating ELA and mathematics units and almost all PK-12 curriculum leaders. A smaller number of teachers from other schools and subjects also participated. To promote curriculum access and viability for high-needs students, at least one special educator from each school and two elementary Title I teachers also attended the UbD sessions.
 4. Other professional development for teachers through grades 6 or 8 or 9, depending on the topic, has also supported the new curriculum initiative. For example, teachers could take advantage of courses in decoding common core mathematics in grades 4-9; *Reading Street* training; a graduate level course in foundational reading skills through grade 5; a model for managing differentiated instruction through grade 6 (in some subjects); and the collection, use, and analysis of assessment data and progress monitoring through grade 8.
 5. Professional development for the new educator evaluation system has supported teachers' development of SMART goals (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action-Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-focused; and Timed and Tracked); many are linked to teachers' curriculum development and the use of data for decision-making. However, 2012-2013 was the new educator evaluation system's first year of implementation. (See the third Human Resources and Professional Development finding below.)
 6. All principals have participated in National Institute for School Leadership training since 2011 to strengthen skills in instructional leadership, using data to drive decision-making, and distributed leadership.

Impact: Since 2010, the district's curriculum and instruction system has been refocused. This represents a substantial shift in the beliefs and work of leaders, teachers, and students. When completed and with proper support and professional development for teachers, the new curriculum has the potential to transform teaching and learning in the district by promoting students' conceptual knowledge, thinking and analytical skills, and ability to use and apply knowledge.

Assessment

- 2. The district has begun to establish a system of balanced assessments in the elementary grades, K-5, that has the potential for use in improving educator and student performance and in school improvement. It has begun to extend this system into grade 6 at the middle school.**
 - A.** Document review and interviews by the visiting team showed that the district administers the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) tests to all students K-6. These include modules that test phonemic awareness, letter naming fluency, basic and advanced phonics, word attack skills, accuracy, fluency with connected text, and reading comprehension.
 1. The district has engaged consulting services to develop DIBELS data analysis, reporting, and intervention practices K-6.
 2. The data from the DIBELS modules is collected and analyzed using the Student Performance System (SPS), a data analysis and reporting program.
 - a. The curriculum and grants coordinator collects, analyzes, and distributes reports to the K-5 principals and the curriculum specialists K-6. Data is then provided to the teachers.
 - b. Data teams are in place in the elementary schools with teacher representation from each grade level. Principals and curriculum leaders participate, when possible, in school-based data team meetings K-5.
 3. Progress monitoring also provides data to the school-based student support teams (BBSTs) to alert all to the need for support or interventions.
 - B.** The district monitors the literacy progress of students through benchmark tests three times each year K-6. Students are placed into instructional groups based on the assessment data. K-5 teachers use end-of-unit benchmark tests from the Everyday Math program to monitor progress in mathematics.
 1. ELA benchmark tests also include Pearson Reading Street end-of-unit assessments (K-5) and the CORE Reading Maze Comprehension Test in grades 2-6.
 - C.** The district has begun to use data about K-6 student performance to improve instruction as well as some programs.
 1. The adoption of the new reading series, *Reading Street*, resulted from data analysis and the finding of gaps in the prior ELA literacy program.
 2. At one elementary school, assessment results are used to group students in grade 3 in mathematics . Teachers at this school have also implemented a “flipped” model of instruction where teachers provide online video lessons for students and parents, follow up with student assessments, and then discuss, facilitate, or remediate in class the next day.

- a. In grades 4-5, the school established a hands-on mathematics lab in 2011-2012 attended by all students. The focus is on strengthening through hands-on experiences mathematical strands where students have shown low performance in areas such as math arrays and practical math applications.
3. In visited elementary classrooms, the review team observed clear and consistent evidence of the use of formative assessment to guide instruction in 55 percent of K-5 classrooms, a higher frequency than in the middle and high schools (40 percent and 33 percent, respectively).

Impact: The use of literacy assessments K-6 to guide instruction and provide student support has changed teacher practice, according to the curriculum and grants coordinator. It has informed professional development at the K-6 level. One leader noted that it has entirely changed teachers' way of thinking about instruction with teachers now asking, "What can we do about our assessment results?" The shift to a data-driven culture is also helping teachers to "see connections" between instruction and student achievement. The elementary schools have seen moderate growth in ELA in recent years as noted in the student performance section of this report.

Student Support

3. **For students who are not performing at grade level in ELA and mathematics, teachers K-6 are learning to use multiple sources of data to identify and monitor progress.**
 - A. According to interviews with school and program leaders, and a review of documents provided by the district, classroom teachers and specialists K-6 are identifying and supporting students who are not performing at grade level in ELA and mathematics.
 1. Students who are performing below grade level, according to data, are referred to the Building Based Student Support Teams (BBSTs). The BBST in each school includes assistant principals, specialists, and teachers who design interventions in instruction which are implemented for six weeks, reviewed, and then revised to better address these students' literacy and mathematics learning needs.
 2. If students referred to the BBST have not made sufficient progress after two months, according to benchmark assessment and teacher reports, then additional services may be provided with more time and directed instruction inside and outside of the classroom. A reading specialist provides specific services in ELA or a special educator offers support services in mathematics.
 - B. According to leaders, classroom teachers, and specialists K-6, teachers are also using data to guide instruction and better support students within and outside of the classroom.
 1. In grades 1-3, students who are performing below grade level are offered specific accommodations in the regular education classroom with a combination of the classroom teacher and a reading specialist providing learning strategies delivered in inclusion classes at each grade level.
 2. In grades 4-6, students who are performing below grade level are offered specific accommodations for a six-week period in the regular classroom. The classroom teacher, a special educator, or a Title I teacher provides

services inside the classroom and sometimes in the resource center and offers learning strategies to target identified skill areas.

3. If students in grades 1-6 have not made sufficient progress after a two-month period, according to the BBST, they are referred for special education testing; if needed an Individualized Education Program may be developed to address the student's learning, behavioral, or health needs.

Impact: The district has begun to institute policies, procedures, and practices that create an effective system for monitoring the progress of all students K-6. Each school's leaders and its BBST use a preliminary system for identifying those students who are not performing at grade level and offer additional instructional support inside and outside of the regular education program to address their defined learning needs in ELA and mathematics.

4. The district maintains a safe learning environment for staff and students by implementing a districtwide, comprehensive safety plan for each school, as well as an emergency medical plan for each school and for athletic and extracurricular programs.

- A. The district and each school have a comprehensive safety plan that is reviewed annually with police and fire departments. In each school these plans are publicly posted and diagrams are provided in each room.
 1. In 2011 and 2012 the district provided training for all staff in dealing with crises and emergencies.
 2. For the two years before the site visit the district provided time to practice safety procedures inside classrooms and outside across all campus areas, as noted on certificates provided by police and fire officials in 2012 and 2013.
- B. According to interviews with the athletic director and principals, the emergency medical procedures provided to staff and students that are in place for the sports program and extra-curriculum events have been successfully used on several occasions.

Impact: By developing a comprehensive safety plan the Freetown-Lakeville Regional School District has provided adults and children an organized learning environment that assures safety for its community members. The district has strengthened its ties to both communities by fully collaborating with the agencies charged with dealing with crises and emergencies.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

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

Leadership and Governance

- 5. The perception of interviewees at the time of the review was that governance of the school system has suffered from interpersonal conflict; public communications not conducive to productivity or building a community of support; insufficient understanding of finance and resource allocation decisions; and over-involvement in day-to-day financial operations.**
- A.** Recent transitions have occurred in governance and in the superintendency.
1. Because of the recent regionalization, the governance structure of the school district has undergone a transition from three separate school committees, to a thirteen-member transitional school committee in July 2012, to (beginning in March 2013) an eight-member school committee with four representatives from each town. Of the newly constituted eight-member committee, three of the members were new to the school committee at the time of the review. Members of the school committee attended the Massachusetts Association of School Committee (MASC) program in the summer 2012, and the option to attend was to be available again in summer 2013.
 2. With the unanticipated departure of the incumbent superintendent in July 2012, the district was led by an interim superintendent who previously served as the assistant superintendent. This interim superintendent was to leave the district at the end of June 2013.
 3. During the 2012-2013 school year the school committee conducted a superintendent search, but was unable to agree on a permanent superintendent from between two finalists. The school committee voted to begin a new search for a superintendent during the 2013-2014 school year, and also hired a new interim superintendent for the coming year. The new interim superintendent was to engage in a transition process with the previous interim and assume complete responsibility for leading the district on July 1, 2013.
 - a. The inability to reach agreement on one of the two finalists for the superintendent position, who were described as “great finalists” by an administrator, was attributed by the same administrator to “infighting” by the school committee that involved a lot of personal feelings and caused divisions among the administration and school committee members. This administrator also said that things were better in the new school committee, with not as much infighting.
- B.** Interviewees expressed concerns about how relationships between the school committee and others negatively impacted morale, confidence in the school system, and the ability of the district to develop a culture of collaboration that would allow stakeholders to work together.
1. One administrator reported feeling undervalued and disrespected by members of the school committee, and said that the school committee gave people the idea that the administration was incompetent and deceitful about the budget.
 2. A parent in the parent focus group conducted by the review team asked the team to convey the message to the school committee that they should treat people with respect.

3. According to the teachers' association, there is not a "close" working relationship with the school committee, a relationship that is necessary to carry on a productive dialogue as the new regional system evolves.
 - a. Association representatives expressed the view that their expertise was not valued by the school committee. They said that some members of the school committee had made disparaging remarks about the association during school committee meetings as well as on social media. The association representatives said that they viewed these statements as "counterproductive."
 4. Officials from one of the towns mentioned a meeting at which the school committee had "accused the Finance Committee of being against kids," but they also said that a meeting was planned between the school committee and the board of selectmen. They said that the school committee was "still trying to find their way under regionalization." Officials from the other town, when asked how the reconstituted school committee was working out, answered that there was "a newness there" and that the relationship was improving.
- C.** Parents and teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of information and quality of communication from the school committee, noting that the latest school committee minutes on the district website were four months old and saying that the school committee discouraged questions and comments from attendees at school committee meetings
- D.** Various stakeholders expressed concerns about poor school committee governance practices.
1. The perception among the curriculum leaders and financial staff was that teaching and learning were not a priority for the school committee and that members preferred to "micromanage" matters, especially those involving expenditures. According to one group of teachers the school committee "talks money all the time." One central office administrator said that the attempts to micromanage expenditures had lessened but posed the question whether they would increase with a new business manager.
 2. The school committee appeared not to have a comprehensive understanding of financial information, according to central office administrators.
 3. Both central office administrators and town officials expressed the opinion that the school committee did not exhibit a full appreciation for the role of instruction in developing the budget.
 4. Officials from both towns expressed the opinion that the school committee did not exercise proper oversight and in-depth inquiry on financial matters—that in terms of the budget it simply did what the administration wanted.

Impact: The school system relies on strong school committee governance in order to (1) establish effective working relationships leading to stakeholders working together toward higher levels of achievement; (2) ensure that decision-making is guided by District Improvement Plan goals; and (3) provide regular communication to the community in order to promote public confidence, community support, and the financial commitment needed for district success. When this

is absent, the school system is weakened to the detriment of the efforts of all stakeholders working to strengthen student achievement.

