

Comprehensive District Review Report



Monomoy Regional School District

Review conducted November 14-17, 2016

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 1 |
| Monomoy Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Overview | 3 |
| Leadership and Governance | 15 |
| Curriculum and Instruction | 20 |
| Assessment | 26 |
| Human Resources and Professional Development..... | 29 |
| Student Support..... | 34 |
| Financial and Asset Management..... | 39 |
| Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Review..... | 41 |
| Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures | 43 |
| Appendix C: Instructional Inventory | 53 |

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone 781-338-3000



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

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

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.

© 2017 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



Executive Summary

In 2010, the school districts of Harwich and Chatham agreed to merge in order to form the Monomoy Regional School District. Since then district leaders have worked to create a unified school district. Bargaining units and administrators have established uniform employment agreements, and an essentially new leadership team was formed as schools opened and closed. Regionalization has been implemented well and has been accepted by most stakeholders; each town is seeing benefits to the agreement that was many years in the making. Both communities enjoy modern and well-maintained facilities. Students benefit from the increased access to programming that regionalization provides at the high school.

The district spends above the state average in per-pupil expenditures and has used this financial support to build a solid foundation for the district. For instance, investments have been made in new curriculum, assessments (in materials and staffing), and professional development. Also, the district has prioritized support for struggling students and strategically supports professional growth and development for all staff. However, the district is not meeting its targets toward narrowing achievement gaps.

As part of the site visit, the review team observed 63 classes throughout the district: 18 at Monomoy Regional High School, 18 at Monomoy Regional Middle School, and 27 at the two elementary schools. The review team observed 24 ELA classes, 22 mathematics classes, and 19 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education classes, two English language learner (ELL) classes, and one career/technical education class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

In observed classrooms instruction was largely conducted at a low cognitive skill level. While students and staff were largely respectful and positive, students were not sufficiently challenged. Most observed instruction was teacher centered and students generally were not actively engaged in their learning.

Strengths

The district has established a solid foundation upon which to build stronger instructional practices, as well as systems of student assessment and support. The strong foundation was apparent in each of the standards reviewed by the team.

The school committee and administrators have developed aligned planning documents that help to focus the district on common work. The collegiality of the administrative team and the coordination of planning efforts are an important part of the foundation that the district has established. Further, the superintendent, school committee, and town officials have developed a positive working relationship between member towns and the district. The result is that the Monomoy Regional School District has a transparent and open budget process, and a well-funded school system.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

The district has not developed a sufficient system of accountability to ensure that its stated intentions are realized in practice. For instance, in the area of curriculum and instruction, the review team noted evidence of a well-documented curriculum; however, in the 63 classes observed in all district schools, the team found little evidence that the stated curriculum informed classroom instruction. Instead, the review team observed inconsistencies in the quality of instruction and limited implementation of the district's stated instructional priorities. A similar disconnect between stated intentions and practice was found in the team's review of the human resources and professional development standard. While the district has provided multiple professional development opportunities and structures to promote professional learning, the review team found little evidence that the district has leveraged its educator evaluation system to ensure improved outcomes for teachers and students.

The district has also not used data to promote improved student achievement. The district has not used performance data to establish its instructional and intervention priorities, compromising the effectiveness of student support structures. Without using performance benchmarks to inform instruction and student support, the district's ability to improve student achievement is limited.

Recommendations

The district should continue working to use data systematically as it establishes its priorities, promotes a culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation, and refines instruction and student support. A critical analysis of data and the establishment of clear improvement targets could serve as the glue that binds together the strong organizational work that Harwich and Chatham have done in the establishment of the Monomoy Regional School District.

Monomoy Public Schools Comprehensive District Review

Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2016–2017 school year include districts classified as Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priorities for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards. A review team consisting of independent consultants, with expertise in each of the district standards, reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The review team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with stakeholders—school committee members, teachers’ association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. After the onsite review, the review team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE.

Review

The review of the Monomoy Regional School District was conducted from November 14–17, 2016. The review included 29.5 hours of interviews and focus group sessions with approximately 95 stakeholders. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 13 elementary school teachers, 11 middle-school teachers, and 12 high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the review schedule are in Appendix A. Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The review team observed instructional practice in 63 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. These data are contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

In December 2010, concurrent special town meeting votes in Harwich and Chatham created the Monomoy Regional School District. District schools were brought under the leadership of an interim superintendent in the spring of 2011 and the first superintendent was appointed in 2013.

In 2011 the district began consolidating and modernizing its schools. Construction for a new high school was approved by voters in 2011 and construction began in March 2013. In September 2014 the regional high school opened and Harwich Middle School and Harwich High School were closed. A regional middle school opened in the former Chatham Middle-High School.

School committee members are elected: four from Chatham and four from Harwich. Because of the sizes of the towns and the regional agreement developed, Chatham resident members have a half vote and Harwich members have a full vote. Neither town manager sits on the school committee, and the committee's leadership alternates between towns each term. The eight members of the school committee meet bi-monthly with few exceptions.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 1, 2013. The district leadership team includes the superintendent; the business manager; the director of student services; the director of curriculum, instruction and assessment, the director of instructional technology; and high school, middle school, and two elementary school principals. The district has four principals leading four schools. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number since the full consolidation of the new district in 2013. There are 14 department heads, 19 teacher leaders, and other school administrators, including four assistant principals. In the 2015–2016 school year, there were 170 teachers in the district.

In the 2015–2016 school year, 1,931 students were enrolled in the district's 4 schools:

**Table 1: Monomoy Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015–2016**

| School Name | School Type | Grades Served | Enrollment |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Harwich Elementary | EES | Pre-K–4 | 597 |
| Chatham Elementary | EES | Pre-K–4 | 270 |
| Monomoy Regional Middle School | MS | 5–7 | 437 |
| Monomoy Regional High School | HS | 8–12 | 627 |
| Totals | 4 schools | Pre-K–12 | 1,931 |
| *As of October 1, 2015 | | | |

Between 2013 and 2016, overall student enrollment increased by 2.7 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged

students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELL students are compared with the state in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: \$16,587, compared with a median of \$13,140 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Monomoy Regional is a Level 2 district because all its schools are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and high needs students.

**Table 2: Monomoy Regional School District
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016**

| School | Group | Annual PPI | | | | Cumulative PPI | School Percentile | Accountability Level |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | | | |
| Chatham ES | All | 38 | 75 | -- | 25 | 41 | 36 | 2 |
| | High Needs | 63 | 25 | 63 | 17 | 37 | | |
| Harwich ES | All | 69 | 31 | -- | 63 | 54 | 37 | 2 |
| | High Needs | 13 | 44 | -- | 69 | 54 | | |
| Monomoy Regional MS | All | 85 | 55 | -- | 65 | 65 | 59 | 2 |
| | High Needs | 90 | 30 | 60 | 65 | 59 | | |
| Monomoy Regional HS | All | 57 | 61 | -- | 86 | 74 | 47 | 2 |
| | High Needs | 71 | 43 | -- | 46 | 49 | | |
| District | All | 57 | 54 | -- | 57 | 56 | -- | 2 |
| | High Needs | 61 | 32 | -- | 46 | 44 | | |

Between 2015 and 2016, the percentage of all students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 1 percentage point in ELA and improved by 8 percentage points in math.

- In ELA the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 3 and 4 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively.
- In math the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 6 and 7 percentage points for high needs students and economically disadvantaged students, respectively, and by 4 and 3 percentage points for ELL and former ELL students and students with disabilities, respectively.

**Table 3: Monomoy Regional School District
ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (Grades 3–8) 2015–2016**

| Group | ELA | | | Math | | |
|-----------------------------|------|------|--------|------|------|--------|
| | 2015 | 2016 | Change | 2015 | 2016 | Change |
| All students | 54% | 53% | -1 | 40% | 48% | 8 |
| High Needs | 35% | 32% | -3 | 27% | 33% | 6 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 39% | 39% | 0 | 31% | 38% | 7 |
| ELL and former ELL students | 34% | 35% | 1 | 26% | 30% | 4 |
| Students with disabilities | 15% | 11% | -4 | 10% | 13% | 3 |

Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science improved by 1 percentage point for all students, and by 4 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities. In 2016, the percentage of all students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 3 percentage points above the state rate. In 2016, the percentages of high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and ELL and former ELL students scoring proficient or advanced in science were between 5 and 11 percentage points higher than the 2016 state rates.

**Table 4: Monomoy Regional School District
Science Proficiency by Subgroup 2013–2016**

| Group | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend | Above/Below State 2016 |
|-----------------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|--------------|------------------------|
| All students | District | 56% | 63% | 63% | 57% | 1 | 3 |
| | State | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 | |
| High Needs | District | 32% | 35% | 47% | 36% | 4 | 5 |
| | State | 31% | 33% | 31% | 31% | 0 | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | District | -- | -- | 54% | 41% | -- | 9 |
| | State | -- | -- | 34% | 32% | -- | |
| ELL and former ELL students | District | -- | 41% | 55% | 30% | -- | 11 |
| | State | 19% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 0 | |
| Students with disabilities | District | 14% | 24% | 29% | 18% | 4 | -3 |
| | State | 21% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 0 | |

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

**Table 5: Monomoy Regional School District
2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup**

| Group | ELA | | | Math | | | Science | | |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating |
| All students | 83.5 | 94.1 | No Change | 79.9 | 89.1 | Improved Below Target | 81.4 | 90.8 | Declined |
| High Needs | 70.5 | 87.3 | No Change | 66.9 | 80.2 | Improved Below Target | 68.4 | 82.3 | Declined |
| Economically Disadvantaged ¹ | 75.2 | 78.4 | No Change | 70.7 | 70.3 | On Target | 72.2 | 80.9 | Declined |
| ELLs | 71.3 | 86.6 | No Change | 63.3 | 82.0 | Improved Below Target | -- | -- | -- |
| Students with disabilities | 56.6 | 82.3 | No Change | 52.7 | 75.0 | Improved Below Target | 55.1 | 79.9 | Declined |

Students' growth in ELA was moderate compared with their academic peers statewide for all students, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners and low for high needs students and students with disabilities. Students' growth in math was high compared with their academic peers statewide for English language learners and moderate for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities.

**Table 6: Monomoy Regional School District
2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

| Group | 2016 Median ELA SGP | | | 2016 Median Math SGP | | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | District | CPI Rating | Growth Level | District | CPI Rating | Growth Level |
| All students | 42.0 | Below Target | Moderate | 50.0 | On Target | Moderate |
| High Needs | 40.0 | Below Target | Low | 49.0 | On Target | Moderate |
| Econ. Disad. | 41.5 | Below Target | Moderate | 49.0 | On Target | Moderate |
| ELLs | 52.0 | On Target | Moderate | 69.0 | Above Target | High |
| SWD | 36.0 | Below Target | Low | 45.0 | On Target | Moderate |

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

The district's out-of-school suspension rates were below the state rates for all students, high need students, and economically disadvantaged students and similar to the state rate for students with disabilities. The district's in-school suspension rates was almost one quarter of the state rates for all students and students with disabilities and were below the state rates for high needs students and economically disadvantaged students.

