Targeted District Review Report

Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School

Review conducted April 4-6, 2016

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Executive Summary 1

Overview 5

Curriculum and Instruction 22

Assessment 39

Student Support 44

Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit 54

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures 56

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory 71

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

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

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

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

Executive Summary

Strengths

District leaders are poised to lead the Somerset Public Schools (K-8) and Somerset Berkley Regional High School (grades 9-12) toward improved teaching, learning, and student achievement despite the challenges in recent years of high leadership turnover, budget shortfalls, elementary redistricting, and regionalization (See the District Profile below). (For purposes of this report and for clarity the Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School are referred to collectively as "the district.")

The superintendent[1] has developed a five-year district strategy plan for the K-8 schools with a vision and core values, and is developing action plans based on that vision. Future Search, a two-day event attended by over 100 students, parents, and community stakeholders, has helped to lay the foundation for an updated strategic plan for the high school.

A significant achievement during the new superintendent's tenure was the closing of one elementary school on June 30, 2014, and the subsequent re-districting of the remaining three schools to close the budget gap of a fiscal year 2014 $475,000 deficit. The superintendent started the fiscal year 2015 with a $850,000 structural deficit that resulted in the elimination of the elementary gifted and talented program, cutting 7.3 FTE positions, and freezing funds for professional development and technology.

The superintendent recognized in his 2015 Entry Plan the absence of a systematic intervention process in the district and has begun to work to establish an effective Response to Intervention (RtI) program throughout the district. He has identified problems in services to students with disabilities and in January 2016 hired an interim director of special education, who was ultimately hired as the permanent director of special education beginning July 1, 2016. The superintendent has also engaged an outside agency to review the district's special education program.

School committee members conveyed confidence and trust in the new leadership team, noting a shift to greater transparency and accountability. Stakeholders expressed confidence in the current superintendent's vision and his leadership style though several were cautious in their optimism because they said they had experienced much change in the past five years.

The high school has created and maintained a comprehensive course of study which supports a wide variety of student interests, particularly in music. Under the guidance of its new director of curriculum and assessment the district has a new K-12 structure which involves teachers beginning to address needed improvements in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Also, the high school has

[1] The superintendent served as the superintendent of the Somerset Public Schools (K-8) for the 2014-2015 school year before his additional appointment as the superintendent of the Somerset Berkley Regional High School in 2015-2016.

implemented a schoolwide assessment rubric for academic, social, and civic expectations to determine proficiency in those areas.

The team observed 57 classes throughout the district: 24 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 18 at the3 elementary schools. The team observed 26 ELA classes, 15 mathematics classes, 13 science classes, and 3 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 13 classes with either a co-teacher or one or more paraprofessionals. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

In most observed classrooms districtwide, classroom climate was characterized by respectful behavior, routines, and discourse and teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

There has been significant interruption in the continuity of curricular, instructional, and special education leadership in the district in recent years.

In the Somerset Public Schools (K-8), the following changes have taken place since 2011:

- There have been two superintendents.
- There has been one director of curriculum (shared with the high school) from 2010-2013 The position was vacant during the 2014-2015 school year and a new director was hired in July 2015.
- There have been five directors of special education.
- There have been three principals at South Elementary School.
- There have been four principals at Chace Elementary School.

In Somerset Berkley Regional High School, the following changes have taken place since 2010:

- The high school district has had four superintendents, including one interim superintendent during the regionalization process.
- The high school had one curriculum director (shared with the Somerset Public Schools) from 2010-2013. In 2013-2014 the curriculum director worked only in the Somerset Public Schools. The position was vacant in 2014-2015, and a new director was hired in July 2015.
- There have been five directors of special education and at the time of the site visit the director of special education was an interim director.
- The high school has had three principals.

The impact and effects of all these changes are substantial. While interviewees were generally positive about the new leaders and the improving climate, they expressed concern about the slow pace of

curriculum improvement, the recent decline in student performance in some subjects and grades as measured by MCAS tests, the impact of possible budget cuts on staffing, the absence of a systematic system of student support, and the limited resources and time for professional development. They also questioned how much the small central office team could realistically accomplish.

Of concern to the review team were the following challenges in the district:

- High leadership turnover in recent years has meant substantial inconsistencies among the schools in curriculum content, instructional strategies, and assessment programs.
- The district's action plans to align curriculum K-12 do not identify responsible persons, the desired outcomes, required resources, the expected dates of completion for each task, or progress benchmarks.
- The district does not have a curriculum review process to ensure curriculum currency, alignment, and fidelity to the 2011 frameworks and equitable access to the curriculum.
- Instructional leadership and responsibility for improving instruction have not been well defined.
- In observed classrooms across the district, the characteristics of high-quality instruction were inconsistently implemented. Review team members noted that differentiated instruction was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction.
- Assessment results are not used to guide daily instruction, to review curricula, or to evaluate student support programs.
- Student support resources vary among schools, and are limited at the middle- and high-school levels. The Chace Elementary School, which follows a traditional Response to Intervention (RtI) model, is well poised to deliver an effective program of intervention.
- Student absence and tardiness at the high school are serious concerns in the district.

Recommendations

- District leaders, with the support of the school committee, should provide sufficient leadership and support so that all students are guaranteed a fully aligned, consistently used, and effectively delivered curriculum.
- The district should prioritize its improvement initiatives, empowering principals as educational leaders, and ensuring teaching support and supervision with appropriate structures. The overarching goal should be to ensure that effective high-quality instructional practices are commonly understood and consistently implemented across all schools.