6. In recent years there has been significant turnover in district leadership. In addition to turnover in the role of superintendent, seven administrators left the district in June 2013 or soon before.

- A. One administrator told the review team that since 2007 there had been four interim superintendents.
- B. The interim superintendent at the time of the review had been in the position since July 2012 and was to leave the district in June 2013. Simultaneous exits by both veteran and relatively recently hired administrators took place in the following positions during the 2012-2013 school year (with the number of years occupied in that position by the exiting administrator noted in parentheses):
 - 1. Assistant superintendent (2 years)
 - 2. Curriculum and grants coordinator (3 years)
 - 3. Director of student services (7 years)
 - 4. Director of finance and operations (4 years)
 - 5. Assawompset Elementary School principal (14 years)
 - 6. Freetown Elementary School principal (1 year)
 - 7. Apponequet Regional High School principal (1 year)

At the school level, both the high school and middle school principals were serving in an interim capacity at the time of the review, with the interim high school principal scheduled to return to the middle school principal position for the 2013-2014 school year.

- C. The review team found widespread concern about turnover.
 - 1. Principals said that in years past with all the changeovers in leadership they focused on survival rather than on curriculum, and that “we each did our own thing.” They said that administrators were leaving at the time of the review because of the turnover in leadership (at the superintendent level) and because of the “school committee way of working.”
 - 2. Teachers tied a past absence of professional development opportunities to the turnover in the position of superintendent before the tenure of the superintendent who departed in 2012.
 - 3. Teachers at the high school expressed the view that they were “a ship without a leader” and voiced a concern about “central office turnover.” Teachers from one of the elementary schools said that the school was now working well and becoming a collaborative learning environment, with the quality of instruction improving. They said that they wanted to continue in the same direction but were not sure what would happen with the administration turning over so much.

4. Although capacity had been built and gains made, an administrator told the review team that “many of the staff are afraid that the old ways may return.”
5. In the team’s interview with two school committee members, concern was expressed that “our entire [administrative] team has turned over this spring.” Particular concern was expressed about “losing two excellent curriculum people,” namely the interim superintendent at the time of the review and the curriculum and grants coordinator. The review team was told that those two administrators were “phenomenal” in analyzing data and putting it into a format for the school committee “so we can make informed decisions.”

Impact: Without consistent leadership messages from the level of governance on down, frequent and wide-ranging leadership turnover will have a detrimental impact on the school district’s practices as they shift without a consistent direction. It also may harm the district’s reputation and erode community support, and it diminishes the ability of the district to sustain improvement initiatives (for instance curriculum development initiatives) and to attract and retain quality leaders and teachers.

Curriculum and Instruction

7. Although the district had made a focused start to revise curriculum and instruction, a number of obstacles threatened continued progress, in particular, the turnover in district leadership.

- A. The development of the UbD curriculum was in its early stages and implementation was fragile. Most units reviewed by the team did not have complete formats. Teachers continued to blend multiple curriculum materials to structure lessons and other units.
 1. Most UbD units met only Stage 1 of the three-stage framework. Stage 1 focuses on desired results by including goals, alignment to standards, understandings, essential questions, and what students will know and be able to do. Some had progressed to Stage 2 with evidence of understanding provided by formative and summative assessments, rubrics, and performance tasks. Only a few had been completed to Stage 3 and included detailed lesson plans with active learning activities, diagnostic and formative assessments, differentiated instruction, technology resources, assignments, and extended learning/practice.
 2. Teachers fill in curricular gaps when they prepare weekly and daily lesson plans. They collaborate to organize curriculum and lessons using pieces from new UbD units, previously developed curriculum units, and selections from textbooks and other teaching materials. Teachers noted in an interview that they were in a “state of flux,” were writing a curriculum while teaching it, and found that confusing. They said: “We are flying the airplane while we are building it.”
- B. There had been varied access or exposure to key professional development across all school levels, especially in differentiated instruction, to support teachers’ development and implementation of the new curriculum.
 1. Almost all elementary teachers have participated in professional development such as the UbD workshop, the Gibson differentiated instruction management model, and a course in data analysis and decision-making

and progress monitoring. Several of these courses were either not offered to secondary teachers or were voluntary and only a few middle school and high school teachers participated (with problems of insufficient notice noted).

2. Attendance at the UbD summer workshop was voluntary. Some said that many teachers chose not to attend because it took place in June, just after school ended.
 3. Middle school ELA teachers have learned to use the Gibson model to manage differentiation and this has led to some mathematics teachers using the strategies. Middle school teachers have also benefited from data analysis training but said that once they used data to identify struggling students, they did not have the skills to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs.
 4. Middle school science and social studies teachers and most high school teachers had not participated in professional development in differentiation and UbD. They acknowledged an absence of expertise in using small groups to tailor instruction to meet students' learning needs and promote more student engagement.
 5. Few high school teachers attended the UbD workshop, even though recommendations from the 2010 NEASC Report and May 2011 NEASC follow-up letter underscored the importance of developing a revised high school curriculum and "aligned pedagogy that challenged all students with higher order thinking, problem-solving, relevant learning activities and authentic and alternative assessments."
- C. In observed classrooms, many middle and high school teachers used traditional teaching strategies (discussed later in this report) that did not yet support the UbD framework and lesson content. This limited UbD's potential to activate students' higher-order thinking skills through collaborative and learning activities targeted to students' learning strengths and challenges.
1. A review by the team of a random sample of the new UbD units showed limited differentiation in current unit documents and only a few accommodations or extensions to meet the needs of struggling students, students with disabilities, or gifted and talented students, mainly because the units were still not complete.
 2. Although differentiated instruction is a key teaching strategy to support the new curriculum, high school teachers told the review team that they did not have that expertise. Teachers noted that this was particularly relevant when teaching students now struggling in college prep level classes since the high school "de-leveled," i.e., changed from four course levels to three.
 3. A high school administrator said that differentiation was emphasized for only a short period of time, after "a little professional development" had been offered, and then it "drifted away," adding that it was not yet firmly embedded in teaching practice.
 4. Although special education teachers attended the UbD professional development workshop, their participation in curriculum unit development has been limited by schedule complications at the middle school and an absence of common planning time with grade-level or subject-level teachers at other schools.

5. When curriculum leaders were asked how the needs of more able and less able high school students were met, they responded that they did not have any special strategies, that teachers relied on paraprofessionals but paraprofessionals also did not have training.
- D.** Leaders, curriculum leaders, and teachers noted in interviews that there was insufficient common planning time to complete all assigned tasks related to implementing the new curriculum.
1. At the elementary schools (K-5) teachers meet 20-23 minutes twice a week for common planning time. Middle school teachers meet 40-80 minutes a week (depending on content area). High school teachers meet one hour weekly and once a month as a full faculty.
 2. Although curriculum leaders teach full time, they serve as liaisons for curriculum communication and guidance from the district. They are also responsible for monitoring team progress. To attend team meetings, they often need to arrange class coverage. One curriculum leader noted a reliance on email to communicate with her teams and another noted meeting with teams after school if and when teachers agreed to stay.
 - a. In 2013-2014 the district planned to appoint grade 6-12 academic department heads who would teach two periods and would also be partly responsible for teacher evaluation. However, elementary school (K-5) curriculum leaders would still teach full time and might still have to miss team meetings if they could not arrange class coverage.
 3. In addition to being used for curriculum revisions, common planning time is used for numerous other grade-level, department, school, and district initiatives. For example, depending on the grade level, teachers use common planning time for discussion of student assessment data, developing common assessments, progress monitoring, meetings with literacy coaches, Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, and Building Based Student Support Teams meetings.
- E.** The transition in personnel in every school and nearly all school leadership roles at the end of the 2012-2013 school year affects the district's ability to move forward in implementing the UbD curriculum and supporting continuously improvement in instruction. The district-level leadership turnover meant the departure of nearly all leaders responsible for setting and maintaining the vision and providing direction and oversight of new curricular and instructional initiatives.
1. The district invested time and funding for all five principals to participate in National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training during the two years before the site visit. The principals, the schools, and the district have benefited from their new expertise, which was to be lost with the departure of four of the five principals in June 2013. (The interim high school principal was to return to his previous role as principal of the middle school.) Teachers told the review team that they were already feeling the loss of leadership.

Impact: The district has set an ambitious agenda for curricular and instructional improvement, but it was already less advanced at the middle school and high school levels, and a number of obstacles may slow or thwart further progress.

- The impending loss of leadership at the time of the review created anxiety among those committed to continued progress for the innovations in curriculum and instruction and added further challenge to continuous improvement.
- Until more UbD units are completed through Stage 3, teachers, leaders, and students will continue to use a “quilt-like patchwork” curriculum that alternates between well-thought-through substantive lesson objectives and active learning and those with less rigorous content delivered more didactically.
- Until all teachers have had the advantages that many of their colleagues through grade 6 have had in professional development and supportive supervision, they will find it more challenging to make curricular and instructional improvements.
- Without adequate time for collaboration and guidance, the pacing for full implementation of district initiatives will be slowed.

8. The district’s strategic vision for a shared understanding and implementation of research-based best instructional practices has not been universally or firmly adopted or widely supported through purposeful and consistent instructional leadership at the school level.

A. Across all schools, inconsistent views of best instructional practice emerged at every level.

1. At the elementary level:

- a. One elementary leader noted that walkthroughs focused on selected characteristics from the list of 17 found in ESE’s *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice*.
- b. Elementary teachers, on the other hand, identified good practice as the use of formative assessments and data to drive reading groups, the use of centers, the use of small groups for instruction, and differentiation. In another interview, a teacher identified an “opening, a closing, and differentiated instruction.”

2. At the middle school level:

- a. A middle school leader described RBT training, posting objectives on the board, connecting learning to past learning, and the use of pre-tests.
- b. Some middle school teachers noted the expectation to use data and differentiate instruction in ELA and mathematics—but not in science and social studies—common assessments, teaching to standards, meeting all students’ needs and keeping kids engaged. Another middle school teacher mentioned “teaching to standards, engagement, access, and meeting the needs of students in inclusion classes.” She then added that when she was being evaluated, she did not know what the principal was looking for because “he didn’t tell me and I don’t have to give him a lesson plan.”

3. At the high school level:

- a. High school curriculum leaders referred to qualities of good teaching created last year by the leadership team and included in the high school improvement plan. Another leader noted that there was now more conversation about curriculum and assessment and little discussion about instruction. Another leader said that teachers collaborated and discussed the elements of good practice at faculty meetings but in 2012-2013 the focus had shifted to curriculum.

B. The capacity for instructional leadership varies throughout the district. Instructional leadership for principals has not been a focus over time, according to administrators; however, in 2012-2013 the interim superintendent aimed to develop a more coherent school system by focusing on district goals and promoting more cohesive leadership and internal accountability for principals to each other.