**Table 7: Monomoy Regional School District
Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016**

| Group | Type of Suspension | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State (2016) |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| High Needs | ISS | 0.8% | 0.5% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 2.9% |
| | OSS | 7.1% | 4.8% | 3.8% | 3.8% | 4.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged* | ISS | 0.6% | 0.6% | 1.0% | 0.9% | 3.2% |
| | OSS | 7.5% | 4.9% | 4.3% | 3.8% | 5.6% |
| ELLs | ISS | 0.0% | -- | -- | -- | 1.9% |
| | OSS | 8.6% | -- | -- | -- | 4.0% |
| Students with disabilities | ISS | 1.5% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 3.5% |
| | OSS | 8.1% | 5.3% | 6.1% | 6.0% | 5.9% |
| All Students | ISS | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.5% | 0.5% | 1.9% |
| | OSS | 4.1% | 3.1% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 2.9% |

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

Between 2014 and 2015, the district's four-year cohort graduation rate declined by 12.8 percentage points for all students and by 21.4 to 32.9 percentage point for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. The district did not reach the four-year cohort graduation target for all students or for any of the subgroups that make up the high needs population.²

**Table 8: Monomoy Regional School District
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012–2015**

| Group | Number Included (2015) | Cohort Year Ending | | | | Change 2012–2015 | | Change 2014–2015 | | State (2015) |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change | |
| High needs | 51 | -- | 73.0 | 83.0 | 58.8 | -- | -- | -24.2 | -29.2% | 78.5 |
| Low income | 42 | -- | 72.7 | 83.3 | 61.9 | -- | -- | -21.4 | -25.7% | 78.2 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 64.0 |
| SWD | 26 | -- | 70.0 | 71.4 | 38.5 | -- | -- | -32.9 | -46.1% | 69.9 |
| All students | 104 | -- | 89.8 | 89.7 | 76.9 | -- | -- | -12.8 | -14.3% | 87.3 |

² The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

Between 2013 and 2014, the district's five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 0.7 percentage points for all students, and by 6.1 and 8.2 percentage points for high needs students and low income students, respectively, and declined by 3.6 percentage points for students with disabilities. The district reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students and high needs students.³

**Table 9: Monomoy Regional School District
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2011–2014**

| Group | Number Included (2014) | Cohort Year Ending | | | | Change 2011–2014 | | Change 2013–2014 | | State (2014) |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change | |
| High needs | 47 | -- | -- | 81.1 | 87.2 | -- | -- | 6.1 | 7.5% | 80.3 |
| Low income | 30 | -- | -- | 81.8 | 90.0 | -- | -- | 8.2 | 10.0% | 79.6 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 69.8 |
| SWD | 21 | -- | -- | 75.0 | 71.4 | -- | -- | -3.6 | -4.8% | 73.5 |
| All students | 107 | -- | -- | 91.8 | 92.5 | -- | -- | 0.7 | 0.8% | 88.5 |

In 2015, the district's drop-out rate for all students was similar to the state rate, and the drop-out rates for high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and students with disabilities were higher than the 2015 state rates.

**Table 10: Monomoy Regional School District
Dropout Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015⁴**

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | State (2015) |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| High Needs | -- | 1.9% | 3.1% | 4.2% | 3.4% |
| Econ. Disad. ⁵ | -- | 2.0% | 1.7% | 4.5% | 3.3% |
| ELLs | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 5.7% |
| SWD | -- | 3.9% | 4.5% | 6.3% | 3.5% |
| All students | -- | 1.1% | 2.1% | 2.0% | 1.9% |

Grade and School Results

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students declined by 5.6 points, from 89.1 in 2013 to 83.5 in 2016, and declined by 2.3 to 9.9 points in each tested grade.

- ELA CPI declined by 7.1 to 9.9 points in the 3rd, 4th, and 7th grades, by 4.2 points in the 8th grade, and by 2.3 to 2.8 points in the 5th, 6th, and 10th grades.

³ The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

⁴ Low income students' drop-out rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged drop-out rates.

⁵ Low income students' drop-out rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged drop-out rates.

- In 2016, ELA CPI in the 10th grade was 96.2, 0.5 point below the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.

**Table 11: Monomoy Regional School District
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State (2016) | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 3 | 186 | 89.2 | 83.7 | 80.7 | 79.3 | -- | -9.9 | -1.4 |
| 4 | 150 | 80.5 | 83.3 | 77.9 | 73.4 | -- | -7.1 | -4.5 |
| 5 | 158 | 88.2 | 87.3 | 86.6 | 85.5 | -- | -2.7 | -1.1 |
| 6 | 132 | 87.8 | 82.8 | 82.2 | 85.0 | -- | -2.8 | 2.8 |
| 7 | 124 | 91.1 | 90.9 | 85.3 | 83.1 | -- | -8.0 | -2.2 |
| 8 | 140 | 92.9 | 88.3 | 80.6 | 88.7 | -- | -4.2 | 8.1 |
| 10 | 105 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 98.2 | 96.2 | 96.7 | -2.3 | -2.0 |
| All | 1,014 | 89.1 | 87.3 | 83.8 | 83.5 | -- | -5.6 | -0.3 |

In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA ranged from 43 to 47 percent in the 3rd grade and was 48 percent in the 4th grade, 58 percent in the 5th grade, 65 percent in the 6th grade, 55 percent in the 7th grade, and 60 percent in the 8th grade. In 2016, ELA proficiency was 92 percent in the 10th grade.

**Table 12: Monomoy Regional School District
ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016⁶**

| School | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | Total |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Chatham ES | 47% | 48% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Harwich ES | 43% | 48% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 45% |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 58% | 65% | 55% | -- | -- | 60% |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 60% | 92% | -- |
| District | 44% | 47% | 57% | 64% | 54% | 59% | 91% | -- |

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students declined by 5.4 and 9.7 points at Chatham and Harwich elementary schools, respectively. Between 2015 and 2016, ELA CPI declined by 0.3 point at Monomoy Regional Middle School and improved by 9.1 points at Monomoy Regional High School.

- Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for high needs students declined by 2.9 and 7.3 points at Chatham and Harwich elementary schools, respectively. Between 2015 and 2016 ELA CPI for high needs students declined by 0.9 point at Monomoy Regional Middle School and improved by 7.0 points at Monomoy Regional High School.
- Between 2015 and 2016, ELA CPI for economically disadvantaged students improved by 2.6 and 6.1 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.
- Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for English language learners declined by 23.0 points at Harwich Elementary. Between 2015 and 2016, ELA CPI for English language learners improved by 16.5 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School.
- ELA CPI for students with disabilities declined by 7.5 and 3.8 points at Chatham and Harwich elementary schools, respectively. Between 2015 and 2016 ELA CPI for students with disabilities

⁶ 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

declined by 5.1 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and improved by 24.0 points at Monomoy Regional High School.

**Table 13: Monomoy Regional School District
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013–2016**

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|
| Chatham ES | 83.7 | 84.9 | 79.3 | 78.3 | -5.4 |
| High Needs | 66.7 | 66.9 | 68.5 | 63.8 | -2.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 74.3 | 64.8 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | 47.7 | -- |
| SWD | 62.5 | 57.9 | 58.0 | 55.0 | -7.5 |
| Harwich ES | 86.2 | 83.9 | 79.1 | 76.5 | -9.7 |
| High Needs | 73.1 | 72.2 | 67.5 | 65.8 | -7.3 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 71.9 | 70.4 | -- |
| ELLs | 88.6 | 88.5 | 75.0 | 65.6 | -23.0 |
| SWD | 56.5 | 51.6 | 48.5 | 52.7 | -3.8 |
| | | | | | 2-Year Trend |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 85.6 | 85.3 | -0.3 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 73.7 | 72.8 | -0.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 76.2 | 78.8 | 2.6 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | 73.5 | 90.0 | 16.5 |
| SWD | -- | -- | 61.4 | 56.3 | -5.1 |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | 80.5 | 89.6 | 9.1 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 69.4 | 76.4 | 7.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 73.6 | 79.7 | 6.1 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | 37.5 | 61.5 | 24.0 |

Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI for all students declined by 1.4 points, from 81.3 in 2013 to 79.9 in 2016, and declined in the 3rd, 4th, and 8th grades.

- Math CPI declined by 6.0 and 7.0 points in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively, and by 2.2 points in the 8th grade.
- Math CPI improved by 4.5 points in the 6th grade and by 0.1 to 0.6 point in the 5th, 7th, and 10th grades.
 - In 2016, math CPI was 90.0 in the 10th grade, 0.3 point above the 2016 state CPI of 89.7.

**Table 14: Monomoy Regional School District
Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 3 | 187 | 89.0 | 82.1 | 80.6 | 83.0 | -- | -6.0 | 2.4 |
| 4 | 150 | 83.3 | 85.8 | 75.2 | 76.3 | -- | -7.0 | 1.1 |
| 5 | 159 | 83.0 | 81.2 | 79.8 | 83.6 | -- | 0.6 | 3.8 |
| 6 | 133 | 83.6 | 73.9 | 79.1 | 88.1 | -- | 4.5 | 9.0 |
| 7 | 124 | 73.5 | 73.5 | 70.4 | 73.6 | -- | 0.1 | 3.2 |
| 8 | 138 | 70.0 | 67.8 | 36.0 | 67.8 | -- | -2.2 | 31.8 |
| 10 | 105 | 89.8 | 92.6 | 87.9 | 90.0 | 89.7 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| All | 1,015 | 81.3 | 79.3 | 74.7 | 79.9 | -- | -1.4 | 5.2 |

In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math ranged from 35 to 57 percent in the 3rd grade and from 28 to 49 percent in the 4th grade, and was 49 percent in the 5th grade, 69 percent in the 6th grade, 43 percent in the 7th grade, and 39 percent in the 8th grade. In 2016, math proficiency was 81 percent in the 10th grade.

**Table 15: Monomoy Regional School District
Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016⁷**

| School | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | Total |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Chatham ES | 35% | 28% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 32% |
| Harwich ES | 57% | 49% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 53% |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 49% | 69% | 43% | -- | -- | 54% |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 39% | 81% | -- |
| District | 49% | 42% | 48% | 69% | 42% | 38% | 80% | 49% |

Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI declined by 10.8 and 4.0 points at Chatham and Harwich elementary schools, respectively. Between 2015 and 2016 math CPI improved by 5.7 and 20.4 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.

- Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI for high needs students declined by 12.5 and 2.9 points at Chatham and Harwich elementary schools, respectively, and improved by 5.2 and 14.8 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.
- Between 2015 and 2016, math CPI for economically disadvantaged students improved by 8.2 and 11.3 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.
- Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI for English language learners declined by 13.6 points at Harwich Elementary and improved by 16.8 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School.
- Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI for students with disabilities declined by 19.4 points at Chatham Elementary and improved by 0.7 point at Harwich Elementary. Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 1.8 and 20.1 points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.

⁷ 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

**Table 16: Monomoy Regional School District
Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013-2016**

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|
| Chatham ES | 85.1 | 85.1 | 77.7 | 74.3 | -10.8 |
| High Needs | 75.8 | 65.4 | 66.5 | 63.3 | -12.5 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 71.4 | 65.6 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | 36.4 | -- |
| SWD | 71.4 | 55.3 | 54.3 | 52.0 | -19.4 |
| Harwich ES | 87.2 | 84.4 | 78.3 | 83.2 | -4.0 |
| High Needs | 75.9 | 74.1 | 70.8 | 73.0 | -2.9 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 73.7 | 76.5 | -- |
| ELLs | 88.6 | 86.5 | 79.7 | 75.0 | -13.6 |
| SWD | 61.5 | 56.3 | 55.1 | 62.2 | 0.7 |
| | | | | | 2-Year Trend |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 77.1 | 82.8 | 5.7 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 64.0 | 69.2 | 5.2 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 65.2 | 74.1 | 8.2 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | 63.2 | 80.0 | 16.8 |
| SWD | -- | -- | 52.1 | 53.9 | 1.8 |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | 48.7 | 69.1 | 20.4 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 40.7 | 55.5 | 14.8 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 47.5 | 58.8 | 11.3 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | 22.2 | 42.3 | 20.1 |

In 2016, science proficiency rates were above the state rates for the district as a whole and for the 5th and 10th grades; between 2013 and 2016 science proficiency rates declined in the 5th and 8th grades.

- 5th grade science proficiency decreased by 7 percentage points, from 64 percent in 2013 to 57 percent in 2016, 10 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency decreased by 8 percentage points, from 47 percent in 2013 to 39 percent in 2016, 2 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency was 82 percent in 2016, 9 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

**Table 17: Monomoy Regional School District
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013-2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 5 | 166 | 64% | 62% | 74% | 57% | 47% | -7% | -17% |
| 8 | 143 | 47% | 46% | 36% | 39% | 41% | -8% | 3% |
| 10 | 98 | -- | 91% | 85% | 82% | 73% | -- | -3% |
| All | 407 | 56% | 63% | 63% | 57% | 54% | 1% | -6% |

In 2016, science proficiency was 59 percent in the 5th grade, 12 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. In 2016, science proficiency was 40 percent in the 8th grade, 1 point below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent, and 82 percent in the 10th grade, 9 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

**Table 18: Monomoy Regional School District
Science Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015-2016**

| School | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 | Total |
|---------------------|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Chatham ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Harwich ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 59% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 59% |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 40% | 82% | 57% |
| District | -- | -- | 57% | -- | -- | 39% | 82% | 57% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 41% | 73% | 54% |

Between 2015 and 2016, science proficiency rates for all students declined by 16 percentage points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and improved by 1 point at Monomoy Regional High School.

- Between 2015 and 2016 science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 22 and 6 percentage points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.
- Between 2015 and 2016 science proficiency rates for economically disadvantaged students declined by 25 and 8 percentage points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.
- Between 2015 and 2016 science proficiency rates for English language learners declined by 36 percentage points at Monomoy Regional High School.
- Between 2015 and 2016 science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 22 and 4 percentage points at Monomoy Regional Middle School and Monomoy Regional High School, respectively.

**Table 19: Monomoy Regional School District
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013-2016**

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2-Year Trend |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| Chatham ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Harwich ES | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Monomoy Regional MS | -- | -- | 75% | 59% | -16 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 59% | 37% | -22 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 66% | 41% | -25 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | 50% | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | 44% | 22% | -22 |
| Monomoy Regional HS | -- | -- | 56% | 57% | 1 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | 43% | 37% | -6 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 51% | 43% | -8 |
| ELLs | -- | -- | 36% | 0% | -36 |
| SWD | -- | -- | 21% | 17% | -4 |

Leadership and Governance

Contextual Background

Since the towns of Harwich and Chatham agreed to form the Monomoy Regional School District in 2010, school leaders and local officials have worked cooperatively to create a functional partnership that provides leadership to schools. As the Monomoy Regional School District took shape, elementary schools in Harwich and Chatham remained open, a new high school was built, a regional middle school was established, and Harwich Middle School and Harwich High School closed. Employment contracts were consolidated, and policies and procedures were established for the district.

The superintendent has built a cohesive administrative team by making a series of decisive hires during his tenure in the district. The school committee and the new leadership team have worked together to establish a strategic plan to guide the district's improvement efforts and to align School Improvement Plans with the strategic plan. While work needs to be done to sharpen the focus of district improvement efforts, district practice reflects several important indicators of effective leadership.

Strength Finding

1. The district has established a strong organizational foundation for the district.

- A.** District leaders and town officials have worked cooperatively to establish a sound fiscal basis for the district.
 - 1. A review of district expenditures indicated that the efficiencies afforded by regionalization have enabled the district to spend in excess of its net school spending requirement while enjoying considerable savings.
 - a. A review of district expenditures between 2013 and 2106 indicated that the district exceeded its net school spending requirement by an average 54.5 percent.
 - b. A review of the fiscal year 2015 budget indicated that member towns are spending \$3.45 million less on education than was spent by member towns in fiscal year 2011, before regionalization.
- B.** District leaders and town officials meet regularly to discuss mutual concerns and solve problems.
 - 1. In separate interviews, the superintendent and town officials attested to the level of cooperation that exists between the district and member towns.
 - 2. Members of the school committee told the review team that the district enjoys a cooperative and productive relationship with member towns.
- C.** The district has created a climate of openness and trust with teachers.

1. Members of the teachers' association told the review team that a climate of open communication and cooperative conflict resolution characterizes the relationship between the association and the administration; also, teachers meet regularly with the administration to discuss mutual concerns.
- D.** The district has built a cohesive leadership team.
1. During several interviews the superintendent expressed his confidence in his leadership team.
 2. Principals expressed their support of the superintendent, and noted the cohesive working relationship that exists among peer principals.
- E.** A document review indicated that the district has established priorities by organizing work around common strategic objectives and initiatives.
1. The district has developed a strategic plan that establishes four strategic objectives.
 2. These strategic objectives organize district initiatives in the following areas: curriculum and instruction; parent and community partnerships; student support and safety; and social-emotional learning and school culture.
 3. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) display a strong alignment with the district's strategic plan.
- F.** District and school leaders agreed that the strategic plan has focused the district on teaching and learning.
1. The review team was told that before the development of the strategic plan, most administrative energy was spent on the tasks of organizing the regional school district.
 - a. The school committee and the superintendent stated that school, budget, contract, and program consolidation dominated the administrative agenda for the first two years of the district's existence.
 - b. Principals agreed that administrative tasks associated with regionalization were a priority until the 2016-2017 school year.
 2. School leaders agreed that the development of the strategic plan is an important step for this district.
 - a. The superintendent told the review team that before the development of the strategic plan, the district had too many initiatives, noting that the plan has enabled school leaders to establish priorities.
 - b. Principals said that the strategic plan has driven the district forward by shifting the emphasis from the logistics of regionalization to teaching and learning.

3. The school committee unanimously supported the adoption of the MAP assessment in order to ensure that the district can set measureable goals and gauge progress toward them.

Impact: District leaders and town officials have laid an organizational foundation upon which educational practices that promote high levels of student achievement can be built.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The district is only beginning to establish a culture that regularly uses student performance and other data to determine priorities that are measurable and time-bound.

A. The district has not systematically used data to establish priorities.

1. Leaders agreed that student performance and other relevant data have not been used in the development of the strategic plan or in the shaping of School Improvement Plans.
2. An administrator noted that the need for measureable plan benchmarks was one reason the district decided to implement the MAP assessment.

B. Planning documents do not contain measurable objectives and temporal parameters.

1. A review of planning documents indicated that they do not uniformly contain categories of measurement typically found in planning documents.
2. For example, specific initiative activities, performance targets, timelines, and responsible parties are not specified in the documents.

Impact: The district's improvement planning has limited impact on student achievement. By not targeting student achievement and not specifying achievement goals and parties responsible for promoting improved student achievement, the district has missed a valuable opportunity to create a cycle of continuous improvement, to monitor progress, and to gauge the effectiveness of planned initiatives.

Recommendation

1. The district should continue to analyze student performance and other data and systematically use these data to inform its planning process.

A. Under the leadership of the superintendent, a working group with wide representation should analyze student performance and other data and use this analysis to inform strategic planning.

1. It is critically important that this stakeholder group recognize, and be committed to, the role of the strategic plan in creating a blueprint for student success, achieving greater teacher effectiveness, and strongly influencing each School Improvement Plan.

- B.** The strategic plan should include the district’s mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.
 - 1. The strategic plan’s goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action Oriented and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).
- C.** The strategic plan’s performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district’s educational programs.
 - 1. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) should continue to be aligned with the strategic plan and should be based on an analysis of student performance data.
 - a. Principals should provide the superintendent, school committee, and staff with regular updates on progress toward SIP goals.
 - b. The principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.
 - 2. Professional development should be designed to support strategic initiatives and goals.
- D.** The strategic plan should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
 - 1. The superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and the community on progress toward achieving strategic goals.
 - 2. The district should establish procedures to review the strategic plan annually. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted to meet current conditions.
 - 3. The superintendent and the school committee should consider aligning some goals in the Superintendent’s Educator Plan (as part of the district’s educator evaluation system) with strategic goals.
- E.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.
 - 1. The district should ensure that educators at all levels use data to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.
- F.** Ongoing, targeted training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided for staff in each school, grade level, and subject area.
- G.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, improvement planning, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

Benefits: A coordinated, data-driven planning process is integral to the improvement of student achievement. By starting with an analysis of student performance data and other data, the district is likely to construct plans that address students' needs. Furthermore, by linking clear benchmarks with each strategic initiative, the district will create a useful management and accountability tool. Last, the strategic plan and the SIPs will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district's short- and long-term goals.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/turnaround/level-4-guiding-principles-effective-benchmarks.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/leadership-and-governance.html>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
- ESE's *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.

Curriculum and Instruction

Contextual Background

Since regionalization, the district has dedicated substantial resources to improving its documented curriculum across all grade levels. This work began with the establishment of curriculum task forces charged with combining the best of each town's curricula and developing a common vision for curriculum at each school for each content area. Each task force created a curriculum map for the district in its content area; these documents served as the foundation for instructional curriculum. The district continued its investment in curriculum development by hiring an external consultant to train teachers and designated teacher leaders in the use of "backward design" planning techniques over the course of three summers. As a product of this professional development initiative, teachers have created well-documented curriculum maps and unit plans (all using a common template) that have been uploaded to the district's online student information system.