- The district should develop a system for making data-driven decisions to improve student achievement and to evaluate the effectiveness of its programs.
- The district should continue its work to establish an effective RtI process in all schools and to improve services for students with disabilities. It should review its attendance and tardiness policies to ensure that all students are fully participating in the educational program.

Overview

Purpose

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

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

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School was conducted from April 4-6, 2016.

The site visit included 22 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 78 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 3 elementary-school teachers, 3 middle-school teachers, and 13 high-school teachers. Attendance at one teacher focus group was affected by a mid-day snowstorm which delayed student dismissal.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 57 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Somerset High School regionalized with nearby Berkley in 2011 to form the Somerset Berkley Regional High School; the Somerset K-8 grades remain an independent school district as does the Berkley school district. Before regionalization, approximately 200-250 students from Berkley attended Somerset High School as tuition students. The regionalization agreement provided parents of high-school students in Berkley with formal representation on the school committee of the newly formed regional high school and qualified Somerset for much needed state building funds. In 2014-2015, to help close a financial deficit, Somerset redistricted all its schools and closed the Wilbur School, its oldest elementary school.

Somerset is governed by a three-member board of selectmen and a town administrator and has an open town meeting form of government; the chair of the school committee is elected. The five members of the Somerset Public Schools' school committee meet twice per month. Two members serve as representatives to the Somerset Berkley Regional High School's school committee, which has seven members and meets twice per month. Joint school committee meetings are scheduled several times per year as needed. Two Berkley school committee members serve as representatives on the Somerset Berkley Regional High School's school committee.

The superintendent served the Somerset Public Schools in the 2014-2015 school year before his additional appointment as the superintendent of the regional high school in 2015-2016. The district leadership team includes the principals and the directors of curriculum and assessment, student services, business and finance, and technology. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past five years, although the position of director of curriculum and assessment was left vacant in 2014-2015 because of budget cuts. The district has five principals leading five schools. There are four assistant principals. In 2015-2016, there were 121 teachers in the Somerset Public Schools (K-8) and 85 in the Somerset Berkley Regional High School.

In the 2015-2016 school year, 1,802 students were enrolled in the elementary and middle schools and 957 were enrolled in the high school.

Table 1: Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015-2016

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Chace Street	ES	Pre-K-5	387
North	ES	K-5	503
South	ES	K-5	285
Somerset Middle School	MS	6-8	627
Totals: Somerset Public Schools	**4 schools**	**Pre-K-8**	**1,802**
Somerset Berkley Regional High School	HS	9-12	957
*As of October 1, 2015			

Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment in the Somerset Public Schools decreased by 2 percent and overall student enrollment in the Somerset Berkley Regional High School decreased by .8 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures in the Somerset Public Schools were lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures in K-8 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal 2014: $12,569 as compared with $13,718 (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.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures in the Somerset Berkley Regional High School were lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for 6 regional high schools of similar size (< 1,000 students) in fiscal 2014: $13,595 as compared with $15,813 (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

District and Subgroup Results

The Somerset Public Schools district is Level 2 because three of its four schools are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and/or high needs students. Somerset Berkley Regional High School is also a Level 2 district for not meeting its gap narrowing targets for all students and high needs students.

Table 2: Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2012–2015

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Accountability Level
		2012	2013	2014	2015			
ES: Chace Street	All	30	70	65	30	49	41	2
	High Needs	--	--	63	100	--		
ES: North Elementary	All	35	70	85	60	67	45	2
	High Needs	81	113	106	106	100		
ES: South Elementary	All	125	110	110	35	82	56	1
	High Needs	--	--	--	50	--		
MS: Somerset Middle	All	90	65	55	60	63	67	2
	High Needs	95	65	65	65	68		
Somerset District	All	39	63	55	35	47	--	2
	High Needs	57	75	75	75	73		
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional	All	64	107	82	50	72	68	2
	High Needs	68	110	64	64	74		

Between 2012 and 2015 the ELA CPI in the Somerset Public Schools declined by 1.2 points for all students and by 4.9 points for students with disabilities and improved by 0.3 points for high needs students.

Table 3a: Somerset Public Schools ELA CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	88.5	87.9	89.1	87.3	-1.2	0.5
	State	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.8	0.1	
High Needs	District	74.9	75.0	77.0	75.2	0.3	-1.1
	State	76.5	76.8	77.1	76.3	-0.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	79.6	--	2.0
	State	--	--	--	77.6	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	66.2	67.4	67.8	68.9	2.7	
Students with disabilities	District	66.8	66.3	68.8	61.9	-4.9	-5.5
	State	67.3	66.8	66.6	67.4	0.1	

Between 2012 and 2015 the ELA CPI in the Somerset Berkley Regional High School declined by 0.8 CPI points for the district as a whole, by 4.8 CPI points for high needs students, and by 14.1 CPI points for students with disabilities.