1. Principals had not had any professional development until the recent National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) training.
2. District leaders expressed the view that school leadership capacity needed strengthening. Principals had not been evaluated since 2008. There had been NISL training, but there was room for improvement at the upper levels in the areas of curriculum and instruction and data-driven decision-making. Further, four of the five principals who had received NISL training were leaving.
3. Teachers' confidence in their school leaders as instructional leaders varied. For example, some noted that none of the three leaders at the high school in 2012-2013, a principal and two assistant principals, had ever been a classroom teacher.
4. District leaders often described a school culture that was adult centered rather than student centered, where the needs of students were secondary, particularly at the secondary levels. As a result, some initiatives were stalled. According to an administrator, the rationale given to district leadership for remaining with the status quo in one instance was that the changes were "too overwhelming," there was "not enough support" for them and they were "doing fine without them."

Impact: District and school personnel named useful practices as expectations for teaching. However, the variations indicated an absence of clarity about what the district expects of teachers about good instructional practice and how leaders can support it. Although there is a clear vision articulated at the district level, there is not a shared understanding of this throughout the district and implementation varies, indicating a fragile and early stage of implementation. And without sufficient time, emphasis, capacity-building, and support, particularly at the secondary level, it will be challenging for the district to carry through on the vision.

9. According to the review team’s observations, teaching and learning characteristics most associated with best practices were not strongly or uniformly embedded in instruction across all schools and grade levels. There were indications of more confident application of these key characteristics K-5. Technology was insufficiently used to enhance learning across the district.

The team observed 62 classes throughout the district: 18 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 29 at the elementary schools. The team observed 22 ELA classes, 23 mathematics classes, 7 science classes, and 10 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 18 special education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. See Appendix C for data from the team’s classroom observations.

The following is an analysis of classroom observations in Freetown-Lakeville organized, to begin with, by the instructional inventory’s three categories: the classroom learning environment, characteristics of good teaching, and characteristics of good learning. The inventory’s characteristics are italicized.

- A. Classroom Learning Environment:** There was clear and consistent evidence of a good learning environment related to teacher and student interaction and helpful classroom procedures across the observed classrooms in all schools.
1. In 92 percent of observed lessons, there was clear and consistent evidence of *positive and respectful teacher and student interactions*. In a number of lessons, observers described a positive tone, approachable and helpful teachers, and attentive students.
 2. In 85 percent of observed lessons, there was clear and consistent evidence that *classroom procedures were maintained, classrooms were safe, and there were smooth transitions across classroom activities*. In 76 percent of observed lessons, *classroom rituals, routines, and appropriate interactions* clearly and consistently *created a safe intellectual environment*. In many lessons through grade 5, students made easy transitions from centers or group work to individual work or to one-on-one sessions with the teacher. Middle and high school students followed directions as teachers changed activities.
 3. Rigor and high expectations for students and availability of resources for differentiation were found clearly and consistently in approximately one half of the visited classrooms.
 - a. In 52 percent of observed classes, the team found clear and consistent evidence that *the lesson reflected rigor and high expectations*. For example, in a grade 2 ELA class, the students explored “wondering” and in a grade 3 mathematics class, a student gave reasons for the answers to a question. However, observers in a number of high school lessons noted that while topics often reflected high expectations and thoughtful content, students were not engaged in rigorous or challenging active learning activities. Students more frequently listened to teachers lecture or check short answers for homework or worksheets with students demonstrating less engaged and less active learning behaviors.
 - b. The *availability of multiple resources to meet students’ diverse learning needs* was clearly and consistently found in 47 percent of observed lessons. In elementary classrooms observers noted the

presence of resources such as craft materials, small whiteboards, posters, and other visual aids. High school science labs appeared dated and worn, with graffiti on sink panels. Students reported having to buy the books for AP classes (at a cost of \$160 for AP Biology and \$45 for AP History). Teachers in one focus group described not having enough supplies and paper and having to buy teaching materials.

B. Characteristics of Good Teaching: Teachers for the most part demonstrated solid knowledge of subject matter; however, student engagement in interactive lessons, the hallmark of UbD design, was observed in fewer than half the visited classes, with more frequent, clear, and consistent practices observed in lessons in grades 1-5.

1. Overall, in 81 percent of observed lessons, teachers clearly and consistently *demonstrated knowledge of subjects and content*. Thoughtful, essential understandings and questions were sometimes demonstrated in UbD lesson design and drew students to engage in content. For example, in a middle school social studies lesson, the teacher exposed students to original sources and demonstrated mastery of centuries-old conflicts as she and the students defined “bias.”
2. Teachers clearly and consistently *used appropriate and varied strategies matched to learning objectives and content* in 53 percent of observed lessons: in 17 of 29 lessons through grade 5 and in 16 of 33 lessons in grades 6-12. Teachers *implemented appropriate and varied strategies that met students’ diverse learning needs* in 31 percent of observed lessons, in 10 of 29 lessons through grade 5 and in 9 of 33 lessons from grades 6-12. In those classrooms where varied strategies were not found, the review team noted whole-class, teacher-centered approaches where students demonstrated low active engagement and little collaborative learning or problem solving. Occasionally students worked in groups on assigned roles and activities, although usually in grades 5 and below.
3. Although leaders and teachers had named *the use of clear grade-appropriate lesson objectives* as a districtwide expectation, objectives were clearly and consistently communicated in only 42 percent of observed lessons.
4. In 43 percent of observed lessons, teachers clearly and consistently *required inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of concepts*. In 42 percent of classes, teachers *used varied questioning techniques that required or sought thoughtful responses and promoted deeper understanding*. Teacher questioning often sought short answers to “what” and “who” and only sometimes asked “how” and “why” or “why not.”

C. Characteristics of Good Learning: Clear and consistent evidence of students demonstrating characteristics of good learning varied in frequency and robustness.

1. In 58 percent of observed lessons, students were clearly and consistently *engaged in productive learning routines*. In 60 percent of observed lessons, students clearly and consistently *took responsibility for their learning*. For example, in a high school algebra class, students asked the teacher to review an answer to a homework question. In a grade 7 mathematics class, students worked individually on problems and went to the teacher with questions. And in a grade 3 ELA class, students were eager to read their themes aloud. When students worked individually or collaborated in pairs or groups, they cooperated and were on task.

Frequently, however, lesson design in grades 9-12 required students to follow directions for tasks in which the lesson substance was presented and controlled by the teacher rather than by students.

2. Students were observed clearly and consistently *engaged in challenging academic tasks* in 37 percent of observed lessons. Observers noted the presence of this characteristic in a grade 5 social studies class where students began writing persuasive essays after discussing opinion and fact. In a grade 6 ELA class, students revisited a poem to analyze it as a metaphor. However, in a grade 3 mathematics lesson, students were asked to recall information when it was apparent that they already understood it. In a focus group with high school students, students reported high expectations in about half their classes and described their schoolwork as “sort of challenging,” with AP classes being the most challenging.
3. In 39 percent of observed lessons, students clearly and consistently *articulated their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups*. In visited classes, the use of groups and pairs and individual student presentations was more frequently observed K- 5 (45 percent) and observed less often (33 percent) in grades 6-12. In a grade 5 ELA lesson, students in pairs and small groups compared and contrasted topics they had chosen and discussed in pairs their Venn Diagrams to illustrate similarities and differences. In a grade 9 social studies class on the Depression, the teacher orchestrated an interactive discussion in which students shared their views thoughtfully. In a high school science class, a student presented his research about the biology of the human heart and explained how various lifestyle habits were linked to heart disease.
4. In 29 percent of observed lessons, *students’ responses to questions* clearly and consistently *elaborated about content and ideas*. Observers noted that students typically were only asked to give “right” answers rather than following up answers with additional questioning or probes to demonstrate deeper understanding. Students were often asked to recall information found in texts, or solve problems and fill in the answers on worksheets, or review homework exercises by listening to the teacher give the correct answer, rather than the teacher guiding small groups to check answers and discuss why or how mistakes were made.
5. In 40 percent of observed lessons, students clearly and consistently *made connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences and other subject matter*. This was observed in 14 of 29 lessons through grade 5 and in 11 of 33 middle and high school lessons. For example, in a grade 1 math lesson, students first identified and wrote the names of geometric shapes on a worksheet and then walked around the classroom to match and write down the name of objects in those geometric shapes. In a grade 6 mathematics lesson, students had to find prior information in order to calculate new data. In a grade 9 geometry class, students made connections to geometric shapes in building architecture. Overall, however, student explanations, connections, and references were noted in only 28 percent of observed high school lessons (in 5 of 18 lessons).

D. The use of technology by both teachers and students was rarely observed.

1. Teachers clearly and consistently *made use of technology to enhance learning* in 15 percent of observed lessons.

2. Students were observed clearly and consistently *using technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding* in 13 percent of observed lessons. In most classrooms, observers noted three or four outdated computers; students were observed using computers in lessons only once. In a focus group, high school students noted inadequate technology.

E. The Freetown Elementary School, the district's Level 3 school, demonstrated the most frequent evidence of strong teaching and learning in all the categories of classroom observations noted above.

1. For example, in 80 percent of observed classes (8 out of 10 classes) at the school, the lesson clearly and consistently reflected *rigor and high expectations*. An observer in a grade 2 class noted that the teacher made students "think and consider."
2. In 70 percent of observed classrooms (7 out of 10 classes) the team found clear and consistent evidence that the *teacher conducted frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction*. In one grade 3 lesson the teacher asked "surprise questions"; in another, the teacher constantly assessed understanding and paraphrased students' responses.
3. In 80 percent of observed classes (8 out of 10 classrooms) teachers clearly and consistently *required inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking*. In one grade 3 class each student was researching the life of a colonial hero in a guided writing activity.
4. Teachers described how the new principal changed the school's agenda and focus. Meetings are now instructionally focused on writing, prompts, rubrics, and DIBELS to drive decisions about reading groups. Teachers said that they all use small groups and centers and collaborate with the new literacy coach.
5. In another interview, the principal noted conducting collaborative and transparent instructional walkthroughs and other culture-changing practices to improve student learning.

F. Summary: With evidence of a good learning environment, the district's classrooms demonstrated receptive settings for good teaching and learning to take place. Classroom observations showed, however, that the knowledge and expertise needed to implement the recent innovations such as UbD and differentiated instruction and active learning to demonstrate understanding were not yet firmly embedded in the day-to-day practice of teaching or of learning. While content sometimes had the potential to stretch students' minds, the teaching and learning strategies used were more traditional than innovative. This was particularly evident in the use of strategies that promote higher-order thinking, rigor, deep questioning, and students' elaboration of their own thinking and reasoning.

Impact: Until more teachers are exposed to, and engage in, more student-centered, active, and reflective pedagogy, there will continue to be a gap between the district's goals for curriculum and instruction and how teachers teach and students learn.

Assessment

10. Freetown-Lakeville does not have a district-level data team to analyze K-12 student achievement data to inform policy and budget decisions, improve teaching and learning, and guide teacher evaluation and professional development.