In addition, the district's leadership structures are designed to monitor progress toward meeting curriculum-related goals across all grade levels. The district's curriculum coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the curriculum is implemented with fidelity and informs the superintendent and the school committee of progress throughout the year. Two education councils coordinate the work of educators across the district. The first council, which consists of the director of curriculum, instruction and assessment, the director of student services, the director of instructional technology, the superintendent, both the elementary principals and all designated teacher leaders, meets monthly. One of the main goals of this education council is to engage in continuous work to align the district's curricula both horizontally and vertically. The second education council consists of the director of curriculum, instruction and assessment, the middle school and high school principals, the director of student services, the director of instructional technology, the superintendent, and the teachers who serve as department heads for each content area.

Further, the district developed a curriculum task force that has recently begun to revise curriculum in each content area by engaging in a cycle of assessing the curriculum, developing improvements, implementing the changes, and then evaluating the efficacy of the changes. The task force plans to review three content areas per year. Each phase of the cycle is scheduled to take a full year to complete; thus, it will take four years to complete revisions in any one content area. The review team did not find evidence that student achievement data has been used to prioritize the work of the curriculum task force. At the time of the onsite in November 2016, the district was in the second year of the revision cycle.

In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent across the district, particularly in the areas of critical thinking, high expectations, and differentiation.

Strength Finding

1. The district has developed curriculum maps and other curriculum resources that are aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and has established structures for continual review and revision of curricula in all content areas.

A. The district has developed curriculum maps and other curriculum resources that are aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate and go beyond the Common Core State Standards.

1. The district has worked to mitigate the impact of regionalization on curriculum development.
 - a. Teachers told the review team that the district created a set of 13 curriculum task forces at the outset of the regionalization. Their purpose was to review the existing curricula in both Harwich and Chatham and to develop a common vision for each content area. The task forces were engaged in this work for three years. Each group created a standards-based curriculum map to serve as the foundation for further curriculum development in the district.
2. Teachers reported that the district hired an external consultant to train all instructional staff in developing curriculum, using the Understanding by Design (UbD) model.
3. Curriculum maps developed by teachers were designed to be stored on the school's online student information system (Aspen) that can be accessed by multiple stakeholders.
 - a. The team reviewed sample curriculum maps from a range of content areas and found them to be thoroughly and consistently documented with use of a common template that included elements such as desired results, evidence, and learning plan.

B. The district has established structures for continual review and revision of curricula across all content areas.

1. Teachers said that the district uses a review cycle in which administrators evaluate, update, and ensure the alignment of the curricula in use at each of its four schools.
 - a. A document review indicated that administrators began reviewing the curricula of three content areas in 2015-2016. In each subsequent year, three additional content areas are targeted for review. For example, the mathematics, wellness, and student support curricula were scheduled to be assessed during the 2015-2016 school year. Improvements are scheduled to be developed in those content areas during the 2016–2017 school year. In addition, the special education, science/technology/engineering, and arts curriculum are scheduled to be assessed during the 2016-2017 school year.

2. Teachers stated that each phase of the curriculum review cycle is completed by a task force of designated teacher leaders and other teacher leaders in the content area being reviewed.
3. Teachers reported and administrators confirmed that professional learning communities (PLCs) have been formed at each school in order to monitor and improve curricula.
 - a. The superintendent told the team that PLCs meet every other Wednesday when students are dismissed 40 minutes early; the staff participate in PLC meetings for an additional 40 minutes after the usual dismissal time.
 - b. Teachers reported that they use PLC meeting time to analyze curricula by grade level and content area, determine progress toward meeting established department goals, and implement changes to address concerns.
 - c. A review of sample PLC agendas indicated that these meeting times are used for work on curriculum-related initiatives. Most agendas contained curriculum-related topics, such as creating rubrics, reviewing standards, writing common assessments, and developing stand-alone lessons connected to current events.

Impact: The district's efforts to develop curriculum resources have provided instructional staff with a common foundation upon which goals for continuous improvement can be based. In addition, the district has created staffing structures and procedures that provide ample time and space for teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators to engage in the process of refining the curriculum from the lesson level up through the vertical alignment of instruction of each content area at each grade level.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. **In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent across the district, particularly in the areas of critical thinking, differentiation, and high expectations. The incidence of characteristics of effective instruction was generally highest at the middle school and consistently lowest at the high school.**

The review team observed 63 classes throughout the district: 18 at Monomoy Regional High School, 18 at Monomoy Regional Middle School, and 27 at the 2 elementary schools. The review team observed 24 ELA classes, 22 mathematics classes, and 19 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education classes, two English language learner (ELL) classes, and one career/technical education class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- A.** In observed classrooms across the district, instructional practices that reflected elements of effective instructional design or promoted high expectations varied among levels.

1. Review team members observed moderate and strong evidence of teachers providing and referring to specific learning objectives (characteristic #2) in only 48 percent of classrooms: in 72 percent of lessons at the middle-school level, in just 41 percent of classes at the district's elementary schools, and in only 33 percent of lessons at the high-school level.
2. The review team found moderate and strong evidence of lessons that reflected high expectations (characteristic #3) in 47 percent of observed classrooms: in 78 percent of lessons at the middle-school level, in just 45 percent of classrooms at the district's elementary schools, and in only 22 percent of classes at the high-school level.
3. There was moderate and strong evidence of instructional strategies that were well-matched to the learning objective (characteristic #4) in 51 percent of observed lessons: in 78 percent of lessons at the middle-school level, in 55 percent at the district's elementary schools, and in only 17 percent of classes at the high-school level.
4. Review team members found moderate and strong evidence of students engaged in tasks that encouraged critical thinking (characteristic #6) in only 36 percent of observed lessons: in 67 percent of lessons at the middle-school level, in only 30 percent at the district's elementary schools, and in only 17 percent of classes at the high-school level.
 - a. High-school students reported that teaching styles vary widely across classrooms. Students said that the instruction in some classes is repetitive and not engaging or challenging. For example, some students stated that teachers rely heavily upon lectures, PowerPoint presentations, and videos.
5. In observed classrooms across the district, the review team found moderate and strong evidence of differentiation of instruction that provides access to all learners (characteristic #8) in only 28 percent of observed lessons: in 33 percent of classes at the middle-school level, in just 23 percent of classrooms in the district's elementary schools, and in only 28 percent of classes observed at the high-school level.

Impact: Without consistent use of effective instructional strategies, the district is not providing all students with rigorous, standards-based, data-driven instruction to help them achieve to the best of their ability and prepare them for college and careers.

Recommendation

1. **The district should identify and articulate a district instructional model, communicate this to the full educational community, and support teachers in its implementation.**
 - A. The district should convene a representative group of teachers and administrators to define the characteristics of high-quality instruction.

1. The district has curriculum maps and other curriculum resources to support this.
 2. Key instructional practices should be prioritized as the district's non-negotiables.
 - a. The recommended product of these meetings is a model that includes strategies that emphasize higher-order thinking, promotes high levels of student engagement, requires students to perform complex tasks, and differentiates instruction.
- B.** Once a model of instructional practices is identified and defined, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.
1. The district is encouraged to provide opportunities for educators to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model. These opportunities might include grade level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time, or professional development days.
 - a. The district might consider implementing peer observations as a way to build on the existing culture of collaboration.
 2. The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs/small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies regularly with teachers.
 3. The district should use understanding gained from the walkthroughs to inform the district's instructional model and curriculum.
 - a. Priorities should be sequenced based upon critical need and ability and included as annual goals in School Improvement Plans.
- C.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.
1. Job-embedded professional development should focus on elements of the instructional model and especially skills associated with differentiation, higher-order thinking, and high levels of student engagement.
 2. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district's expectations for instruction.
 3. Teachers should receive frequent feedback that helps them to continually improve instruction.

Benefit: Implementing this recommendation will mean clear and articulated expectations for educators for what constitutes high-quality instruction. This will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that provides effective instruction for

all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's "What to Look For" Observation Guides (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.
- ESE's Online Calibration Training Tool (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/tool/>) uses videos of classroom instruction from ESE's Calibration Video Library to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as a district leadership team, watch a video together and then individually assess the educator's practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric and provide the educator with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare to each other, as well educators throughout the state.
- ESE's Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) 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. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

Assessment

Contextual Background

An administrator noted that data-driven decision making in the district, using both common assessments and the new Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, is a work in progress. The district is in the process of developing a balanced system of assessments and has not consistently implemented a practice of data-based decision making. A full-time staff member is responsible for managing formal assessments as well as ensuring the district's compliance with government reporting requirements. However, the district is just beginning to identify specific assessment systems to generate useful data toward improving student achievement.

In June 2016, the district first administered the MAP assessments to students in the transitional grades 4 and 7, before the students moved up to the middle school and high school, respectively. Beginning in 2016–2017 the district implemented the MAP assessments three times a year in kindergarten through grade 7 in ELA and math. In the 2016–2017 school year the district has begun to administer MAP three times a year in grades 8 and 9. Before the implementation of the MAP assessments, the use of formative and summative assessments varied in frequency and quality by content area and grade level. Some stakeholders said that the use of formative assessments varied from teacher to teacher. Others stated that teachers in some content areas were working to develop common formative assessments, while others were not.

Strength Finding

- 1. The district uses a range of assessments to collect student achievement data and disseminate the data to staff and families. The district has some structures to analyze and use data to make decisions and to develop programs and services, and some supports for professional staff in using student achievement data.**
 - A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district uses a variety of assessments to collect student achievement data.
 1. Two years of Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) data are available on the ESE website for district and school staff; however, administrators reported in the district's self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit that the data are not useful since trends have not been established.
 2. A review of the assessment inventory in the self-assessment indicated that the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and the Developmental Reading Assessment 2 (DRA 2) are administered three times a year in kindergarten through grade 4.

3. Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) is administered K–9 three times per year.
 4. A National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) math assessment is used at the elementary level.
 5. Administrators said that common assessments are a “work in progress” across all levels.
 - a. All courses taught by multiple staff share common assessments and at the high school students take mid-term and final exams.
 6. Formative assessments are done on a teacher-by-teacher basis, and various departments throughout the district are working toward developing common assessments.
 7. Teachers in grades 5–7 have developed cornerstone or performance task assessments that serve as summative assessments at the end of humanities and STEM units or projects.
- B.** School staff, families, and students have access to student reports on achievement, internal reports, and external review findings.
1. Principals share MCAS and PARCC information with students.
 2. Parents told the team that families access student data and reports on student progress on Aspen, as well as through weekly phone calls and e-mails from teachers.
 3. Teachers are given assessment data for bi-monthly PLCs during early release days.
 - a. K–9 teachers have access to MAP reports.
 4. The assessment and compliance officer compiles all scores and student data into one easily accessible student information system.
- C.** School staff and administrators have some structures to analyze and use data to make decisions.
1. An administrative data team establishes the assessment calendar for the year and supervises school data teams.
 2. The district schedules bi-monthly PLCs led by an instructional leader trained in use of a data protocol.
 - a. Teacher leaders have received training about the MAP and they are sharing the data in the PLCs.
 3. Middle-school staff use data to design interventions for a daily block called “seminar,” during which some students receive remediation and/or more challenging content.
 4. At the high school, the use of grade reports to identify struggling learners not on

Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) has resulted in the creation of an academic center and the Struggling Learners' Committee.