Table 3b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
ELA CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	97.8	99.3	99.0	97.0	-0.8	0.3
	State	95.8	96.9	96.0	96.7	0.9	
High Needs	District	92.6	97.5	95.5	87.3	-5.3	-4.8
	State	91.0	93.1	91.5	92.1	1.1	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	94.3	--	0.9
	State	--	--	--	93.4	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	77.0	81.8	77.8	80.7	3.7	
Students with disabilities	District	89.2	96.0	93.0	74.0	-15.2	-14.1
	State	85.8	88.4	86.0	88.1	2.3	

Between 2012 and 2015 the math CPI in the Somerset Public Schools declined by 0.5 CPI points for all students and by 1.6 CPI points for students with disabilities, and improved by 1.5 CPI points for high needs students.

Table 4a: Somerset Public Schools
Math CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	81.9	83.5	82.0	81.4	-0.5	0.7
	State	79.9	80.8	80.3	80.7	0.8	
High Needs	District	65.6	68.5	67.1	67.1	1.5	-0.8
	State	67.0	68.6	68.4	67.9	0.9	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	71.7	--	2.5
	State	--	--	--	69.2	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.5	2.9	
Students with disabilities	District	56.2	59.9	57.2	54.6	-1.6	-2.7
	State	56.9	57.4	57.1	57.3	0.4	

Between 2012 and 2015 Somerset Berkley Regional High School's math CPI improved by 1.7 CPI points for all students and by 3.1 CPI points for high needs students, and declined by 4.2 CPI points for students with disabilities.

Table 4b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Math CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	92.7	97.4	95.2	94.4	1.7	4.5
	State	90.0	90.2	90.0	89.9	-0.1	
High Needs	District	77.8	89.4	82.6	80.9	3.1	2.0
	State	80.4	80.3	80.6	78.9	-1.5	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	87.9	--	6.7
	State	--	--	--	81.2	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	67.5	64.4	67.8	65.8	-1.7	
Students with disabilities	District	75.0	88.0	75.0	70.8	-4.2	1.1
	State	71.4	70.0	70.8	69.7	-1.7	

Between 2012 and 2015 the Somerset Public Schools' science CPI declined by 1.7 CPI points for all students, did not improve for students with disabilities, and improved by 1.8 CPI points for high needs students.

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

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	79.9	77.1	81.3	78.2	-1.7	-1.2
	State	78.6	79.0	79.6	79.4	0.8	
High Needs	District	61.6	64.3	68.8	63.4	1.8	-2.9
	State	65.0	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	69.1	--	2.0
	State	--	--	--	67.1	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	51.4	54.0	54.0	53.9	2.5	
Students with disabilities	District	48.8	58.5	64.3	48.8	0.0	-11.4
	State	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	

Between 2012 and 2015 Somerset Berkley Regional High School's science CPI improved by 1.1 CPI points for all students and by 4.5 CPI points for high needs students, and declined by 3.9 CPI points for students with disabilities.

Table 5b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Science CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4- Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	88.9	95.2	92.0	90.0	1.1	1.8
	State	87.0	88.0	87.9	88.2	1.2	
High Needs	District	71.0	87.1	80.6	75.5	4.5	-1.8
	State	76.0	77.7	77.5	77.3	1.3	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	87.1	--	8.5
	State	--	--	--	78.6	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	61.8	63.0	62.6	62.3	0.5	
Students with disabilities	District	64.8	83.0	72.6	60.9	-3.9	-10.3
	State	68.8	70.3	70.0	71.2	2.4	

The Somerset Public Schools district did not reach its 2015 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities.

Table 6a: Somerset Public Schools
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup

	ELA			Math			Science		
Group	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating
All students	87.3	93.3	No Change	81.4	88.2	No Change	78.2	88.3	Declined
High Needs	75.2	83.9	No Change	67.1	75.1	No Change	63.4	74.7	Declined
Economically Disadvantaged[2]	79.6	--	--	71.7	--	--	69.1	--	--
ELLs	--	--		--	--		--	--	--
Students with disabilities	61.9	78.5	Declined	54.6	68.2	Declined	48.8	70.1	Declined

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

Somerset Berkley Regional High School did not reach its 2015 CPI targets in ELA, math, and science for all students and high needs students.

Table 6b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup

	ELA			Math			Science		
Group	**2015 CPI**	**2015 Target**	**Rating**	**2015 CPI**	**2015 Target**	**Rating**	**2015 CPI**	**2015 Target**	**Rating**
All students	97.0	98.7	No Change	94.4	96.3	No Change	90.0	92.4	No Change
High Needs	87.3	95.3	Declined	80.9	86.5	No Change	75.5	81.5	Declined
Economically Disadvantaged[3]	94.3	--	--	87.9	--	--	87.1	--	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

In the Somerset Public Schools, growth in ELA and math was moderate in ELA and math for all students and high needs students compared with their academic peers statewide. Growth was low in ELA and moderate in math for students with disabilities, compared with their academic peers statewide.

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

Group	**Median ELA SGP**			**Median Math SGP**		
	District	**State**	**Growth Level**	**District**	**State**	**Growth Level**
All students	47.0	50.0	Moderate	56.5	50.0	Moderate
High Needs	42.0	47.0	Moderate	52.0	46.0	Moderate
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs	--	53.0	--	--	51.0	--
SWD	38.0	43.0	Low	49.0	43.0	Moderate

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

In Somerset Berkley Regional High School, growth in ELA and math was moderate for all students compared with their academic peers statewide and low for high needs students and economically disadvantaged students.