- A.** The district does not have a K-12 data team, although it does have a district data administrator who collects and disseminates data upon request.
 - 1. The district has a full-time district data administrator who described her role as “primarily providing stakeholders with the information they need.” However, she noted that she does not analyze the data but that school-based data teams “do most of the analysis.”
- B.** The district disaggregates DIBELS data for some subgroups but does not have a formal system in place to track student achievement for all subgroups as they move through the grades.
 - 1. The director of curriculum has presented information to the school committee about the achievement of students from low-income families.
 - 2. Disaggregation of data for other subgroups is not routinely done. For example, leaders do not analyze participation of subgroups in AP classes.
 - 3. The superintendent told the review team that program changes were sometimes made that did not have ties to data analysis. For example, at the middle school an extra math class was added for all students without sufficient data analysis to determine which groups might best benefit from targeted instruction.
- C.** While the district engages in some program evaluations, these have made limited use of data.
 - 1. The middle school special education program was evaluated by an external consultant to address the proficiency gap between students on IEPs and students who were not on IEPs. Another consultant evaluated the Life Skills program, adaptive PE programs, and other services. However, the director noted that they did not analyze data by subgroups.
 - 2. The high school participated in a NEASC accreditation visit in May 2011 and was still in the process of implementing the recommended changes at the time of the site visit.

Impact: The district has the capacity to generate district level data reports through the office of the data administrator; however, because it does not have a K-12 data team of leaders and teachers to analyze the data, it has limited ability to use the data to guide policy development and implementation, improve instruction, identify strengths and challenges in student support programs, inform teacher supervision, evaluation, and professional development, or guide budget decisions.

11. While the review team found limited data analysis taking place in grades 7-12, practices were not systematized or formalized. The district planned to expand the model of data collection and analysis found K-6, but at the time of the visit the model was not being replicated in grades 7-12.

- A.** At the time of the review grades 7-12 did not have an integrated student data management program in place similar to that used K-6, the Student Performance System, to help teachers access and use the data to inform daily instruction. Data analysis was conducted by the principal or by curriculum leaders.
1. The middle school does not have a data team. The interim principal at the middle school told the team that he analyzed the data and provided teachers with an informational “dashboard.”
 - a. The interim middle school principal said that he expected teachers to look at the data and select appropriate instructional strategies. Discussions about data may take place during the forty-minute block team planning time.
 - b. When the review team asked curriculum leaders about where teachers were in the continuum of data use, they replied that between 35 and 40 percent of teachers were using aligned pre- and post-tests, that this was the first year they were using data, and that before this, teachers were not collaborating around the use of data.
 2. The high school does not have a formal school-based data team and data is not systematically used to inform instruction; however, at the time of the review discussions about data were taking place within some content areas and at Building Based Student Support Team meetings.
 - a. At the high school, curriculum leaders reported that within the ELA and mathematics departments MCAS and PSAT data was analyzed for placement purposes. They noted that this analysis was not used to inform instruction. In ELA the high school is analyzing open response data to improve student achievement. Curriculum leaders noted that they believed that data was “now guiding their discussions” and the task of aligning the curriculum and developing common units and assessments.
- B.** In-class formative assessment practices are not sufficiently developed to improve teaching and individual student learning across the district.
1. Not all teachers know how to use formative assessment data to guide and differentiate instruction. Some curriculum leaders told the team that there was an absence of understanding about what differentiation was. One middle school teacher told the team that an administrator had told her that differentiated instruction did not need to take place daily. One high school teacher told the team that meeting the needs of more able and less able students was more “intuitive” and that although they used formative assessment data, their teaching was not data driven.
 2. In observed classrooms, the frequent use of formative data was more consistent at the elementary level and less a part of practice at the secondary level. In 55 percent of classes (16 out of 29) observed at the elementary level there was clear and consistent evidence of teachers conducting frequent formative

assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction, while this was true in forty percent (6 out of 15 classes) and 33 percent (6 out of 18 classes) of classes at the middle school and high school, respectively.

Impact: Because data analysis in grades 7-12 was neither systematized nor formalized, there was not yet a districtwide culture of leaders and teachers making continuous use of a wide range of information to guide instruction. Without the expansion of the use of data to inform daily instruction into grades 7-12, leaders have insufficient ability to monitor individual student progress and to evaluate intervention programs as students move through the grades.

12. Assessment results and the implications for student learning are not communicated effectively to community leaders, school committee members, parents, and students.

- A. An official from one town told the review team that he wanted to know more about achievement data trends and such information as how many students were National Merit Scholarship finalists.
- B. High school students spoke of an absence of feedback on assessments. One student said that he had not received any feedback for three tests this semester. Another said that he had not received back a rough draft that he had submitted three months before. Others said that feedback depended on the teacher; for example, in some classes students received feedback later on the same day, and a biology teacher gave results back in a few days.
- C. Parents said that there was not enough communication about what their children were learning or how they were doing. One parent in a parent focus group said, “Parents are now asked to be involved in educating their kids, yet we don’t have the curriculum and we don’t know what the standards are . . . [I]f I’m integral to my child’s education, then I think it is important to get the information.” Another said that there were not clear communications with teacher and principal.
 - 1. The high school uses the EdLine reporting system; the minimum required is one grade for the term although some teachers provide more. Parents can initiate a request and get a more detailed report.

Impact: Without providing accurate and timely accounts of assessment results to all stakeholders, the district cannot build the community understanding of its goals and needs necessary to gain financial support. Further, when students do not receive timely feedback about their learning, opportunities are missed for them to make use of resources to improve their learning. Similarly, without adequate communication parents are unable to monitor and support their children’s learning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

13. At the time of the review the district had negotiated an agreement with the teachers’ association to adopt the state’s new educator evaluation system and was working on implementing the new system. However, implementation appeared to be behind where it should have been for a Race to the Top district, with turnover in administrators posing difficulties and the previous evaluation system providing a weak foundation for the new one.

- A. As a participant in the Race to the Top grant program, the district was required in 2012-2013 to begin

implementation of a new educator evaluation system consistent with the state's new evaluation system, and to evaluate at least half of its educators under the new system. See [603 CMR 35.11\(1\)](#).

- B.** At the time of the onsite visit in May 2013 the district had taken steps toward implementing a new evaluation system.
1. On October 23, 2012, the district sent ESE the agreement on educator evaluation that had been negotiated with the teachers' association.
 2. Interviewees told the team that a labor management committee had been established to monitor the introduction of the new educator evaluation system.
 3. According to administrators and teachers, the district had completed the ESE-prescribed training for evaluators and teachers. Administrators told the review team that initial training with an outside consultant had not been successful so a team of administrators conducted the training. This effort received a strong endorsement from teachers.
 4. Along with forms accompanied by guidance for district staff, the review team was provided with a timeline for transition "from the 2011-2012 Evaluation Process to the New Teacher Evaluation process in 2012-13," a timeline taken from the negotiated agreement on the new evaluation system.
 5. The review team was provided with several examples of formative assessments.
 6. A representative of the teachers' association said that as "cumbersome" as the process was, it had "opened up dialogue" and forced principals and teachers to "connect around goals," and that the representative's "teacher/principal relationship now includes many visits."
- C.** However, the district did not appear to be where it should have been as a Race to the Top district; interviewees expressed confusion about the new educator evaluation system and noted the disruption to the process caused by administrator turnover.
1. Goals were not available for review by the review team, and though the team received examples of formative assessments, formative assessments were not yet in personnel files at the time of the onsite.
 2. When asked about the new evaluation system, teachers in one focus group said that they were still working out the kinks in what the indicators were. They also said that they had written SMART goals but "have not figured out how to organize the evidence." They said that the evaluation system was too time consuming, and that there were issues around the management of collecting evidence. They noted, "We have disruptions with administrators who have moved."
 3. Concerns about evidence collection were echoed by teachers in other focus groups: For a lot of teachers "it is materials to keep and they are not very clear about why this is an issue"; the new evaluation system is "all about paper."
 4. Representatives of the teachers' association told review team members that "no one quite understands the

new system” and “no one knows who is in charge.” They said that there was “lots of confusion” and that many teachers had had “great evaluations” in the past and were “nervous” and “anxious” about the new system.

5. The district lost eight administrators during the 2012-2013 school year (see the second Leadership and Governance and the first Curriculum and Instruction Challenge findings above), including two administrators in charge of training staff on the new system.
- D.** The district is instituting its new educator evaluation system in the place of an old system that did not provide frequent enough evaluations or evaluations that consistently promoted professional growth.
1. The district used a three-year evaluation cycle rather than a cycle of evaluation at least once every two years as required under state regulations for teachers with professional status.
 2. Even so, 31 percent of the 42 randomly selected teacher personnel files did not contain any evaluations for the last three years before the review.
 3. With the exception of one assistant principal, administrators had not been formally evaluated since 2008, in contravention of the requirement that they be evaluated every year.
 4. Of 26 teacher evaluations completed in a timely way, only 60 percent were informative and only 56 percent were instructive about improving performance. Of that group, only 7 percent recommended specific professional activities to promote professional growth.
 5. The evaluations reviewed by the team did not contain any connections to previous assessments, and did not indicate whether specific recommendations for improved performance had been followed.

Impact: Turnover in administrators has raised challenges for the district in implementing its new educator evaluation system and helping staff understand it and have confidence in it; particularly with the weak foundation provided by the previous evaluation system, these challenges stand in the way of making the new educator evaluation system a lever for districtwide improvement in teaching and learning.

14. The staff turnover the district has recently experienced has not been ameliorated with steps that could reduce the turnover and its resultant impact on teaching and learning.

- A.** The district has a recent history of staff losses due to budget reductions.
1. Administrative positions have been reduced every year since 2009.
 2. A written summary provided by the district to the review team indicated that there were 123 vacancies during that period. Many of these vacancies were because of layoffs.
 3. The director of guidance position, a key position in scheduling at the high school, was eliminated two years before the site visit. The job description for that position, reviewed by the visiting team, runs for eight pages. These former duties either were given to other staff, or lost to the district. Teachers at the high school said that this loss has been disruptive to scheduling.

4. According to the interim superintendent at the time of the review, data analysis had not previously driven budget decisions; thus staffing decisions had not been dependent on data about student needs. See first Assessment challenge finding above.

- B. As described in the Leadership and Governance portion of this report, the district has also experienced significant turnover in administrative staff, including turnover of superintendents. Despite a significant loss of key administrators, no exit interviews were conducted to collect data on why staff leave the district, in order to determine how to improve staff retention.
- C. The team found no evidence of a career ladder or program to prepare and support high-performing educators to take on leadership roles in preparation for administrative level positions, though school committee policies contain language (see Policy GCE) about not overlooking the talents and potential of individuals already employed by the school system.

Impact: Without conducting exit interviews of departing administrators and cultivating potential administrators among its employees, the district loses opportunities

- to take steps to prevent future losses of valued administrators, and
- to advance high-performing employees willing to make a commitment to the district.

15. The district did not have a current professional development plan at the time of the review. With no provision in the teachers' collective bargaining agreement for professional development time, a large proportion of professional development takes place while students are in school.