5. Students identified through the at-risk task force are referred to the alternative education program in the high school.
6. Administrators told the team that a comparison of PARCC results and grade reports indicated that students who earned As on their report cards commonly did not score Exceeds Expectations on PARCC, causing the district to reflect on its grading practices.

D. District and school leadership have used data to develop some programs and services.

1. At the middle school, a seminar block was created for enrichment and for academic support for identified students.
2. At the high school, an academic center was created for students who have 504 plans.
3. Teachers and administrators said that at the high school, an alternative education program was created to help students recover credits; the program includes smaller classes and a modified schedule.

E. Professional staff members are supported in using student achievement data.

1. Teacher leaders are trained to support other teachers in the use of the data protocol.
2. Teacher leaders collaborate in PLCs every other Wednesday.
3. Teachers attend conferences to learn to analyze data and to teach other teachers.

Impact: Because of the wide range of assessment data and reports available and the structures, practices, and support in place, the district is in a position to base its improvement practices on evidence-based student achievement data.

Human Resources and Professional Development

Contextual Background

The district has established policies and procedures for recruiting and hiring qualified administrators and instructional staff, including rubrics for assessing candidates, multi-tiered interview processes, and the opportunity for feedback from multiple stakeholders. Teachers' salaries are comparable to those in nearby districts, and Monomoy offers opportunities for advancement within the school system.

In the years since the regionalization, staff turnover in the district has dropped considerably, stabilizing human resources in all four schools.

In its review of teachers' and administrators' personnel folders, the team found that most teachers received only one observation for the 2015–2016 school year and that in general instructional feedback was not systematic or growth oriented.

The district has created a professional climate that is conducive to adult learning. The district engages in planning professional development opportunities that are aligned with the priorities outlined in its strategic plan. In addition, the district provides resources for instructional staff to participate in external professional development activities when its own offerings do not meet the specific needs of individual staff members. The district also provides some professional development that is differentiated based on educators' areas of responsibility and levels of experience, such as a teacher induction program and educator choice in some district-provided offerings.

Strength Findings

1. The district has established policies and practices to recruit and hire qualified professional staff.

- A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has established policies and practices to hire qualified staff.
 - 1. Openings are routinely posted at schools and with SchoolSpring.
 - 2. Administrators told the team that appropriate teams are formed to screen, interview, and recommend candidates. For instance, at individual schools, teams are formed to screen candidates and typically include teachers, parents, and administrators. Central office and administrative candidates are screened by a wider, more varied group.
 - 3. The interview and screening process is standardized. A centralized interview rating form, confidentiality agreement, and candidate response rubric are applied districtwide.
 - 4. Teachers and other professional staff are appropriately licensed and the district has historically requested few waivers; no waivers were requested for school year 2016–2017.

- B.** The district attracts quality candidates by appropriately compensating staff and by providing leadership opportunities for teachers.

1. At the request of the superintendent, central office staff research neighboring districts to ensure competitive salary and benefit packages.
2. Each open teaching position typically results in 50 or more applicants, and turnover of staff is quite low. However, during the recent consolidation, employees were offered a retirement incentive that resulted in 20 to 30 retirements, creating more than four times the number of teaching openings this district typically had in a given year.

2. The district has created a culture that strategically supports continued professional growth and development.

- A.** The district provides a climate for professional development (PD) that is conducive to adult learners' needs.

1. A PD committee develops PD schedules and content based on the district's strategic plan. For the two whole-day PD sessions, the committee develops the agendas, arranges the presenters, and schedules locations. Electronic surveys are used after each PD session to determine the quality of the session and its impact on teaching and learning.
2. Administrators said that common planning time (CPT) is used bi-monthly for professional learning communities to provide job-embedded professional development to individualize teachers' professional growth. CPT focuses on the development of teams' professional practice goals and student learning goals, as well as development of curricula and collaborative problem solving. CPT requires for each PLC agendas and assigned roles and responsibilities, such as scribe and timekeeper.

- B.** Opportunities exist for teachers to take on additional leadership and responsibility.

1. Leadership positions are available at every school and level. The district hires instructional leaders (K–7) and department heads (grades 8–12). These leadership positions are attached to full-time teaching positions. Instructional leaders and department heads meet regularly with central office leader and guide school-level instruction. In addition, the district uses a task force model to bring multiple educators together to research and make recommendations on topics such as math curriculum adoption and service learning programs. All teachers are invited to apply for these positions.
2. The district has mentor and induction programs; all teachers can apply for one or more of these positions. Although many teachers said that they are pleased with these leadership opportunities, some teachers in one focus group raised concerns about being encouraged to take on multiple additional roles. They expressed concern about the commitment of time and energy required of these positions.

C. Professional development offerings are differentiated.

1. The district takes advantage of “All Cape” professional development offerings, a networked series of offerings developed in collaboration with each district located on Cape Cod. These sessions allow for differentiation because a wide range of professional development is available. For instance, high school foreign language teachers can meet with other teachers of similar content and grade levels to develop instructional strategies and devise curriculum.
2. Interviews and a document review indicated that many professional development sessions are structured so that a variety of offerings are available; for instance, a recent session offered math professional development for math teachers districtwide. Other subgroups met for personalized professional development, including Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) for unified arts teachers, team building and technology, Aspen and Google docs, and strategic plan review.

Impact: Because of effective hiring practices and robust professional development opportunities available for teachers, the district has the ability to hire and develop outstanding educators.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

3. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system.

- A.** A review of the personnel folders of 17 teachers randomly selected from across the district and the personnel folders of all four principals indicated that in most cases they were missing systematic and growth-oriented feedback.
 1. Most feedback was general and positive, and provided few explicit suggestions to promote teachers’ professional growth and to help teachers improve instruction.
 2. Although teachers and administrators stated in focus groups that the district’s educator evaluation system was aligned with the state’s educator evaluation regulations, interviews and a review of personnel files indicated that most teachers received summative evaluations in June of 2016 but only one observation report for the 2015–2016 school year, usually in October or November 2015.
 - a. Generally the evaluator documented what was happening in the classroom and gave feedback limited to the percentage of students on task at a given moment.
- B.** The review team did not find evidence that trends from classroom observations are used in the design of professional development or to identify educators’ potential for new roles and opportunities. Also, the district does not appear to have a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of professional development on instruction.

Impact: Without consistently providing teachers and administrators with clear, specific feedback to improve instruction and recommendations that might contribute to the professional growth and development of teachers and school leaders, the district is missing opportunities to substantially improve learning opportunities, classroom instruction, and academic achievement for all students.

Recommendation

1. **The district should develop policies and practices to effectively promote the culture of growth-oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation that is the goal of the educator evaluation system.**
 - A. The district should review its current supervisory policies, practices, and expectations to ensure that the frequency of observations by evaluators is sufficient and that the quantity and the quality of evaluative feedback, both written and verbal, is enhanced.
 1. Evaluators should serve as instructional coaches/mentors to educators, to engage them in an ongoing, performance-based, collaborative dialogue, thereby providing them with formal and informal feedback, guidance, and support that is continuous, frequent, and focused on specific professional practices and skills.
 - B. The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of evaluators to ensure that they are regularly providing all staff with high-quality instructional feedback that is timely, informative, instructive, and capable of promoting individual growth and overall effectiveness.
 1. All administrators should receive ongoing training to enhance their ability to observe and to analyze instruction and to provide feedback directly focused on professional practice, growth, and student achievement.

Benefit: Implementing this recommendation will mean improved outcomes for students and educators.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) 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. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- ESE's *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.
- ESE's *Online Calibration Training Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/calibration/tool/>) uses videos of classroom instruction from ESE's Calibration Video Library to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as a district leadership team, watch a video together and then individually assess the educator's practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric and provide the educator with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare to each other, as well educators throughout the state.

Student Support

Contextual Background

Schools in the Monomoy Regional School District have implemented a range of programs and practices to meet the needs of students across grade levels. Monomoy schools have established a set of practices to effectively identify students in need of additional support. Teachers use strategies from the Response to Intervention model as an initial method of assessing and addressing the needs of the children in their classes. For those students whose needs are not met in the classroom, each school has a Student Support Team (SST) that accepts referrals from teachers related to persistent concerns about students' academic performance or well-being. These teams have well-established procedures for implementing and assessing additional intervention strategies for each student. Each elementary school has also created a committee that works to implement PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports) to increase student engagement.

The district uses home language surveys to identify English language learners (ELLs). There is one certified ELL teacher on the staff at each of the district's schools, and an additional ELL teaching assistant at the middle school. These staff members develop a schedule of services for students on their caseloads, collaborate with teachers, and deliver ELL services both in and outside general education classrooms.

The district has also implemented a range of programs designed to meet students' needs. An academic support center at the high school serves students who are struggling academically. This program has a dedicated, full-time staff member who delivers remediation to students based on the specific content with which they are having difficulty. The use of the center is also built into the class schedule of those students who have been identified as needing this additional support. At the middle school, a daily intervention block (known as seminar) is used to provide academic remediation as well as enrichment opportunities for those students who have mastered academic content. To support students who may be at risk of dropping out of high school, an alternative education program at the high school level enables students to spend part of their day in a work or career setting, while still accessing academic content. Last, high-school students who fall behind have opportunities to recover their academic credits via an online platform known as FuelEd. This program is used for students in the alternative program and in mainstream classes at the high school.

Strength Findings

- 1. The district has policies, procedures, and practices to support struggling students.**
 - A.** All schools in the district have processes to identify and provide interventions for students not performing at expected achievement levels.