Table 7b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
2015 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup[4]

Group	Median ELA SGP			Median Math SGP		
	District	State	Growth Level	District	State	Growth Level
All students	49.0	51.0	Moderate	52.0	50.0	Moderate
High Needs	38.0.	47.0	Low	40.0	47.0	Low
Econ. Disad.	39.5	47.0	Low	28.0	46.0	Low
ELLs	--	59.0	--	--	53.0	--
SWD	--	43.0	--	--	46.0	--

In 2015, out -of -school and in-school suspension rates in the Somerset Public Schools were lower than the state rates for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities.

Table 8a: Somerset Public Schools
Out-of-School and In-School Suspensions by Subgroup 2013–2015

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	2.8%	1.5%	3.2%	4.8%
	ISS	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	3.4%	--	2.8%	5.4%
	ISS	0.8%	--	0.5%	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	3.2%	2.3%	5.4%	6.1%
	ISS	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	--	--	--	3.8%
	ISS	--	--	--	1.8%
All Students	OSS	1.3%	0.7%	1.8%	2.9%
	ISS	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.8%

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

[4] District and state growth rates refer to the 10th grade median student growth percentile.

In 2015, out-of -school suspension rates in the Somerset Berkley Regional High School were above the state rates for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities. The high school did not have any reported in-school suspensions.

Table 8b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Out-of-School and In-School Suspensions by Subgroup 2013–2015

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	10.4%	6.5%	8.0%	4.8%
	ISS	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	7.8%	7.0%	6.4%	5.4%
	ISS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	13.5%	6.8%	10.6%	6.1%
	ISS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	--	--	--	3.8%
	ISS	--	--	--	1.8%
All Students	OSS	3.8%	2.2%	4.8%	2.9%
	ISS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%

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

In 2015, Somerset Berkley's four-year cohort graduation rate was above the state rate by 8.7 percentage points for all students and by 8.2 to 12 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. Somerset Berkley reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students, high needs students, and low income students.[5]

Table 9: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
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	60	86.7%	75.0%	81.5%	86.7%	0.0	0.0%	5.2	6.4%	78.5%
Low income	41	87.5%	78.9%	85.3%	90.2%	2.7	3.1%	4.9	5.7%	78.2%
SWD	30	81.3%	68.4%	74.1%	80.0%	-1.3	-1.6%	5.9	8.0%	69.9%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.0%
All students	225	96.7%	95.5%	93.7%	96.0%	-0.7	-0.7%	2.3	2.5%	87.3%

[5] The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low income students did not receive a 2015 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

In 2014, Somerset Berkley's five-year cohort graduation rate was above the state rate by 6 percentage points for all students and by 4.9 to 8 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities. Somerset Berkley reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students.[6]

Table 10: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
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	54	--	86.7%	75.0%	85.2%	--	--	10.2	13.6%	80.3%
Low income	34	--	87.5%	78.9%	85.3%	--	--	6.4	8.1%	79.6%
SWD	27	--	81.3%	68.4%	81.5%	--	--	13.1	19.2%	73.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	69.8%
All students	238	--	96.7%	95.5%	94.5%	--	--	-1.0	-1.0%	88.5%

Somerset Berkley's dropout rates for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities were lower than the state rates for each group.

Table 11: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Dropout Rates by Subgroup 2012–2015[7]

	2012	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	2.2%	7.3%	2.8%	2.2%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	2.3%	6.9%	3.4%	2.0%	3.3%
SWD	1.3%	10.5%	2.9%	1.9%	3.5%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	0.9%	2.5%	1.3%	0.8%	1.9%

Grade and School Results

In 2015, ELA proficiency rates in the Somerset Public Schools and in Somerset Berkley Regional High School were above the state rates in each tested grade except the 3rd grade. There were notable improvements in ELA proficiency in the 5th grade and declines in the 3rd and 7th grades.

- ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate by 9 percentage points in the 4th grade, by 3 percentage points in the 6th, 7th, and 10th grades, and by 2 and 1 percentage points in the 8th and 5th grades, respectively.

[6] The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2013 graduation rate. Low income students did not receive a 2015 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.
[7] Low Income Dropout Rate used for the 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged dropout rate.

- Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved by 14 percentage points in the 5th grade, and by 1 percentage point in the 10th grade.

- In 2015, ELA proficiency in the 3rd grade was below the state rate by 3 percentage points.
  - Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates declined by 10 and 8 percentage points in the 7th and 3rd grades, respectively, and by 1 to 3 percentage points in the 4th, 6th, and 8th grades.

Table 12: Somerset Public Schools and the Somerset Berkley Regional High School ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012–2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	207	65%	63%	64%	57%	60%	-8	-7
4	206	64%	62%	70%	62%	53%	-2	-8
5	197	58%	65%	71%	72%	71%	14	1
6	205	75%	64%	63%	74%	71%	-1	11
7	220	83%	79%	78%	73%	70%	-10	-5
8	220	85%	87%	86%	82%	80%	-3	-4
3-8	1,255	71%	70%	72%	70%	--	-1	-2
10	250	93%	98%	97%	94%	91%	1	-3

In 2015, ELA proficiency rates were above the state rates in the 3rd and 5th grades in one of the three elementary schools, and in the 4th grade in all three elementary schools. ELA proficiency was above the state rate in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at Somerset Middle. ELA proficiency in the 10th grade at Somerset Berkley Regional was 94 percent-, 3 percentage points above the state rate of 91 percent.