- A. The district professional development plan provided to the review team was for 2009-2013. Having been written before the inclusion in the regional district of the Freetown and Lakeville elementary districts, it did not reflect the regional district's current professional development needs.
- B. Interviews and a review of professional development schedules from September to June (2012-2013) indicated the following:
 - 1. Each month had a substantial schedule of well-organized meetings and workshops. In some months over 40 professional development events and meetings took place.
 - 2. A substantial amount of professional development has been directed at kindergarten through grade 5 with less provided for the upper grades.
- C. The Unit A collective bargaining agreement does not have an article entitled "Professional Development" and does not provide any time for professional development in Article III on Work Year and Schedules.
 - 1. Each teacher covered by the Unit A collective bargaining agreement, however, has both individual and "common" planning time scheduled. In interviews the team was told that minutes of common planning time were kept and the minutes were reviewed by the departing curriculum and grants coordinator, who was the author and supervisor of several professional development activities in the district. However, the team was

also told that the amount of common planning time in the district was insufficient (see first curriculum and instruction challenges finding above).

- D. A large proportion of professional development takes place when schools are in session. (Some training takes place during the summer, but attendance is voluntary.) Students are supervised by substitutes while teachers attend training sessions. However, the district has not assessed the impact of this practice on student learning.
- E. The district has created “curriculum leaders” to support its professional development efforts in classrooms. However, these staff positions have full-time teaching loads, leaving little time beyond informal contact to maintain high quality follow through in classrooms. Some of these positions were to be replaced in 2013-2014 (at the grade 6-12 levels) by staff with both teaching and administrative responsibilities, which would provide time for more follow-up and for curriculum leaders to be present in other teachers’ classrooms.
- F. In interviews the team was told that the recent focus on instructional improvement might not have made sufficient impact to be continued without strong and sustained coaching and mentoring support.

Impact: The district’s recent professional development has depended more on individuals than on an organized system for professional development with a current plan for professional development targeted at district needs and priorities, input into professional development planning from teachers and supervisors, and sufficient time for collaboration and professional development activities, including embedded professional development. Without such a system, it will be difficult for the district to sustain its efforts to improve student outcomes.

Finance and Asset Management

16. Communications and relationships among administrators and officials of the district and its member towns have been problematic, complicating the budget process and other financial matters, but the interim superintendent at the time of the review had taken some positive steps.

- A. Although the regional district existed before, incorporating the elementary school districts into the region means that district management, the budget process and negotiations on local appropriations, and facilities management changed in some respects.
 - 1. The interim superintendent at the time of the review had initiated a new budget process. The fiscal year 2014 budget was built from the bottom up in several tiers, with the first tier being the base instructional needs, taking student data into consideration, and succeeding tiers of one million dollar increments.
 - 2. In building the budget, administrators used a grid of services to track the needs of subgroups such as students with disabilities, allowing efficiencies.
 - 3. School committee members said that the superintendent and curriculum director were good at analyzing student data and putting it into an understandable format for informed decision-making.

4. Compared to the prior year budget process, administrators believed the information flow had improved. However, although administrators worked with the finance committees, select board members, school committee members and a representative from each town to build a projection of finances if taxes were not raised, some community members felt that budget information supporting the override request in Lakeville was not sufficiently clear.
 5. Representatives of one town said that there had not been adequate follow-up communication from the school district after the \$903,000 technology debt exclusion passed by the voters of both towns in September 2012. They also said that it was sometimes difficult to understand financial information that was provided, and that it would be desirable to have a format all parties could agree on.
- B.** Finance reports and the budget document provide information only by school, although the BudgetSense accounting system in use has the capability of generating additional useful reports and information.
- C.** The district and towns have not yet created an integrated facilities plan.
1. A three year capital plan for the regional district through fiscal year 2013 existed, but was largely unfunded.
 2. A number of the requests in the capital plan were so small that they should have been addressed in the maintenance budget request.

Impact: The transitions in governance, organization, and leadership have occurred with some level of conflict, which means there has not been a shared vision of what the district should be doing, with less focus on education. The district and member towns face the challenge of leaving history behind, creating a settled leadership, and building strong relationships and communication about finances as well as other issues.

Freetown-Lakeville RSD District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

1. **The school committee and the new superintendent should take steps to build their capacity to work together effectively in the best interest of the students in the school system.**
 - A. All school committee members who have not done so should participate in the mandated orientation workshop for school committee members conducted by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC).
 - B. The school committee might investigate the possibility of support for governance for Freetown-Lakeville from the MASC beyond the orientation workshop.
 - C. The superintendent should ensure that district planning documents and the district goals they contain are up-to-date and appropriate. School Improvement Plans and their goals should also be revised if necessary.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *District Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apr/review/district/district-self-assessment.pdf>) and *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apr/ucd/CSESelf-Assessment.pdf>) are tools designed to help districts and schools to assess systems, processes, and practices. These could be used to inform updated district and school improvement plans.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apr/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but would also be a useful reference as the district updates district and school improvement plans.

Benefits: Guidance for school committee members and the new superintendent will help them to further develop a common understanding of their respective roles. This will lead to a more effective partnership, with enhanced communication, more public confidence, and a more strategic commitment of resources toward improving instructional quality and raising student achievement. Up-to-date district planning documents will assist in achieving this more strategic commitment of resources as the school committee ensures that decision-making is guided by the district's current goals.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. New district and school leaders should continue to address the district's goals and objectives for curriculum and instruction in the Strategic Educational Plan (2010-2015), as updated (see previous recommendation).

The district should take the approach that curriculum, instruction, assessment, and the support of learning for all students are parts of a coherent educational system. Supervision, evaluation, and other work to improve teaching practices should all be continuously interwoven into the system in order to foster deeper student understanding and higher levels of student achievement.

- A.** To support ongoing curriculum development, new district and school leaders should build their skills at applying the principles of *Understanding by Design* (UbD). In order to support and monitor the effectiveness of teachers' work, they should understand the multiple interdependent practices that are integral to successfully teaching for understanding. Topics requiring leaders' expertise include: the three stages of a UbD curriculum; differentiated instruction; the design and use of multiple forms of assessments including performance tasks and applications of knowledge to provide data and evidence of student mastery; the use of student achievement data to inform curricular and instructional decision-making; and the design, implementation and monitoring of appropriate lesson plans, activities, and teaching materials.
 - 1. New district leaders should be able to support and guide the district's new department heads for grades 6-12 and the schools' other curriculum leaders PK-5 in developing, supporting, and monitoring the emerging practices.
 - 2. New school leaders, especially principals, should be able to support and monitor teachers. Principals should collaboratively guide teachers and monitor and evaluate their ability to develop and implement lessons that cultivate students' active learning and ability to think, solve problems, analyze, and make meaning of what they have learned. Principals should put in place ongoing strategies for providing feedback.
 - a. One strategy could be to establish a walkthrough protocol or walkthrough protocols as a way to observe instruction and to provide swift and useful feedback to teachers as a group on strengths and challenges as they continually improve and refine teaching practices.
- B.** The district should *collaboratively* articulate or review, clarify, and discuss the essential components of high-quality teaching that represent the district's teaching expectations. Teachers should use these strategies in planning, conducting, and improving their practice; reference to them should become a common vocabulary that teachers and leaders use to discuss and reflect upon teaching.
 - 1. A consistent lesson-planning template should be developed collaboratively with teachers. While there may be some variations depending on academic disciplines and levels, a similar format should still be recognizable across the district. The lesson plans should provide a structure to elaborate on the key elements of UbD curriculum units through all their stages and to address the diverse needs of all learners.

- C. The district should continue to provide professional development to help teachers master new teaching strategies and practices—for instance, strategies and practices for differentiation, collaborative learning, asking higher-order questions, assessment design, and data analysis.
- D. The district should keep stakeholders such as the school committee, parents, and community members, informed of its goals for the ongoing improvement of curriculum and instruction, the progress toward those goals, and its needs as it strives to attain them.

Recommended resources:

- ESE’s Model Curriculum Units (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/files.html>) were developed using the Understanding by Design process, and could be useful exemplars as the district continues to develop curriculum. Supplemental presentations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/resources/>) provide more information about the units.
- ESE’s *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *PBS LearningMedia* (<http://www.pbslearningmedia.org/>) is a free digital media content library that provides relevant educational resources for PreK-12 teachers. The flexible platform includes high-quality content tied to national curriculum standards, as well as professional development courses.
- ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. In particular, Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) could be useful as the district develops a common framework for teaching and learning.

Benefits: The pathway for curriculum and instruction articulated by district leaders in the recent years before the review team’s visit and represented in the Strategic Educational Plan 2010-2015 is based on best practice and is compatible with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. If Massachusetts adopts the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments to replace MCAS, the pathway will be compatible with PARCC assessments. With proper support and professional development for teachers, this new approach to curriculum and instruction has the potential to transform teaching and learning in the district by promoting and developing students’ conceptual knowledge and strengthening their thinking and analytical skills, thus preparing them for college and career success.

Assessment

- 3. In order to establish a culture of making systematic, continuous use of data to improve student achievement and inform all aspects of decision-making, the district should set clear and consistent expectations for leaders and teachers about the collection and use of data. A district data team would ensure that data on student achievement and program quality is disseminated to the appropriate stakeholders.**
 - A.** The district should create a district data team to analyze patterns and trends in student learning and behavior across the district. The team should make recommendations to district and school leadership about effective implementation of research-based practices at every level through the analysis of student performance data.
 - B.** At the elementary level, the district should continue building a culture of effectively using data to inform instruction, continuing its support of the effective model currently in use throughout all the elementary schools.
 - C.** The district should collaborate with secondary leaders to establish a parallel, coherent, and systematic approach to the effective use of data at the secondary level. District leaders should:
 1. Ensure that there is a common vision for and set of expectations about how data should guide teaching and learning at the secondary level.
 2. Determine what types of data at the secondary level (grades 7-12) will enable teachers in the content areas to more frequently and effectively monitor student learning and establish a system of data collection and dissemination that provides teachers with timely data of those types.
 3. Establish data teams at the secondary level charged with monitoring student achievement.
 4. Analyze the performance data of high-needs students, in order to:
 - a. better understand and address the factors that may be impeding their achievement and
 - b. design effective interventions, particularly at the middle school level.
 5. Provide staff at all levels with the training they need in order to use data to inform the content they teach and the instructional strategies they select.
 6. Extend the school's dissemination of student performance data to parents, particularly at the secondary level, through the use of a parent- and student -friendly information system.
 - D.** The district should ensure the systematic development and use of formative assessment practices aligned with the UbD curriculum at all levels. (There was no evidence that the teacher conducted frequent formative assessments in 35 percent of district classes visited by the review team, and only partial evidence in another 19 percent.)

Recommended resources:

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

Benefits: Implementation of these recommendations will provide teachers with the tools and support they need to monitor daily learning for each student and ensure that instruction is flexible and targeted to meet the needs of all learners. Further, these recommendations will help the district begin to address the requirements of the new educator evaluation system, ensuring consistent and reliable information about student learning to inform both summative ratings and student impact ratings. Finally, the dissemination of student performance and program evaluation data will help inform the school committee, parents, town officials, and the community at large about the district's progress toward its goals and the resources needed to achieve them. It will also help to build trust that spending targeted to specific student performance goals.