1. Teachers and support staff said that teachers at each school routinely employ the Response to Intervention (RtI) process in their classrooms as an initial method of identifying the learning needs of students in their classes. This process involves teachers implementing interventions targeting specific students who are struggling, documenting the student's response, and collecting data to show whether the interventions were successful.
 - a. Staff reported that instructional staff use information they gain from the RtI process to engage in discussions about struggling students during Collaborative Learning Team (CLT) meetings.
 - i. Teachers stated that CLT meetings take place once per week at each district school.
 2. Staff said that persistent student concerns are reported to the SST. The members of the SST suggest additional interventions; these are implemented and documented by the teacher for a period of six to eight weeks. If these interventions do not yield desired results, the students are referred for further support services.
 - a. The team reviewed documents (e.g., student referral forms, agendas, overview of the SST process) that confirmed the description of the SST process by members of the district's staff.
 - b. Staff reported that student achievement data from the MAP interim assessments (given three times per year from kindergarten through grade 9) provide information that identifies students who are not performing at expected levels.
 - c. Staff further stated that students new to the district are given home language surveys when they enroll. Any students who indicate that they speak a language other than English at home then complete the WIDA Access Placement Test (WAPT) screening assessment to determine the level of English language learner support that may be necessary.
 3. An administrator said that class data in Aspen, as well as MAP performance and growth data, inform the supports and enrichment provided to students.
- B. The district has a range of programs, structures, and staff to support students academically.**
1. Districtwide initiatives and structures support the academic development of all students.
 - a. The Chatham and Harwich Elementary School Improvement Plans include a focus on instruction and wellness that contains objectives related to supporting students academically (such as differentiating instruction and using RtI techniques), as well as creating school-based cultures where students feel emotionally safe as learners (such as use of PBIS (Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports) and bullying prevention programming.

- b. Staff said that the staff at the middle school recently implemented an intervention block (known as seminar) during which all students are offered classes based on their individual needs. Through the first months of the school year, teams of teachers worked to determine students' specific needs; as a result, some were offered enrichment opportunities, while others participated in remediation of fundamental skills and concepts. Teachers further stated that seminar block at the middle school takes place for one period each day, five days per week.
 - c. Staff also reported that the high school recently established an academic center for any students who are struggling academically. This support is built into the schedules of specific students who need help with executive functioning, study skills, or organization.
 - i. Support staff stated that a full-time teacher was hired to staff the academic center, that no more than eight students are scheduled to use the center at one time, and that programming is highly differentiated to meet students' needs.
 - ii. A review of the high school's program of studies confirmed that the academic center can be assigned to any student in grades 8 through 12 who is not meeting with success in the general education curriculum. Students can enroll for either a full year or a semester. The purpose of the center is to "assist with homework completion, preparation for assignments, and organizational skills."
2. The district implemented supports designed to target students at risk of not graduating from high school.
- a. Administrators and staff stated that the high school established a task force to analyze the causes of students' academic struggles and implement changes to address them. This task force developed plans for the academic center and revamped the structure of SST meetings at the high school to proactively involve parents.
 - b. In addition, staff reported that staff at the middle school and staff at the high school communicate to ensure that students make successful transitions into eighth grade (the lowest grade at Monomoy Regional High School). Rising eighth grade students are provided opportunities to visit the high school and build connections with their future teachers.
 - i. Staff further said that the high school hosts an orientation day in August during which older students give tours of the building and new eighth grade students receive their schedules.
 - ii. Staff reported that two eighth grade teachers have a common planning period once per week to focus on students who are exhibiting concerning behaviors.
 - iii. The review team studied the high school program of studies that contained the description of a course called "Seminar 8," described as "an opportunity for

students in grade 8 to gain the skills and traits necessary to meet with success throughout their high school years.” This review indicated that the course focuses on self-confidence, study habits, and common issues faced by teens.

- iv. Also, staff stated that as of the 2016–2017 school year, high school students who failed classes or who received incompletes have access to FuelEd, a credit recovery program. This program enables students to recover credits while carrying a full course load.
3. The district provides programs to support students in developing career pathways and making informed decisions about their lives after graduation.
- a. Administrators and staff said that the high school’s alternative education program was established to capture the interests of students with a wide range of potential post-graduation pathways. Currently, there are two options for students who participate in the program---one where they take classes at the high school for part of the day then also spend time at a worksite placement, and another where they spend full days at worksite placements. Staff reported that this program is staffed by one full-time teacher and one teaching assistant who serve 10–12 students, each of whom develops an individualized learning plan with staff to guide their work in the program.
 - i. The high school’s program of studies describes the alternative education program as a “vocational approach to the high school experience” where students participate in “work-study or job shadowing in the afternoon” and take content area courses in English, mathematics, social studies, and science, along with classes in life skills, vocational preparation, and social skills development.”
 - b. In addition, staff stated that some high school students participate in a program called Inclusive Concurrent Enrollment (ICE) through Cape Cod Community College (CCCC) through which students take courses at CCCC and receive tutoring services.
 - i. The high school’s program of studies describes the dual-enrollment option at CCCC as an opportunity for students to “take college courses and receive credit towards both high school and college graduation.”
 - c. Staff also said that an internship program at the high school matches twelfth grade students with employers in fields of their interest. Staff stated that this program includes classroom instruction on practical money skills.

Impact: Having common practices, policies, and procedures throughout the district to identify struggling students and a range of programs, practices, community partners, and designated staff to meet students’ academic and non-academic needs promotes a culture of high student achievement, supports course completion and grade promotion, encourages on-time graduation, and ensures that students are prepared for college and career.

2. The district has policies and practices that promote student attendance; effective transitions from one school, grade level or program; and timely and equitable access to quality programs for homeless students.

A. The district has programs and staff to support students' non-academic needs.

1. The district has policies and programs to promote student attendance.
2. Staff said that school psychologists and guidance counselors are responsible for monitoring students' attendance. Following an established number of absences, these staff members are responsible for initiating established routine follow-up procedures that include written notice to families, and--- in instances of chronic absence---contacting the district attorney's office, and/or filing a "child requiring assistance" order.
3. Staff stated that staff members schedule meetings and home visits to engage the families of students with chronic absence from school.
4. Staff said that district schools have a partnership with an external provider of counseling and addiction recovery services that runs a program called VIPS (Very Important Person Services). In this program, staff are enlisted to re-engage chronically absent students through short, three-minute interactions with the student three times each day, a strategy that aims to establish a relationship between students and adults at school.

B. The district provides equitable access to quality programming for homeless youth.

1. Staff noted that the schools communicate with the social service agency working with families of homeless students to coordinate services to ensure that their educational needs are met.
2. In addition, staff reported that school-based staff work to ensure adequate transportation is provided for these students, that they are enrolled in after-school activities, and that families are connected with community-based social services.
3. Staff stated that a resource officer at the high school is responsible for coordinating home visits, arranging transportation for homeless students, and for connecting families with housing opportunities and local food pantries.

Impact: The district has established equitable policies, procedures, and practices to promote attendance, to reduce or limit drop-out rates, to return students who have dropped out to educationally appropriate placements, and to support homeless students. These supports are invaluable in ensuring that all students are able to participate fully in the academic program.

Financial and Asset Management

Contextual Background

Since regionalization, the district has consolidated collective bargaining agreements, unified staff salary schedules, built a new high school, created a regional middle school, and established a uniform budget process. The district has secured a budget that exceeds its net school spending requirement by a substantial amount. The budget process is clear and transparent, and frequent meetings between school leaders and local officials indicate communication and cooperation between the school district and member towns. Budget documents are clear and comprehensive, providing clarity about both spending priorities and trends. The district exhibits sound fiscal planning, management, and asset control. Last, district students enjoy modern and well-maintained facilities.

Strength Finding

- 1. The district has developed a well-organized system of financial and asset management that is fiscally sound and transparent.**
 - A.** The district's current budget document is comprehensive.
 - B.** The budget process is transparent and all stakeholders are involved in the development of the budget.
 1. District administrators and town officials told the team that they all work to develop the budget.
 2. An abundance of information is available to the public about budget development, from proposal through adoption stages.
 - C.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district's budget documents are available to all stakeholders.
 1. All budget documents and presentations since regionalization are available on the district's webpage and disseminated to the public through a variety of methods.
 2. The business manager prepares regular monthly financial reports for the superintendent and the school committee.
 3. School administrators can easily access the budgets for their respective schools in order to manage and track spending.
 - D.** The budget provides sufficient staffing and support for the district while exceeding net school spending requirements.
 1. The budget exceeds net school spending requirements.

2. School staff and employees, as well as leaders from the municipalities, concurred that there are adequate resources in the district.
- E. The district maintains control over spending and follows regular protocols with respect to audits, fund management, and spending.
1. The district uses fiscal management software that supports budget development from design to the approved budget.
 2. The district has regular audits and addresses any concerns identified in an audit in a timely and efficient manner.
- F. The district has developed facilities management and capital plans that are building-specific and districtwide.
1. Building maintenance plans and capital improvement plans are developed collaboratively with lead custodians in each school building, and shared with school and district administrators.
 2. The business manager and the facilities director reported that improvements were made at all district schools before the start of the 2016–2017 school year.
- G. The district’s school buildings provide safe and secure learning environments.
1. The district restructured the former configuration of schools and grades to maximize space, facilities, and opportunities for students.
 2. The district built and opened a new high school in August 2014.
 3. The district has updated technology at the middle school, and the central office is preparing for the 1:1 Chromebook initiative.

Impact: The participation of administrators in developing the budget is crucial to identifying the needs of students and schools. Clear, comprehensive, transparent, and public budget development processes and documents make a strong case for school programs and needs. They provide helpful information as school leaders and town officials decide how to allocate resources.

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Review

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from November 14–17, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

Tom Pandiscio, leadership and governance and *review team coordinator*

Casel Walker, curriculum and instruction

Beatriz McConnie Zapater, assessment

Dale Libkin, human resources and professional development

Mirna Vega-Wilson, student support

Lisa Kowaleski, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: vice president and six members.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, curriculum director, assessment and compliance officer, business manager, student support director, payroll manager, accountant, facilities manager, and human resources staff.

The review team visited the following schools: Chatham Elementary School (Pre-K–4), Harwich Elementary School (Pre-K–4), Monomoy Regional Middle School (grades 5–7,) and Monomoy Regional High School (grades 8–12).

During school visits, the review team conducted interviews with four principals and three focus groups with elementary-school teachers, middle-school teachers, and high-school teachers.

The review team observed 63 classes in the district: 18 at the high school, 18 at the middle school, and 27 at the 2 elementary schools.