Table 13: Somerset Public Schools and the Somerset Berkley Regional High School

ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Chace Street	59%	58%	70%	--	--	--	--	62%
ES: North Elementary	64%	62%	82%	--	--	--	--	69%
ES: South	53%	76%	65%	--	--	--	--	64%
MS: Somerset Middle	--	--	--	75%	74%	84%	--	78%
Somerset Public Schools District Total	57%	62%	72%	74%	73%	82%	--	70%
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional	--	--	--	--	--	--	94%	94%
Somerset Berkley District Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	94%	94%
State	60%	53%	71%	71%	70%	80%	91%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates improved by 11 percentage points at North Elementary and by 1 point at Somerset Berkley Regional, did not improve at South and Chace Street elementary schools, and declined by 5 percentage points at Somerset Middle.

- ELA proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 25 and 21 percentage points at Chace Street and North Elementary, respectively, and by 6 percentage points at South Elementary, and declined by 3 and 1 percentage points at Somerset Middle and Somerset Berkley Regional, respectively.
- ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 18 and 19 percentage points at Chace Street and North Elementary, respectively, and declined by 7 to 13 percentage points at South, Somerset Middle, and Somerset Berkley Regional.

Table 14: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend
ES: Chace Street	62%	66%	65%	62%	0
High Needs	24%	28%	27%	49%	25
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	58%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	11%	15%	21%	29%	18
ES: North Elementary	58%	63%	67%	69%	11
High Needs	33%	44%	44%	54%	21
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	59%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	14%	24%	30%	33%	19
ES: South Elementary	64%	64%	76%	64%	0
High Needs	36%	41%	64%	42%	6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	50%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	26%	32%	43%	17%	-9
MS: Somerset Middle	83%	78%	77%	78%	-5
High Needs	54%	54%	52%	51%	-3
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	62%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	38%	38%	38%	31%	-7
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional	93%	98%	97%	94%	1
High Needs	75%	93%	89%	74%	-1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	86%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	63%	88%	84%	50%	-13

Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates improved in each tested grade except the 4th and 6th grades.

- Math proficiency rates improved by 10 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 4 percentage points in the 8th and 10th grades, by 3 percentage points in the 7th grade, and by 1 percentage point in the 5th grade.
    - ELA proficiency rates were above the state rates by 13 percentage points in the 8th grade and by 8 percentage points in the 7th and 10th grades.

- Math proficiency rates declined by 8 and 3 percentage points in the 4th and 6th grades, respectively.
    - Math proficiency rates in the district were below the state rate by 6 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 4 percentage points in the 3rd and 6th grades, and equal to the state rate in the 4th grade.

Table 15: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	208	56%	64%	65%	66%	70%	10	1
4	206	55%	54%	59%	47%	47%	-8	-12
5	197	60%	62%	62%	61%	67%	1	-1
6	206	61%	67%	55%	58%	62%	-3	3
7	220	56%	56%	57%	59%	51%	3	2
8	221	69%	74%	65%	73%	60%	4	8
3-8	1258	60%	63%	60%	61%	--	1	1
10	250	83%	92%	89%	87%	79%	4	-2

Math proficiency rates were above the state rate in the 3rd and 4th grades in two of the three elementary schools and in the 5th grade in one of the elementary schools. Math proficiency at Somerset Middle was above the state rate in the 7h and 8th grade and below the state rate in the 6th grade. Math proficiency in the 10th grade at Somerset Berkley Regional was 87 percent, above the state rate of 79 percent.

Table 16: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Chace Street	72%	60%	60%	--	--	--	--	64%
ES: North Elementary	72%	41%	69%	--	--	--	--	60%
ES: South Elementary	59%	54%	53%	--	--	--	--	55%
MS: Somerset Middle	--	--	--	59%	60%	75%	--	65%
Somerset Public Schools District Total	66%	47%	61%	58%	59%	73%	--	61%
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional	--	--	--	--	--	--	87%	87%
Somerset Berkley District Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	87%	87%
State	70%	47%	67%	62%	51%	60%	79%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 math proficiency rates improved by 8 and 6 percentage points at Chace Street and North Elementary, respectively, and by 1 and 4 percentage points at Somerset Middle and Somerset Berkley Regional, respectively, and declined by 12 percentage points at South Elementary.

- Math proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 29 percentage points at Chace Street , by 9 and 7 percentage points at Somerset Middle and Somerset Berkley Regional, respectively, and by 2 percentage points at North Elementary. Math proficiency rates declined by 5 percentage points at South Elementary.
- Math proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 23 and 4 percentage points at Chace Street and Somerset Middle, respectively, and declined by 27 percentage points at South Elementary and by 4 and 8 percentage points at North Elementary and Somerset Berkley Regional, respectively.

Table 17: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend
ES: Chace Street	56%	62%	63%	64%	8
High Needs	16%	25%	23%	45%	29
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	58%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	0%	5%	16%	23%	23
ES: North Elementary	54%	59%	61%	60%	6
High Needs	33%	32%	46%	35%	2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	41%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	21%	17%	27%	17%	-4
ES: South Elementary	67%	70%	69%	55%	-12
High Needs	44%	58%	55%	39%	-5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	42%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	48%	59%	57%	21%	-27
MS: Somerset Middle	64%	67%	61%	65%	1
High Needs	33%	41%	33%	42%	9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	55%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	19%	20%	21%	23%	4
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional High	83%	92%	89%	87%	4
High Needs	53%	68%	61%	60%	7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	71%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	50%	60%	44%	42%	-8

Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates declined in the 5th and 8th grades at Somerset Middle and improved in the 10th grade at Somerset Berkley Regional.