Human Resources and Professional Development

- 4. The district should continue the work of the already established labor management oversight committee to plan and oversee the implementation of the new educator evaluation system.**
 - A. The district should ensure that the committee has adequate representation among stakeholders, including teachers.
 - B. New administrators should be brought up to date about the educator evaluation system and provided with the required training for evaluators.
 - C. Educator evaluations should be done on schedule and in a way that consistently promotes professional growth.
 - D. The district should consider providing additional training about the new system in general, to allay teachers' anxiety and confusion and specifically to provide guidance about organizing evidence.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will help staff understand the new educator evaluation system and have confidence in it. It will also ensure that the new system is implemented in a smooth and timely fashion and used as a districtwide lever for improvement in teaching and learning.

5. The district should develop a succession planning/career ladder component to its human capital system, building on the standards of the new educator evaluation system.

- A.** The district should articulate a career ladder and the superintendent should establish a succession plan to identify and prepare qualified and interested in-district candidates with high potential for strong and competent administrative practice. If an employee was selected as an administrator and agreed to go through training, the employee would agree to commit to a certain amount of time in an administrative position.
- B.** The new educator evaluation regulations provide that licensed staff who receive high ratings be recognized and rewarded.²² They should have opportunities for professional growth and be considered for greater responsibility.
 - 1. Developing a career ladder that would recognize outstanding performance, not only as described in the educator evaluation regulations,²³ but also, for instance, by teachers who attain recognition from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, could result in a number of career pathways for educators.
 - 2. The existing labor management committee established to monitor the introduction of the new educator evaluation system could serve a valuable role in the development of a new career ladder.
 - 3. The teacher mentoring program the district had at the time of the onsite could be used as a model for an in-district administrator mentoring program, resulting in opportunities for experienced administrators to coach newly promoted administrators.
 - 4. The district should consider conducting exit interviews of key personnel who leave the district in order to determine their reasons for leaving and develop further strategies for retaining valuable staff members.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's Administrator Induction Programs web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/admins.html>) provides an overview of administrator induction programs and a link to the *Massachusetts Guidelines for Induction Programs*.
- The district may consider looking for succession planning/career ladder models from the following sources:
 - Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents (MASS) (<http://www.massupt.org/pages/MASS>)
 - Massachusetts Association of School Personnel Administrators (MASPA) (<http://www.maspaonline.org/>)

Benefits: Conducting exit interviews and developing an in-house career ladder are strategies that can help to mitigate the administrative turnover experienced by the district. In addition, by identifying the needs of the district and providing

²² "Educators whose summative performance rating is exemplary and whose impact on student learning is rated moderate or high shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement." 603 CMR 35.08(7).

²³ See previous footnote.

training and mentoring to qualified individuals, the district can build staff capacity to assume increasing responsibility and improve the motivation and retention of district employees.

6. The district should take the steps necessary to develop an organized system of professional development with:

- **a current plan for professional development targeted at district needs and priorities;**
- **input into professional development planning from teachers and supervisors; and**
- **increased time for collaboration and embedded professional development activities, with less need for coverage by substitutes and less lost class time for teachers.**

A. The district should set up a system, for instance a professional development committee, to:

1. gather information about professional development needs from teachers, supervisors, and others, including insights gained about those needs from walkthroughs and from the new educator evaluation system, and
2. plan and coordinate sustained professional development based on district priorities, as described in the district's updated planning documents (see Leadership and Governance recommendation above), that aligns with identified professional development needs.

B. The district should continue the practice in use at the time of the review visit of using common planning time for professional development, and it should take the steps necessary to increase the amount of common planning time available across the district, whether during the school day or after school.

C. It should also consider following up on the appointment of grade 6-12 academic department heads with a reduced teaching load by instituting a similar arrangement for K-5 curriculum leaders. These curriculum leaders can take an important role in leading curriculum initiatives and in improving instruction through embedded professional development.

D. The district may also want to find other ways to provide professional development in targeted areas, such as the following:

1. Teachers could attend district-endorsed outside courses and workshops in connection with their individual professional development plans and/or educator plans, as they work to attain goals aligned with district priorities.
2. External tuition reimbursement funds for professional development for re-licensing might be prioritized to ensure that courses taken by staff on their own time address district priority areas.
3. Grant funds could be used to cover costs of professional development time outside the work day.
4. The district might take the steps necessary to institute professional development days or half-days, as used in many other districts.

5. The district's mentoring program could be extended (with appropriate stipends included) to include advanced and remedial mentoring so as to make professional development in the district more nimble and flexible.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Common Planning Time Self-Assessment Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CPTtoolkit.pdf>) is a guide to help districts raise student achievement by building districts' capacity to support effective teacher instructional teams.
- As part of its work to enhance districts' capacity to implement and sustain effective practices, the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ssd/dsac/>) provides training and support for professional learning communities.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will lead to professional development that is more collaborative, better targeted to the district's needs and priorities, more closely linked with educator evaluation, and more sustained and effective. It will also decrease the amount of class time that teachers miss in order to participate in professional development.

Finance and Asset Management

7. The new superintendent and the school committee should continue to make improvements to the budget process and the budget presentation to town officials and the public, recognizing that the recent consolidation of three districts into one K-12 district requires a particular focus on clarity and communication.

- A. At the time of the review team's onsite, the interim superintendent had improved the flow of information during the budget process; this improvement should be continued. More work needs to be done on providing town officials and the public with an accessible and persuasive budget summary and presentation.
- B. Student data should inform the budget discussion, provided in an understandable format for informed decision-making. This practice was begun under the interim superintendent in 2012-2013. Expanding staff capacity for data analysis to guide educational decisions will support data-driven decision-making during the budget process (see Assessment recommendation above).

Recommended resource:

- *Smart School Budgeting* (<http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is The Rennie Center's summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.

Benefits: Improving the flow of information during the budget process will help reduce conflict and focus stakeholders on a shared vision of the district's goals. Improving the analysis of student data and using it to guide budget decisions (staffing decisions, for example) will help the district maximize the impact of its resources on student achievement.

- 8. The new superintendent should continue to consolidate the new K-12 district using key tools for management, planning, and communication.**
- A.** School committee members, and town officials as appropriate, should regularly receive robust financial reports making use of the full capabilities of the district's accounting system.
 - B.** The district should make sure that there is clear and ongoing communication with town governments and voters about the use of funds from the technology debt exclusion, and other special funding approved by the voters in debt exclusions and overrides.
 - C.** The superintendent should request that the school committee and town representatives work together to create an integrated facilities plan.

Benefits: Robust financial reports, clear follow-up communication about debt exclusions and overrides, and integrated facilities planning will contribute to a shared understanding among stakeholders of the status of finances and facilities in the district and provide a firm foundation for future decisions about budget, facilities, and other financial matters.

Implementing this recommendation and the previous one will help in addressing the challenge the district and towns face of leaving history behind, creating a settled leadership, and building strong relationships and communication about finances as well as other issues.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from May 28-31, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Owen Conway, leadership and governance
2. Linda Greyser, curriculum and instruction
3. Christine Brandt, review team coordinator, assessment
4. Thomas Johnson, human resources and professional development
5. Evangeline Stefanakis, student support
6. Richard Scortino, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: director of finance and operations, assistant business director, facilities manager, and town officials from Freetown and Lakeville.

The team conducted interviews with two members of the school committee.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: interim superintendent, curriculum and grants coordinator, and director of student services.

The team visited the following schools: Apponequet Regional High School (grades 9-12), Freetown-Lakeville Middle School (grades 6-8), G.R. Austin Intermediate School (grades 4-5), Assawompset Elementary School (K-3), and Freetown Elementary School (PK-3).

During school visits, the team conducted focus groups with 3 elementary school teachers, 12 intermediate and middle school teachers, and 8 high school teachers.

The team observed 62 classes in the district: 18 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 29 at the elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

| Monday 5/28/13 | Tuesday 5/29/13 | Wednesday 5/30/13 | Thursday 5/31/13 |
|--|--|---|---|
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Apponequet High School, Freetown and Assawompset elementary schools and G. R. Austin Intermediate School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Apponequet High School, Freetown and Assawompset elementary schools, G. R. Austin Intermediate School, and Freetown-Lakeville Middle School for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Apponequet High School, Freetown and Assawompset elementary schools, G. R. Austin Intermediate School, and Freetown-Lakeville Middle School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

**Table B1a: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

| Student Group | District | Percent of Total | State | Percent of Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Asian | 30 | 1.0% | 56,517 | 5.9% |
| Afr. Amer./Black | 29 | 0.9% | 81,806 | 8.6% |
| Hispanic/ Latino | 41 | 1.3% | 156,976 | 16.4% |
| Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat. | 44 | 1.4% | 26,012 | 2.7% |
| Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl. | 2 | 0.1% | 1,020 | 0.1% |
| White | 2,903 | 95.0% | 630,150 | 66.0% |
| All students | 3,055 | 100.0% | 954,773 | 100.0% |

Note: As of October 1, 2012

**Table B1b: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

| Student Group | District | | | State | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | N | Percent of High Needs | Percent of District | N | Percent of High Needs | Percent of State |
| Students w/ disabilities | 477 | 58.4% | 15.5% | 163,921 | 35.5% | 17.0% |
| Low income | 456 | 55.8% | 14.9% | 353,420 | 76.5% | 37.0% |
| ELL and Former ELL | 7 | 0.9% | 0.2% | 95,865 | 20.7% | 10.0% |
| All high needs students | 817 | -- | 26.5% | 462,272 | -- | 47.9% |

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 3,078; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending
Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

| | FY11 | | FY12 | | FY13 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated |
| Expenditures | | | | | |
| From school committee budget | 22,768,363 | 22,760,818 | 33,449,477 | 32,866,607 | 34,003,267 |
| From revolving funds and grants | --- | 2,345,305 | --- | 3,465,095 | --- |
| Total expenditures | --- | 25,106,123 | --- | 36,331,702 | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid* | --- | 6,980,661 | --- | 10,359,748 | 10,478,788 |
| Required local contribution | --- | 10,686,706 | --- | 16,827,381 | 17,448,621 |
| Required net school spending** | --- | 17,667,367 | --- | 27,187,129 | 27,927,409 |
| Actual net school spending | --- | 17,675,367 | --- | 26,975,257 | 27,993,045 |
| Over/under required (\$) | --- | 8,000 | --- | -211,872 | 65,636 |
| Over/under required (%) | --- | 0.0 | --- | -0.8 | 0.2 |

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

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

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

Data retrieved April 1, 2014

**Table B3: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010–2012**

| Expenditure Category | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Administration | \$283.45 | \$310.16 | \$309.14 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | \$579.05 | \$616.73 | \$517.69 |
| Teachers | \$4,749.88 | \$4,390.82 | \$4,105.13 |
| Other teaching services | \$595.44 | \$599.34 | \$699.50 |
| Professional development | \$29.11 | \$78.39 | \$83.53 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | \$290.07 | \$290.65 | \$170.67 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | \$452.12 | \$436.33 | \$314.95 |
| Pupil services | \$1,143.17 | \$1,440.99 | \$1,062.67 |
| Operations and maintenance | \$1,077.89 | \$1,072.74 | \$801.55 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | \$1,875.28 | \$1,997.39 | \$1,632.54 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | \$11,075 | \$11,234 | \$9,697 |