The review team analyzed multiple data sets and reviewed numerous documents before and during the review, 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

Review Schedule

| Monday 11/14/2016 | Tuesday 11/15/2016 | Wednesday 11/16/2016 | Thursday 11/17/2016 |
|---|--|---|--|
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document review; and interview with the teachers' association. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Chatham Elementary, Harwich Elementary, Monomoy Regional Middle School, and Monomoy Regional High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town/city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Chatham Elementary, Harwich Elementary, Monomoy Regional Middle School, and Monomoy Regional High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Chatham Elementary, Harwich Elementary, Monomoy Regional Middle School, and Monomoy Regional High School for classroom observations; and district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Monomoy Regional School District
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

| Student Group | District | Percent of Total | State | Percent of Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| African-American | 97 | 5.0% | 83,481 | 8.8% |
| Asian | 28 | 1.5% | 61,584 | 6.5% |
| Hispanic | 104 | 5.4% | 176,873 | 18.6% |
| Native American | 13 | 0.7% | 2,179 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,600 | 82.9% | 597,502 | 62.7% |
| Native Hawaiian | 4 | 0.2% | 888 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 85 | 4.4% | 30,922 | 3.2% |
| All Students | 1,931 | 100.0% | 953,429 | 100.0% |

Note: As of October 1, 2015

**Table B1b: Monomoy Regional School District
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

| Student Groups | District | | | State | | |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | N | Percent of High Needs | Percent of District | N | Percent of High Needs | Percent of State |
| Students w/ disabilities | 318 | 44.7% | 16.4% | 165,559 | 39.4% | 17.2% |
| Econ. Disad. | 432 | 60.7% | 22.4% | 260,998 | 62.2% | 27.4% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 64 | 9.0% | 3.3% | 85,763 | 20.4% | 9.0% |
| All high needs students | 712 | 100.0% | 36.6% | 419,764 | 100.0% | 43.5% |

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,943; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

**Table B2a: Monomoy Regional School District
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2016) | MCAS Year | | | PARCC | | Gains and Declines |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------------|
| | | | 2013 | 2014 | | 2015 | 2016 | 2-Year Trend |
| 3 | CPI | 186 | 89.2 | 83.7 | CPI | 80.7 | 79.3 | -1.4 |
| | P+ | 186 | 74% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | 51% | 44% | -7 |
| 4 | CPI | 150 | 80.5 | 83.3 | CPI | 77.9 | 73.4 | -4.5 |
| | P+ | 150 | 53% | 62% | Lv 4&5 | 57% | 47% | -10 |
| | SGP | 138 | 47.0 | 46.0 | SGP | 39.0 | 39.5 | 0.5 |
| 5 | CPI | 158 | 88.2 | 87.3 | CPI | 86.6 | 85.5 | -1.1 |
| | P+ | 158 | 71% | 67% | Lv 4&5 | 61% | 57% | -4 |
| | SGP | 150 | 48.0 | 56.0 | SGP | 39.5 | 47.0 | 7.5 |
| 6 | CPI | 132 | 87.8 | 82.8 | CPI | 82.2 | 85.0 | 2.8 |
| | P+ | 132 | 71% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | 48% | 64% | 16 |
| | SGP | 123 | 45.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 33.0 | 43.0 | 10.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 124 | 91.1 | 90.9 | CPI | 85.3 | 83.1 | -2.2 |
| | P+ | 124 | 74% | 74% | Lv 4&5 | 56% | 54% | -2 |
| | SGP | 113 | 55.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 28.0 | -22.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 140 | 92.9 | 88.3 | CPI | 80.6 | 88.7 | 8.1 |
| | P+ | 140 | 84% | 70% | Lv 4&5 | 44% | 59% | 15 |
| | SGP | 131 | 54.5 | 36.0 | SGP | 13.0 | 42.0 | 29.0 |

**Table B2b: Monomoy Regional School District
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016⁸**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2016) | MCAS/Accountability Year | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State (2016) | 2-Year Trend |
| 10 | CPI | 105 | 98.5 | 97.4 | 98.2 | 96.2 | 96.7 | -2.3 |
| | P+ | 105 | 95% | 93% | 96% | 91% | 91% | -5% |
| | SGP | 94 | 66.0 | 57.0 | 60.0 | 66.5 | 50.0 | 6.5 |
| All | CPI | 1,014 | 89.1 | 87.3 | 83.8 | 83.5 | 87.2 | -5.6 |
| | P+ | -- | 73% | 69% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | SGP | 751 | 51.0 | 46.0 | 40.0 | 42.0 | 50.0 | 2.0 |

⁸ In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2c: Monomoy Regional School District
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2016) | MCAS Year | | | PARCC | | Gains and Declines |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------------|
| | | | 2013 | 2014 | | 2015 | 2016 | 2-Year Trend |
| 3 | CPI | 187 | 89 | 82.1 | CPI | 80.6 | 83.0 | 2.4 |
| | P+ | 187 | 74% | 63% | Lv 4&5 | 42% | 49% | 7 |
| 4 | CPI | 150 | 83.3 | 85.8 | CPI | 75.2 | 76.3 | 1.1 |
| | P+ | 150 | 54% | 65% | Lv 4&5 | 41% | 42% | 1 |
| | SGP | 141 | 54.0 | 55.0 | SGP | 44.0 | 49.0 | 5.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 159 | 83 | 81.2 | CPI | 79.8 | 83.6 | 3.8 |
| | P+ | 159 | 63% | 61% | Lv 4&5 | 50% | 48% | -2 |
| | SGP | 150 | 41.5 | 47.0 | SGP | 32.0 | 53.0 | 21.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 133 | 83.6 | 73.9 | CPI | 79.1 | 88.1 | 9.0 |
| | P+ | 133 | 63% | 51% | Lv 4&5 | 46% | 69% | 23 |
| | SGP | 121 | 46.0 | 38.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 61.0 | 18.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 124 | 73.5 | 73.5 | CPI | 70.4 | 73.6 | 3.2 |
| | P+ | 124 | 50% | 48% | Lv 4&5 | 38% | 42% | 4 |
| | SGP | 112 | 63.0 | 51.0 | SGP | 41.0 | 47.5 | 6.5 |
| 8 | CPI | 138 | 70 | 67.8 | CPI | 36.0 | 67.8 | 31.8 |
| | P+ | 138 | 44% | 39% | Lv 4&5 | 5% | 38% | 33 |
| | SGP | 129 | 45.5 | 33.5 | SGP | 6.5 | 31.0 | 24.5 |

**Table B2d: Monomoy Regional School District
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016⁹**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2016) | MCAS/Accountability Year | | | | State (2016) | Gains and Declines | |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| 10 | CPI | 105 | 89.8 | 92.6 | 87.9 | 90 | 89.7 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| | P+ | 105 | 83% | 85% | 74% | 80% | 78% | -3 | 6 |
| | SGP | 94 | 65.0 | 68.0 | 61.0 | 68.5 | 50.0 | 3.5 | 7.5 |
| All | CPI | 1,015 | 81.3 | 79.3 | 74.7 | 79.9 | 81.5 | -1.4 | 5.2 |
| | P+ | -- | 60% | 58% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | SGP | 750 | 52.0 | 48.0 | 37.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | -2.0 | 13.0 |

⁹ In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2e: Monomoy Regional School District
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure | | Number Included (2016) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State (2016) | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| 5 | CPI | 166 | 86.3 | 84.9 | 90.6 | 83.4 | 76.4 | -2.9 | -7.2 |
| | P+ | 166 | 64% | 62% | 74% | 57% | 47% | -7 | -17 |
| 8 | CPI | 143 | 76.4 | 74.2 | 70.8 | 71.5 | 71.3 | -4.9 | 0.7 |
| | P+ | 143 | 47% | 46% | 36% | 39% | 41% | -8 | 3 |
| 10 | CPI | 98 | -- | 96.1 | 93.3 | 92.6 | 88.9 | -- | -0.7 |
| | P+ | 98 | -- | 91% | 85% | 82% | 73% | -- | -3 |
| All | CPI | 407 | 81.6 | 83.5 | 84 | 81.4 | 78.7 | -0.2 | -2.6 |
| | P+ | 407 | 56% | 63% | 63% | 57% | 54% | 1 | -6 |

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

**Table B3a: Monomoy Regional School District
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016¹⁰**

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2016) | Accountability | | | | | 2-Year Trend | 4-Year Trend |
|--------------------|----------|-----|------------------------|----------------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | MCAS | | | PARCC | | | |
| | | | | 2013 | 2014 | | 2015 | 2016 | | |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 412 | 79.8 | 74.9 | CPI | 72.8 | 70.5 | -2.3 | -9.3 |
| | | P+ | -- | 54% | 44% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 285 | 51.0 | 42.0 | SGP | 36.5 | 40.0 | 3.5 | -11.0 |
| | State | CPI | 222,707 | 76.8 | 77.1 | CPI | 76.3 | 77.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| | | P+ | -- | 48% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 165,487 | 47.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 47.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 276 | -- | -- | CPI | 76.4 | 75.2 | -1.2 | -- |
| | | P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 192 | -- | -- | SGP | 37.0 | 41.5 | 4.5 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 152,877 | -- | -- | CPI | 77.6 | 78.2 | 0.6 | -- |
| | | P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 114,361 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 188 | 68.6 | 63.0 | CPI | 57.9 | 56.6 | -1.3 | -12.0 |
| | | P+ | -- | 31% | 24% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 122 | -- | -- | SGP | 31.0 | 36.0 | 5.0 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 91,177 | 66.8 | 66.6 | CPI | 67.4 | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| | | P+ | -- | 30% | 31% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 66,633 | 43.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 60 | 81.3 | 79.4 | CPI | 72.2 | 71.3 | -0.9 | -10.0 |
| | | P+ | -- | 62% | 47% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 42 | -- | -- | SGP | 42.5 | 52.0 | 9.5 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 52,960 | 67.4 | 67.8 | CPI | 68.9 | 70.7 | 1.8 | 3.3 |
| | | P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 35,109 | 53.0 | 54.0 | SGP | 53.0 | 54.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 1,014 | 89.1 | 87.3 | CPI | 83.8 | 83.5 | -0.3 | -5.6 |
| | | P+ | -- | 73% | 69% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 751 | 51.0 | 46.0 | SGP | 40.0 | 42.0 | 2.0 | -9.0 |
| | State | CPI | 491,267 | 86.8 | 86.7 | CPI | 86.8 | 87.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| | | P+ | -- | 69% | 69% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 388,999 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

¹⁰ 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B3b: Monomoy Regional School District
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016¹¹**