- 5th grade science proficiency declined by 6 percentage points from 52 percent in 2012 to 46 percent in 2015, 5 percentage points below the state rate of 51 percent.
- 8th grade science proficiency declined by 4 percentage points from 54 percent in 2012 to 50 percent in 2015, 8 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent.
- 10th grade science proficiency improved by percentage points from 69 percent in 2012 to 75 percent in 2015, 3 percentage points above the state rate of 72 percent.

Table 18: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	197	52%	41%	54%	46%	51%	-6	-8
8	221	54%	43%	55%	50%	42%	-4	-5
5 & 8	418	53%	42%	54%	48%	--	-5	-6
10	233	69%	85%	76%	75%	72%	6	-1

The science proficiency rate in the 5th grade was above the state rate by 6 percentage points at North Elementary and below the state rate by 7 percentage points at Chace Street and by 18 percentage points at South Elementary. In the 8th grade at Somerset Middle the science proficiency rate was 51 percent, 9 percentage points above the state rate of 42 percent. In the 10th grade at Somerset Berkley Regional the science proficiency rate was 75 percent, 3 percentage points above the state rate of 72 percent.

Table 19: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Science Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ES: Chace Street	--	--	44%	--	--	--	--	44%
ES: North Elementary	--	--	57%	--	--	--	--	57%
ES: South Elementary	--	--	33%	--	--	--	--	33%
MS: Somerset Middle	--	--	--	--	--	51%	--	51%
Somerset District Total	--	--	46%	--	--	50%	--	48%
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional	--	--	--	--	--	--	75%	75%
Somerset Berkley District Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	75%	75%
State	--	--	51%	--	--	42%	72%	54%

Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates improved by 5 and 6 percentage points at North Elementary and Somerset Berkley Regional, respectively, and declined by 13 percentage points at South Elementary and by 5 and 3 percentage points at Chace Street and Somerset Middle, respectively.

- Science proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 16 percentage points at Somerset Berkley Regional and by 11 and 12 percentage points at North Elementary and Somerset Middle, respectively. Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 17 percentage points at South Elementary.
- Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 2 percentage points at Somerset Berkley Regional.

Table 20: Somerset & Somerset Berkley Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012–2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend
ES: Chace Street	49%	56%	54%	44%	-5
High Needs	--	--	50%	28%	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	28%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	20%	--
ES: North Elementary	52%	40%	46%	57%	5
High Needs	27%	22%	17%	38%	11
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	--	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	0%	29%	17%	--	--
ES: South Elementary	46%	40%	65%	33%	-13
High Needs	27%	36%	36%	10%	-17
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	15%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	30%	--	0%	--
MS: Somerset Middle	54%	44%	57%	51%	-3
High Needs	22%	16%	35%	34%	12
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	48%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	7%	8%	21%	11%	4
HS: Somerset Berkley Regional High	69%	85%	76%	75%	6
High Needs	27%	60%	50%	43%	16
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	59%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	23%	45%	33%	21%	-2

Curriculum and Instruction

Contextual Background

Since 2010, the district has been in a state of flux, with significant interruptions in the continuity of curriculum leadership. Multiple changes in the district as noted in the executive summary have contributed to the instability in recent years and the limited attention to the core of the educational program: curriculum, instruction, and assessment. During this period, student achievement has declined in some subjects and grades as measured by MCAS tests.

During the 2012 academic year the district made an effort to align curriculum to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks. Since that time consistent work to align curriculum has not been done. A review of the curriculum documents indicated that within the same school and content areas, the level of alignment, document formats, and components of curriculum maps differ in many ways. The superintendent noted significant inconsistencies among the schools in curriculum content, instructional strategies, and assessment programs. He expressed concern that all students do not have access to the same high-quality experiences.

District leaders have created a Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (CIA) Committee composed of representative teachers and leaders from all grades, content areas, and school levels. The charge to the CIA was to develop by the end of the 2015-2016 academic year the literacy, the STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics), and the technology action plans identified in the district's strategic vision. In addition, the district has been piloting six new programs: two in elementary ELA, three in elementary mathematics, and a middle-school science program. Also, the district plans to introduce Understanding by Design (UbD) as the organizing framework for new curricula and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) as a framework to ensure that all students' learning needs are embedded in instructional practice.

Although stakeholders including staff, leaders, parents, and school committee members told the team that they believed that these initiatives would bring needed improvements to education in the district, expected characteristics of effective instruction are not included in all the district's action plans. Furthermore, principals, particularly at the elementary level, described themselves more as managers and less as instructional leaders whose core responsibility is to improve teaching and learning. In addition, there are no teacher-leaders K-5 with responsibility to set agendas and convene grade-level colleagues in common planning time meetings and monitor and support instructional improvement.