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

Table B4a: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | | | 2012 Performance (CPI, SGP) |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend | Potentially Meaningful? | |
| 3 | CPI | 243 | -- | -- | -- | 89.1 | -- | -- | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 243 | -- | -- | -- | 69% | -- | -- | | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 244 | -- | -- | -- | 83.8 | -- | -- | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 244 | -- | -- | -- | 61% | -- | -- | | -- |
| | SGP | 226 | -- | -- | --- | 56.0 | -- | -- | | Moderate |
| 5 | CPI | 244 | 86.7 | 87.6 | 90.3 | 86.6 | -0.1 | -3.7 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 244 | 65% | 69% | 76% | 69% | 4 | -7 | | -- |
| | SGP | 237 | 55.0 | 56.5 | 67.0 | 56.0 | 1.0 | -11.0 | | Moderate |
| 6 | CPI | 264 | 89.9 | 90.8 | 92.9 | 89.5 | -0.4 | -3.4 | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 264 | 76% | 75% | 81% | 77% | 1 | -4 | | -- |
| | SGP | 254 | 54.5 | 66.0 | 72.0 | 61.5 | 7.0 | -10.5 | | High |
| 7 | CPI | 252 | 93.4 | 94.0 | 91.5 | 90.8 | -2.6 | -0.7 | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 252 | 82% | 84% | 79% | 76% | -6 | -3 | | -- |
| | SGP | 241 | 66.0 | 53.5 | 51.0 | 40.0 | -26.0 | -11.0 | | Low |
| 8 | CPI | 301 | 96.3 | 94.8 | 94.6 | 95.7 | -0.6 | 1.1 | -- | High |
| | P+ | 301 | 90% | 85% | 87% | 89% | -1 | 2 | | -- |
| | SGP | 288 | 62.0 | 57.5 | 49.0 | 66.5 | 4.5 | 17.5 | | High |
| 10 | CPI | 220 | 97.7 | 96.5 | 95.6 | 98.4 | 0.7 | 2.8 | -- | High |
| | P+ | 220 | 93% | 89% | 89% | 95% | 2 | 6 | | -- |
| | SGP | 208 | 60.0 | 62.0 | 50.0 | 52.5 | -7.5 | 2.5 | | Moderate |
| All | CPI | 1,768 | 92.4 | 92.6 | 92.8 | 90.6 | -1.8 | -2.2 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 1,768 | 80% | 80% | 82% | 77% | -3 | -5 | | -- |
| | SGP | 1,454 | 59.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 55.0 | -4.0 | -3.0 | | Moderate |

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 9 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

**Table B4b: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Mathematics Performance, 2009-2012**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | | | 2012 Performance (CPI, SGP) |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend | Potentially Meaningful? | |
| 3 | CPI | 243 | -- | -- | -- | 86.0 | -- | -- | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 243 | -- | -- | -- | 68% | -- | -- | | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 244 | -- | -- | -- | 84.7 | -- | -- | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 244 | -- | -- | -- | 59% | -- | -- | | -- |
| | SGP | 227 | -- | -- | -- | 55.0 | -- | -- | | Moderate |
| 5 | CPI | 244 | 78.6 | 81.8 | 84.2 | 87.2 | 8.6 | 3.0 | Yes | High |
| | P+ | 244 | 57% | 60% | 68% | 73% | 16 | 5 | | -- |
| | SGP | 236 | 59.0 | 56.0 | 72.0 | 80.5 | 21.5 | 8.5 | | High |
| 6 | CPI | 266 | 80.9 | 80.2 | 84.2 | 85.0 | 4.1 | 0.8 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 266 | 60% | 56% | 65% | 64% | 4 | -1 | | -- |
| | SGP | 255 | 48.0 | 40.5 | 50.5 | 43.0 | -5.0 | -7.5 | | Moderate |
| 7 | CPI | 252 | 78.9 | 78.0 | 69.5 | 81.2 | 2.3 | 11.7 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 252 | 57% | 57% | 43% | 57% | 0 | 14 | | -- |
| | SGP | 242 | 64.0 | 43.0 | 34.0 | 49.0 | -15.0 | 15.0 | | Moderate |
| 8 | CPI | 300 | 82.4 | 82.9 | 79.6 | 80.8 | -1.6 | 1.2 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 300 | 63% | 63% | 59% | 57% | -6 | -2 | | -- |
| | SGP | 289 | 70.5 | 60.5 | 66.0 | 75.0 | 4.5 | 9.0 | | High |
| 10 | CPI | 222 | 93.1 | 94.2 | 91.8 | 94.4 | 1.3 | 2.6 | Yes | High |
| | P+ | 222 | 83% | 86% | 82% | 88% | 5 | 6 | | -- |
| | SGP | 211 | 58.0 | 62.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | -5.0 | 0.0 | | Moderate |
| All | CPI | 1,771 | 82.2 | 82.8 | 80.9 | 85.3 | 3.1 | 4.4 | Yes | Moderate |
| | P+ | 1,771 | 63% | 63% | 62% | 66% | 3 | 4 | | -- |
| | SGP | 1,460 | 60.0 | 51.5 | 56.0 | 61.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | | High |

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 9 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Table B4c: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | | | 2012 Performance (CPI) |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend | Potentially Meaningful? | |
| 5 | CPI | 244 | 85.2 | 87.5 | 87.9 | 89.3 | 4.1 | 1.4 | Yes | High |
| | P+ | 244 | 62% | 65% | 68% | 74% | 12 | 6 | | -- |
| 8 | CPI | 300 | 75.1 | 74.9 | 80.6 | 78.3 | 3.2 | -2.3 | -- | Moderate |
| | P+ | 300 | 42% | 39% | 54% | 48% | 6 | -6 | | -- |
| 10 | CPI | 211 | 90.3 | 93.3 | 95.3 | 95.6 | 5.3 | 0.3 | -- | Very High |
| | P+ | 211 | 75% | 83% | 87% | 86% | 11 | -1 | | -- |
| All | CPI | 755 | 83.4 | 83.9 | 86.8 | 86.7 | 3.3 | -0.1 | -- | High |
| | P+ | 755 | 59% | 59% | 67% | 67% | 8 | 0 | | -- |

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 9 in the Student Performance section above.

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

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|---|----------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| High needs | District | CPI | 473 | 77.8 | 79.5 | 79.7 | 76.5 | -1.3 | -3.2 |
| | | P+ | 473 | 49% | 50% | 54% | 48% | -1 | -6 |
| | | SGP | 376 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 | 46.0 | -8 | -7 |
| | State | CPI | 235,274 | 75.3 | 76.1 | 77.0 | 76.5 | 1.2 | -0.5 |
| | | P+ | 235,274 | 44% | 45% | 48% | 48% | 4 | 0 |
| | | SGP | 177,720 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 1 | 0 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 245 | 81.3 | 81.0 | 82.6 | 80.2 | -1.1 | -2.4 |
| | | P+ | 245 | 57% | 58% | 60% | 56% | -1 | -4 |
| | | SGP | 194 | 55.0 | 54.0 | 58.0 | 48.0 | -7.0 | -10.0 |
| | State | CPI | 180,261 | 75.5 | 76.5 | 77.1 | 76.7 | 1.2 | -0.4 |
| | | P+ | 180,261 | 45% | 47% | 49% | 50% | 5 | 1 |
| | | SGP | 137,185 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 312 | 72.1 | 74.2 | 73.8 | 70.3 | -1.8 | -3.5 |
| | | P+ | 312 | 38% | 37% | 42% | 37% | -1 | -5 |
| | | SGP | 245 | 51.0 | 50.5 | 49.5 | 45.0 | -6.0 | -4.5 |
| | State | CPI | 91,757 | 67.8 | 67.3 | 68.3 | 67.3 | -0.5 | -1.0 |
| | | P+ | 91,757 | 28% | 28% | 30% | 31% | 3 | 1 |
| | | SGP | 66,785 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 42.0 | 43.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| English language learners & Former ELLs | District | CPI | 4 | -- | 0.0 | -- | 0.0 | -- | -- |
| | | P+ | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | State | CPI | 45,367 | 64.8 | 66.1 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| | | P+ | 45,367 | 30% | 32% | 33% | 34% | 4 | 1 |
| | | SGP | 29,933 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 51.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 1,768 | 92.4 | 92.6 | 92.8 | 90.6 | -1.8 | -2.2 |
| | | P+ | 1,768 | 80% | 80% | 82% | 77% | -3 | -5 |
| | | SGP | 1,454 | 59.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 55.0 | -4.0 | -3.0 |
| | State | CPI | 497,549 | 86.5 | 86.9 | 87.2 | 86.7 | 0.2 | -0.5 |
| | | P+ | 497,549 | 67% | 68% | 69% | 69% | 2 | 0 |
| | | SGP | 395,772 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

Table B5b: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|--|----------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| High needs | District | CPI | 476 | 59.8 | 63.7 | 60.2 | 66.9 | 7.1 | 6.7 |
| | | P+ | 476 | 28% | 32% | 32% | 33% | 5 | 1 |
| | | SGP | 380 | 52.0 | 49.0 | 50.0 | 49.0 | -3.0 | -1.0 |
| | State | CPI | 235,612 | 64.5 | 66.7 | 67.1 | 67.0 | 2.5 | -0.1 |
| | | P+ | 235,612 | 32% | 36% | 37% | 37% | 5 | 0 |
| | | SGP | 178,144 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 247 | 65.3 | 68.0 | 65.3 | 71.1 | 5.8 | 5.8 |
| | | P+ | 247 | 35% | 40% | 37% | 40% | 5 | 3 |
| | | SGP | 195 | 46.5 | 50.0 | 53.0 | 50.0 | 3.5 | -3.0 |
| | State | CPI | 180,433 | 64.5 | 67.1 | 67.3 | 67.3 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| | | P+ | 180,433 | 33% | 37% | 38% | 38% | 5 | 0 |
| | | SGP | 137,529 | 44.0 | 47.0 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 1.0 | -1.0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 313 | 53.4 | 56.7 | 53.4 | 59.7 | 6.3 | 6.3 |
| | | P+ | 313 | 21% | 22% | 25% | 23% | 2 | -2 |
| | | SGP | 248 | 52.0 | 47.0 | 41.0 | 48.0 | -4.0 | 7.0 |
| | State | CPI | 91,876 | 56.9 | 57.5 | 57.7 | 56.9 | 0.0 | -0.8 |
| | | P+ | 91,876 | 20% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| | | SGP | 66,876 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English language learners & Former ELLs | District | CPI | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | P+ | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | State | CPI | 45,695 | 59.2 | 61.5 | 62.0 | 61.6 | 2.4 | -0.4 |
| | | P+ | 45,695 | 29% | 31% | 32% | 32% | 3 | 0 |
| | | SGP | 30,189 | 49.0 | 54.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 1,771 | 82.2 | 82.8 | 80.9 | 85.3 | 3.1 | 4.4 |
| | | P+ | 1,771 | 63% | 63% | 62% | 66% | 3 | 4 |
| | | SGP | 1,460 | 60.0 | 51.5 | 56.0 | 61.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| | State | CPI | 497,984 | 78.5 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| | | P+ | 497,984 | 56% | 58% | 58% | 59% | 3 | 1 |
| | | SGP | 396,357 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