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2016) | Accountability | | | | | 2-Year Trend | 4-Year Trend |
|--------------------|----------|-----|------------------------|----------------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------|--------------|
| | | | | MCAS | | | PARCC | | | |
| | | | | 2013 | 2014 | | 2015 | 2016 | | |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 412 | 68.6 | 64.8 | CPI | 64.0 | 66.9 | 2.9 | -1.7 |
| | | P+ | -- | 38% | 35% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 291 | 45.5 | 47.0 | SGP | 36.0 | 49.0 | 13.0 | 3.5 |
| | State | CPI | 222,349 | 68.6 | 68.4 | CPI | 67.9 | 68.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| | | P+ | -- | 40% | 40% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 165,191 | 46.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 276 | -- | -- | CPI | 67.6 | 70.7 | 3.1 | -- |
| | | P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 197 | -- | -- | SGP | 35.0 | 49.0 | 14.0 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 152,560 | -- | -- | CPI | 69.2 | 70.0 | 0.8 | -- |
| | | P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 114,091 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 45.0 | -1.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 188 | 54.6 | 51.1 | CPI | 50.3 | 52.7 | 2.4 | -1.9 |
| | | P+ | -- | 18% | 17% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 126 | -- | -- | SGP | 35.0 | 45.0 | 10.0 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 91,049 | 57.4 | 57.1 | CPI | 57.3 | 58.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| | | P+ | -- | 22% | 22% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 66,511 | 42.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 44.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 60 | 69.2 | 63.7 | CPI | 61.8 | 63.3 | 1.5 | -5.9 |
| | | P+ | -- | 44% | 29% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 44 | -- | -- | SGP | 47.0 | 69.0 | 22.0 | -- |
| | State | CPI | 53,048 | 63.9 | 63.8 | CPI | 64.5 | 65.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| | | P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 35,290 | 53.0 | 52.0 | SGP | 51.0 | 50.0 | -1.0 | -3.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 1,015 | 81.3 | 79.3 | CPI | 74.7 | 79.9 | 5.2 | -1.4 |
| | | P+ | -- | 60% | 58% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 750 | 52.0 | 48.0 | SGP | 37.0 | 50.0 | 13.0 | -2.0 |
| | State | CPI | 490,612 | 80.8 | 80.3 | CPI | 80.7 | 81.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| | | P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | | SGP | 388,423 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

¹¹ 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

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

| Group and Measure | | | Number Included (2016) | Spring MCAS Year | | | | Gains and Declines | |
|--|----------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 160 | 70.3 | 67.5 | 74.2 | 68.4 | -1.9 | -5.8 |
| | | P+ | 160 | 32% | 35% | 47% | 36% | 4 | -11 |
| | State | CPI | 89,857 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 66.3 | 65.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 |
| | | P+ | 89,857 | 31% | 33% | 32% | 31% | 0 | -1 |
| Econ. Disadv. | District | CPI | 108 | -- | -- | 79.2 | 72.2 | -- | -7.0 |
| | | P+ | 108 | -- | -- | 54% | 41% | -- | -13 |
| | State | CPI | 61,476 | -- | -- | 67.1 | 65.8 | -- | -1.3 |
| | | P+ | 61,476 | -- | -- | 33.0% | 29% | -- | -4 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 78 | 57.8 | 60.3 | 63.3 | 55.1 | -2.7 | -8.2 |
| | | P+ | 78 | 14% | 24% | 29% | 18% | 4 | -11 |
| | State | CPI | 38,109 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 60.2 | 59.7 | -0.1 | -0.5 |
| | | P+ | 38,109 | 20% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 20 | -- | 60.3 | 67.5 | 62.5 | -- | -5.0 |
| | | P+ | 20 | -- | 41% | 55% | 30% | -- | -25 |
| | State | CPI | 18,594 | 54.0 | 54.0 | 53.9 | 54.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| | | P+ | 18,594 | 19% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 0 | 1 |
| All students | District | CPI | 407 | 81.6 | 83.5 | 84.0 | 81.4 | -0.2 | -2.6 |
| | | P+ | 407 | 56% | 63% | 63% | 57% | 1 | -6 |
| | State | CPI | 208,262 | 79.0 | 79.6 | 79.4 | 78.7 | -0.3 | -0.7 |
| | | P+ | 208,262 | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 | 0 |

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

**Table B4: Monomoy Regional School District
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

| Group | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2012–2015 | | Change 2014–2015 | | State (2015) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change | |
| High Needs | -- | 1.9% | 3.1% | 4.2% | -- | -- | 1.1 | 35% | 3.4% |
| Econ Disadv ¹² | -- | 2.0% | 1.7% | 4.5% | -- | -- | 2.8 | 165% | 3.3% |
| Students w/ disabilities | -- | 3.9% | 4.5% | 6.3% | -- | -- | 1.8 | 40% | 3.5% |
| ELL | -- | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | -- | -- | 6.7 | -- | 5.7% |
| All students | -- | 1.1% | 2.1% | 2.0% | -- | -- | -0.1 | -5% | 1.9% |

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

**Table B5: Monomoy Regional School District
Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

| Group | School Year Ending | | | | Change 2013–2016 | | Change 2015–2016 | | State (2016) |
|--------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change | |
| All students | 94.4% | 94.7% | 94.0% | 93.9% | -0.5 | -0.5% | -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.

¹² Low income numbers used for economically disadvantaged for 2012, 2013, and 2014

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

| | FY14 | | FY15 | | FY16 | |
|--|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual |
| Expenditures | | | | | | |
| From school committee budget | | \$30,571,301 | \$31,097,988 | \$31,243,280 | \$35,012,973 | \$34,409,498 |
| From revolving funds and grants | --- | \$4,160,366 | --- | \$5,048,131 | --- | \$3,845,499 |
| Total expenditures | --- | \$34,731,667 | --- | \$36,291,411 | --- | \$38,254,997 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid* | --- | \$2,506,360 | --- | \$2,708,296 | --- | \$2,755,146 |
| Required local contribution | --- | \$16,031,006 | --- | \$15,518,373 | --- | \$15,720,020 |
| Required net school spending** | --- | \$18,537,366 | --- | \$18,226,669 | --- | \$18,475,166 |
| Actual net school spending | --- | \$28,785,557 | --- | \$29,002,749 | --- | \$30,714,654 |
| Over/under required (\$) | --- | \$10,248,191 | --- | \$10,776,080 | --- | \$12,239,488 |
| Over/under required (%) | --- | 55.3% | --- | 59.1% | --- | 66.2% |

*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: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports; Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website.

Data retrieved 12/13/16

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

| Expenditure Category | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Administration | \$784 | \$691 | \$799 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | \$1,072 | \$1,028 | \$962 |
| Teachers | \$6,580 | \$6,615 | \$6,573 |
| Other teaching services | \$1,669 | \$1,630 | \$1,715 |
| Professional development | \$92 | \$115 | \$74 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | \$477 | \$233 | \$223 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | \$504 | \$472 | \$471 |
| Pupil services | \$1,183 | \$1,350 | \$1,324 |
| Operations and maintenance | \$1,361 | \$1,487 | \$1,382 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | \$2,586 | \$2,544 | \$3,064 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | \$16,306 | \$16,165 | \$16,587 |

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

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

| Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction | | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg. Number of points |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|-----------------------|
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 1.The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content. | ES | 4% | 30% | 33% | 33% | 2.0 |
| | MS | 6% | 11% | 61% | 22% | 2.0 |
| | HS | 11% | 17% | 44% | 28% | 1.9 |
| | Total # | 4 | 13 | 28 | 18 | 2.0 |
| | Total % | 6% | 21% | 44% | 29% | |
| 2.The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson. | ES | 41% | 19% | 26% | 15% | 1.1 |
| | MS | 11% | 17% | 61% | 11% | 1.7 |
| | HS | 28% | 39% | 33% | 0% | 1.1 |
| | Total # | 18 | 15 | 24 | 6 | 1.3 |
| | Total % | 29% | 24% | 38% | 10% | |
| 3.The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective(s). | ES | 26% | 30% | 41% | 4% | 1.2 |
| | MS | 11% | 11% | 61% | 17% | 1.8 |
| | HS | 28% | 50% | 22% | 0% | 0.9 |
| | Total # | 14 | 19 | 26 | 4 | 1.3 |
| | Total % | 22% | 30% | 41% | 6% | |
| 4.The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s). | ES | 19% | 26% | 33% | 22% | 1.6 |
| | MS | 11% | 11% | 72% | 6% | 1.7 |
| | HS | 39% | 44% | 17% | 0% | 0.8 |
| | Total # | 14 | 17 | 25 | 7 | 1.4 |
| | Total % | 22% | 27% | 40% | 11% | |
| Total Score for Focus Area #1 | ES | | | | | 5.9 |
| | MS | | | | | 7.3 |
| | HS | | | | | 4.7 |
| | Total | | | | | 6.0 |

| Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking | | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg. Number of points |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|-----------------------|
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 5.Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson. | ES | 0% | 30% | 26% | 44% | 2.1 |
| | MS | 0% | 28% | 56% | 17% | 1.9 |
| | HS | 17% | 11% | 67% | 6% | 1.6 |
| | Total # | 3 | 15 | 29 | 16 | 1.9 |
| | Total % | 5% | 24% | 46% | 25% | |
| 6.The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking. | ES | 19% | 52% | 26% | 4% | 1.1 |
| | MS | 11% | 22% | 50% | 17% | 1.7 |
| | HS | 28% | 56% | 17% | 0% | 0.9 |
| | Total # | 12 | 28 | 19 | 4 | 1.2 |
| | Total % | 19% | 44% | 30% | 6% | |
| 7.Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | ES | 7% | 37% | 33% | 22% | 1.7 |
| | MS | 0% | 22% | 56% | 22% | 2.0 |
| | HS | 11% | 44% | 33% | 11% | 1.4 |
| | Total # | 4 | 22 | 25 | 12 | 1.7 |
| | Total % | 6% | 35% | 40% | 19% | |
| Total Score for Focus Area #2 | ES | | | | | 5.0 |
| | MS | | | | | 5.6 |
| | HS | | | | | 3.9 |
| | Total | | | | | 4.9 |

| Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture | | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg. Number of points |
|---|----------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|-----------------------|
| | | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners. | ES | 11% | 67% | 19% | 4% | 1.1 |
| | MS | 17% | 50% | 33% | 0% | 1.2 |
| | HS | 56% | 17% | 17% | 11% | 0.8 |
| | Total # | 16 | 30 | 14 | 3 | 1.1 |
| | Total % | 25% | 48% | 22% | 5% | |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel). | ES | 11% | 33% | 44% | 11% | 1.6 |
| | MS | 11% | 11% | 61% | 17% | 1.8 |
| | HS | 56% | 17% | 22% | 6% | 0.8 |
| | Total # | 15 | 14 | 27 | 7 | 1.4 |
| | Total % | 24% | 22% | 43% | 11% | |
| 10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse. | ES | 0% | 19% | 33% | 48% | 2.3 |
| | MS | 0% | 6% | 72% | 22% | 2.2 |
| | HS | 11% | 22% | 33% | 33% | 1.9 |
| | Total # | 2 | 10 | 28 | 23 | 2.1 |
| | Total % | 3% | 16% | 44% | 37% | |
| 11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students. | ES | 4% | 37% | 44% | 15% | 1.7 |
| | MS | 17% | 17% | 56% | 11% | 1.6 |
| | HS | 28% | 28% | 39% | 6% | 1.2 |
| | Total # | 9 | 18 | 29 | 7 | 1.5 |
| | Total % | 14% | 29% | 46% | 11% | |
| Total Score for Focus Area #3 | ES | | | | | 6.7 |
| | MS | | | | | 6.8 |
| | HS | | | | | 4.7 |
| | Total # | | | | | 6.2 |