Strength Findings

1. **Somerset Berkley Regional High School has established a comprehensive course of study, which addresses and supports a wide range of students' interests. Despite fiscal constraints, the district provides its students and community with broad opportunities to experience achievement and success. The district also provides a high-quality music education program for students in grades 4-12.**

   A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the high school provides a large number of courses for introducing the concepts and skills necessary in each area of study.

   1. The ELA and Reading department has a required course for all students in grades 9 and 10. Students in grades 11 and 12 may select from among 11 electives, including two Advanced Placement (AP) courses.

   2. After completing the required U.S. History and Government courses in grades 9 and 10, students may choose from among 9 full-time social studies electives including one AP course.

   3. In addition to the core courses of Physics, Biology, and Chemistry with AP offerings in each, the science department offers STEAM electives in Environmental Science, Forensics, Biotechnology, Human Anatomy and Physiology, and Science Review. It also offers part-time (three periods per cycle) courses in Astronomy, Oceanography, and a Survey of Health Sciences.

   4. The high school offers five years of Portuguese and Spanish languages and four years of French.

   5. The high school participates in Virtual High School, an online program, which gives students experience in distance learning and access to offerings otherwise not available in the school.

   B. The high school provides a number of opportunities for students to: experience active learning, construct their own learning experiences, use critical and reflective thinking, apply previously learned understandings or skills, and participate in performance assessments.

   1. The Engineering Technology program includes courses in Engineering Design, Architectural Design, Computer Diagnostics and Repair, TV Media and Production, and two courses each in Robotic Engineering, Graphics Engineering, and Computer Drafting and Design.

   2. The art program includes eight studio courses in such areas as Ceramics, Drawing, Jewelry/Metals/Stained Glass, Digital Photography, Textile and Fashion Design, AP Art Studio, and also provides an art history course entitled, "Looking at Art thru Time."

   C. Somerset Berkley Regional High School, and its predecessor Somerset High School, have a long, proud, and well-recognized tradition of providing high-quality programs in music education. The

high school continues to demonstrate its belief in the importance of music in the education and lives of its students and members of the community.

1. The music department offers six in-school, credit-bearing performance ensembles: Concert Band, Symphonic Wind Ensemble, Orchestra, String Ensemble, Concert Choir, and Chorale.

2. The seven extracurricular ensembles, which are extensions of the in-school programs, are Marching Band, Select Jazz Band, Winter Percussion Ensemble, two Show Choirs, Chamber Strings, and Winter Color Guard.

3. Students can choose from among the following non-performance music courses: History of Broadway, Introduction to Music, Music Production and Engineering, Vocal Techniques, Theatre Techniques, History of Rock and Roll, and Piano/Keyboard Lab.

4. The music coordinator, the K-12 subject coordinator in the district, coordinates an instrumental music program that begins in grade 4, thereby providing elementary- and middle-school students opportunities to explore and perform using a wide variety of instruments before they reach the high school.

D. The new high school building, completed in 2014, provides facilities and equipment to support the engineering technology and art programs, including state-of- the-art performance, rehearsal, and music classrooms.

E. The variety of offerings, courses, extracurricular activities and experiences enhance students' learning and connect them to the school in deep and meaningful ways.

1. One student told the review team, "We're a music town." He then listed high school music-related activities, including show choir, drama club, marching band, concert band, jazz band, winter percussion, and vocal technique. He also said that drama was also a highly engaging activity and told the team that there were 30-40 students involved in an upcoming production.

2. Other students listed clubs such as robotics, video club, science club, math club, board game club, politics, student council, and business competitions in which they and their friends participate.

3. One student told the team, "DECA (Distributive Education Club) had over 100 kids; a lot of us made it to states and even nationals."

4. Another student told the review team, "I am here from 7:00 am to 10:00 pm at night."

5. Several students described the school as a family and said, "We care about our community."

    a. They provided numerous examples of community outreach such as participation in Special Olympics' Unified Sports, fundraising for members of the community in need, and holiday caroling at nursing homes. They said that they were excited to have a

representative at school committee meetings for the first time and looked forward to playing a role in improving school policy.

Impact: By establishing and maintaining a comprehensive program of studies, the district promotes opportunities for students to participate in a variety of classes that contribute greatly to developing skills in critical thinking, collaborative work, goal-setting and other essential skills that students need to be successful in college and in the work place. By providing students the opportunity to experience the problem solving and communication processes of creating, performing and responding, students acquire an understanding of classical and contemporary arts, their impact in diverse cultures, and their importance in their lives and the life of their community.

2. District leaders are in the elementary stages of planning instructional improvements. Stakeholders expressed the belief that these initiatives would improve teaching at all school levels.

A. District leaders said that they have created a 19-person curriculum, instruction, and assessment (CIA) team of representative teachers, content coordinators, and principals to collaboratively design action plans to improve key content areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction.

1. The CIA Team convened for three-days in February 2016 to begin envisioning and then developing a districtwide Literacy Action Plan, a STEAM[8] Action Plan, and a Technology Action Plan. The district's new strategic vision guides these plans.

2. Action planning is ongoing with the intent to implement the plans in 2016-2017.

B. The district has been piloting two new programs in elementary ELA, three in mathematics, and one in middle school science. Interviewees said that once the new programs have been adopted, there will be opportunities to rethink and improve targeted instructional strategies.

C. District leaders have recognized the need to provide more professional development and more time for common planning, professional development, and release time to implement action plans, adopt new programs, and improve instruction, curriculum, and assessment.