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

Table B5c: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2012) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|---|----------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| High needs | District | CPI | 188 | 67.8 | 68.3 | 73.0 | 70.7 | 2.9 | -2.3 |
| | | P+ | 188 | 29% | 29% | 40% | 36% | 7 | -4 |
| | State | CPI | 97,010 | 62.1 | 64.3 | 63.8 | 65.0 | 2.9 | 1.2 |
| | | P+ | 97,010 | 25% | 28% | 28% | 31% | 6 | 3 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 98 | 66.0 | 66.8 | 76.9 | 75.0 | 9 | -1.9 |
| | | P+ | 98 | 28% | 30% | 51% | 43% | 15 | -8 |
| | State | CPI | 74,300 | 61.1 | 63.6 | 62.8 | 64.5 | 3.4 | 1.7 |
| | | P+ | 74,300 | 25% | 28% | 28% | 31% | 6 | 3 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 124 | 65.2 | 66.4 | 68.1 | 63.9 | -1.3 | -4.2 |
| | | P+ | 124 | 26% | 24% | 31% | 27% | 1 | -4 |
| | State | CPI | 38,590 | 58.1 | 59.0 | 59.2 | 58.7 | 0.6 | -0.5 |
| | | P+ | 38,590 | 18% | 19% | 20% | 20% | 2 | 0 |
| English language learners & Former ELLs | District | CPI | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | P+ | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | State | CPI | 15,271 | 50.8 | 51.8 | 50.3 | 51.4 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| | | P+ | 15,271 | 15% | 16% | 15% | 17% | 2 | 2 |
| All students | District | CPI | 755 | 83.4 | 83.9 | 86.8 | 86.7 | 3.3 | -0.1 |
| | | P+ | 755 | 59% | 59% | 67% | 67% | 8 | 0 |
| | State | CPI | 211,464 | 76.8 | 78.3 | 77.6 | 78.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 |
| | | P+ | 211,464 | 50% | 52% | 52% | 54% | 4 | 2 |

Notes: 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 B6: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012

| | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2009-2012 | | Change 2011-2012 | | State (2012) |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Percentage Points | Percent | Percentage Points | Percent | |
| All students | 1.8% | 2.0% | 1.7% | 1.2% | -0.6 | -33.3% | -0.5 | -29.4% | 2.5% |

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

**Table B7a: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

| Group | Number Included (2012) | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2009-2012 | | Change 2011-2012 | | State (2012) |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Percentage Points | Percent | Percentage Points | Percent | |
| High needs | 70 | 72.9% | 68.1% | 76.8% | 77.1% | 4.2 | 5.8% | 0.3 | 0.4% | 74.1% |
| Low income | 37 | 67.7% | 58.5% | 65.5% | 67.6% | -0.1 | -0.1% | 2.1 | 3.2% | 72.4% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 45 | 69.4% | 68.8% | 80.0% | 80.0% | 10.6 | 15.3% | 0.0 | 0.0% | 68.6% |
| English language learners (ELLs) & Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61.1% |
| All students | 199 | 89.3% | 87.5% | 92.5% | 92.0% | 2.7 | 3.0% | -0.5 | -0.5% | 84.7% |

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

**Table B7b: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011**

| Group | Number Included (2011) | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2008-2011 | | Change 2010-2011 | | State (2011) |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | Percentage Points | Percent | Percentage Points | Percent | |
| High needs | 56 | 80.9% | 76.3% | 73.6% | 78.6% | -2.3 | -2.9% | 5.0 | 6.8% | 76.5% |
| Low income | 29 | 78.9% | 67.7% | 65.9% | 69.0% | -9.9 | -12.5% | 3.1 | 4.7% | 75.0% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 40 | 76.5% | 75.0% | 75.0% | 82.5% | 6.0 | 7.8% | 7.5 | 10.0% | 70.8% |
| English language learners (ELLs) & Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 64.2% |
| All students | 213 | 89.0% | 91.1% | 89.4% | 93.0% | 4.0 | 4.5% | 3.6 | 4.0% | 86.3% |

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

**Table B8: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Attendance Rates, 2009-2012**

| | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2009-2012 | | Change 2011-2012 | | State (2012) |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Percentage Points | Percent | Percentage Points | Percent | |
| All Students | 96.0% | 95.9% | 96.1% | 96.0% | 0.0 | 0.0% | -0.1 | 0.1% | 94.9% |

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

**Table B9: Freetown-Lakeville RSD
Suspension Rates, 2009-2012**

| Group | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2009-2012 | | Change 2011-2012 | | State (2012) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Points | Percent | Percentage Points | Percent | |
| In-School Suspension Rate | 8.1% | 7.1% | 7.5% | 2.6% | -5.5 | -67.9% | -4.9 | -65.3% | 3.4% |
| Out-of-School Suspension Rate | 5.4% | 5.3% | 4.3% | 3.3% | -2.1 | -38.9% | -1.0 | -23.3% | 5.4% |

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

| Learning Environment | By Grade Span | Evidence | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------------|----|----|
| | | None | Partial | Clear & Consistent | By Indicator | | |
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | # | % | |
| 1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful. | ES | 0 | 2 | 27 | (0) | 1 | 2 |
| | MS | 0 | 0 | 15 | (1) | 4 | 6 |
| | HS | 1 | 2 | 15 | (2) | 57 | 92 |
| 2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably. | ES | 3 | 2 | 24 | (0) | 7 | 11 |
| | MS | 2 | 1 | 12 | (1) | 7 | 13 |
| | HS | 2 | 4 | 12 | (2) | 48 | 77 |
| 3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities. | ES | 1 | 1 | 27 | (0) | 3 | 5 |
| | MS | 1 | 0 | 14 | (1) | 6 | 10 |
| | HS | 1 | 5 | 12 | (2) | 53 | 85 |
| 4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations. | ES | 4 | 9 | 16 | (0) | 13 | 21 |
| | MS | 2 | 4 | 9 | (1) | 17 | 27 |
| | HS | 7 | 4 | 7 | (2) | 32 | 52 |
| 5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented. | ES | 0 | 0 | 29 | (0) | 11 | 18 |
| | MS | 3 | 2 | 10 | (1) | 4 | 6 |
| | HS | 8 | 2 | 8 | (2) | 47 | 76 |
| 6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs. | ES | 7 | 5 | 17 | (0) | 18 | 29 |
| | MS | 7 | 2 | 6 | (1) | 15 | 24 |
| | HS | 4 | 8 | 6 | (2) | 29 | 47 |
| 7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities. | ES | 0 | 2 | 27 | (0) | 2 | 3 |
| | MS | 0 | 2 | 13 | (1) | 12 | 19 |
| | HS | 2 | 8 | 8 | (2) | 48 | 77 |

(Please see next page)

| Teaching | By Grade Span | Evidence | | | | | |
|---|---------------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------------|----|----|
| | | None | Partial | Clear & Consistent | By Indicator | | |
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | # | % | |
| 8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content. | ES | 2 | 2 | 25 | (0) | 3 | 5 |
| | MS | 1 | 3 | 11 | (1) | 9 | 14 |
| | HS | 0 | 4 | 14 | (2) | 50 | 81 |
| 9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident. | ES | 10 | 8 | 12 | (0) | 20 | 32 |
| | MS | 5 | 3 | 7 | (1) | 17 | 27 |
| | HS | 5 | 6 | 7 | (2) | 26 | 42 |
| 10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content. | ES | 8 | 4 | 17 | (0) | 21 | 34 |
| | MS | 6 | 1 | 8 | (1) | 8 | 13 |
| | HS | 7 | 3 | 8 | (2) | 33 | 53 |
| 11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills) | ES | 8 | 5 | 16 | (0) | 22 | 35 |
| | MS | 7 | 2 | 6 | (1) | 13 | 21 |
| | HS | 7 | 6 | 5 | (2) | 27 | 43 |
| 12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding. | ES | 10 | 5 | 14 | (0) | 23 | 37 |
| | MS | 5 | 4 | 6 | (1) | 13 | 21 |
| | HS | 8 | 4 | 6 | (2) | 26 | 42 |
| 13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs. | ES | 12 | 7 | 10 | (0) | 26 | 42 |
| | MS | 6 | 4 | 5 | (1) | 17 | 27 |
| | HS | 8 | 6 | 4 | (2) | 19 | 31 |
| 14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding. | ES | 3 | 8 | 18 | (0) | 10 | 16 |
| | MS | 4 | 2 | 9 | (1) | 17 | 27 |
| | HS | 3 | 7 | 8 | (2) | 35 | 56 |
| 15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction. | ES | 9 | 4 | 16 | (0) | 22 | 35 |
| | MS | 6 | 3 | 6 | (1) | 12 | 19 |
| | HS | 7 | 5 | 6 | (2) | 28 | 45 |
| 16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning. | ES | 24 | 3 | 2 | (0) | 46 | 75 |
| | MS | 11 | 1 | 3 | (1) | 7 | 11 |
| | HS | 11 | 3 | 4 | (2) | 9 | 14 |

(Please see next page)

| Learning | By Grade Span | Evidence | | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------|---------|--------------------|--------------|----|----|
| | | None | Partial | Clear & Consistent | By Indicator | | |
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | # | % | |
| 17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines. | ES | 4 | 6 | 19 | (0) | 12 | 19 |
| | MS | 3 | 3 | 9 | (1) | 14 | 23 |
| | HS | 5 | 5 | 8 | (2) | 36 | 58 |
| 18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks. | ES | 6 | 13 | 10 | (0) | 13 | 21 |
| | MS | 4 | 4 | 7 | (1) | 26 | 42 |
| | HS | 3 | 9 | 6 | (2) | 23 | 37 |
| 19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning. | ES | 3 | 8 | 18 | (0) | 5 | 8 |
| | MS | 1 | 2 | 12 | (1) | 20 | 32 |
| | HS | 1 | 10 | 7 | (2) | 37 | 60 |
| 20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups. | ES | 12 | 4 | 13 | (0) | 29 | 47 |
| | MS | 10 | 1 | 4 | (1) | 9 | 14 |
| | HS | 7 | 4 | 7 | (2) | 24 | 39 |
| 21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses). | ES | 14 | 5 | 10 | (0) | 33 | 53 |
| | MS | 8 | 3 | 4 | (1) | 11 | 18 |
| | HS | 11 | 3 | 4 | (2) | 18 | 29 |
| 22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter. | ES | 12 | 3 | 14 | (0) | 25 | 40 |
| | MS | 5 | 4 | 6 | (1) | 12 | 19 |
| | HS | 8 | 5 | 5 | (2) | 25 | 40 |
| 23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding. | ES | 25 | 2 | 2 | (0) | 48 | 77 |
| | MS | 11 | 2 | 2 | (1) | 6 | 10 |
| | HS | 12 | 2 | 4 | (2) | 8 | 13 |
| 24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars. | ES | 19 | 7 | 3 | (0) | 39 | 63 |
| | MS | 8 | 4 | 3 | (1) | 14 | 23 |
| | HS | 12 | 3 | 3 | (2) | 9 | 14 |