1. In 2015-2016, the district scheduled common planning time (CPT) at all school levels for the first time. During this time, teams of grade-level, content-level, or course-level teachers are able to meet to discuss their work and to meet with principals or content coordinators.

   a. Teachers said that the provision of CPT is outlined in a Memorandum of Agreement with the teachers' association and will be revisited before the end of the 2015-2016 school year.

   b. Elementary CPTs meet for 45 minutes once every 12 days or 15 times a year. At the middle school, CPTs take place once every six-day cycle in grade-level teams. At the high school, CPTs take place twice in an eight-day cycle.

[8] STEAM represents Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics.

2. District leaders are planning expanded professional development time and have asked the school committee to provide one early release day each month for the 2016-2017 school year. The district also is planning curriculum work and professional development during the summer.

    a. A district leader told the team that added release time will be used for professional development in Understanding by Design (UbD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and for implementing the new K-5 ELA programs, the new K-5 math programs, and the new science program in the middle school.

    b. District leaders said that they intend to work with an outside agency to provide courses and professional development tailored to the district's needs.

C. The district is planning for elementary teachers to specialize in content areas in the 2016-2017 school year. District leaders expressed the view that this strategy would have the greatest and quickest impact on student learning.

1. The plan calls for two-person teams of grade-level teachers in grades 3-5. One teacher would specialize in ELA and social studies and the other in math and science and they would share two classrooms. The plan creates efficiencies in teacher training to implement new content and instructional strategies. All teachers, however, would participate in learning how to teach using UbD and UDL strategies.

D. Professional development would include teachers and principals in a shared educational experience.

Impact: The district has identified a series of educational initiatives that address multiple challenges in instruction, curriculum, and assessment. With thoughtful and deliberate leadership, careful and realistic pacing, collaboration, and sufficient resources (e.g., time, money, and newly developed expertise), the district could over time realize significant improvement to teaching and learning.

3. In most observed classrooms, teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content, and classroom climate was characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.

A. In observed instruction, review team members saw moderate and strong evidence of teachers demonstrating knowledge of subject matter and content in 91 percent of classrooms overall (94 percent of elementary classrooms, 86 percent of middle-school classrooms, and 91 percent of high-school classrooms).

1. For example, in a grade 3 reading lesson, the teacher used effective reading strategies to enable students to offer opinions about the chapter book they were reading.

2. In a grade 8 lesson on the Holocaust, the teacher was aware that some students were uninformed about the Holocaust and used appropriate questioning strategies to help ensure the students' grasp of key concepts such as "tolerance."

3. In a grade 8 science lesson on the use of fossils to construct the geologic time scale, the teacher and students together figured out geologic events on cards to sequence them on a timeline.

B. In observed instruction, review team members saw moderate and strong evidence of classroom climate characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse in 88 percent of classrooms overall (100 percent of elementary classrooms, 86 percent of middle-school classrooms, and 80 percent of high-school classrooms).

1. For example, in a grade 8 ELA lesson, the teacher used effective routines to manage a class discussion when the conversation became lively.

2. An observer described a grade 10 biology class as "relaxed but focused."

3. Another reviewer described grade 12 physics students as "honestly involved" in completing a worksheet of problems while the teacher worked with students one on one. In general, students were able to take responsibility for their own learning without having to rely on the teachers for direction.

Impact: When teachers demonstrate in-depth knowledge and expertise in subject matter and content, they likely engage students in learning experiences and help them acquire complex knowledge and skills. When classroom routines, rituals, tone, and behaviors promote a positive intellectual environment, students can take academic risks and assume increasing responsibility for their learning.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

4. The district has not created complete curriculum documents that include curriculum units, objectives, resources, instructional strategies, timelines, and a balanced set of formative and summative assessments. Documentation is furthest along at the middle and high-school levels.

A. The team reviewed the district's K-12 curriculum documents and found a wide variation in the completeness of the documents. The review team did not find a common template or consistent understanding of the necessary components of a written curriculum.

1. Some middle-school teachers told the team that they plan to update curriculum maps using Understanding by Design (UbD) principles by June 2017and said that this is one of the curriculum initiatives described by the new director of curriculum and assessment.

B. In the district's self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit, the district rated its overall current practices in curriculum as "Not At All Well." (Possible responses were Not At All Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)

1. It also reported that while most grade 6-12 content areas are aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks, alignment of instruction in all content areas kindergarten through grade five was "in progress."

C. The superintendent told the review team that the district's curriculum documents are not clear about what students are expected to know and do, do not include balanced assessments, and do not have common suggested strategies for intervention and differentiation.

D. Principals said that the elementary grades do not have written curriculum.

E. The superintendent reported in his 2015 Somerset Public Schools Entry Plan that teachers spent time during the previous two school years developing common curriculum documents across grade levels but that individual schools had continued to make decisions in isolation about instructional materials and curriculum implementation.

F. Some teachers said that in previous years they worked on a curriculum scope and sequence with a prior director of curriculum but a list of common suggested components had not been developed. They also reported that they had been writing curriculum "for the last 19 years" and that the templates "kept changing."

Impact: Without aligned, documented, and cohesive curricula for all content areas, the district cannot guarantee consistent use and effective delivery of its curricula or guarantee that all students have access to appropriate grade-level curricula. Without horizontal or vertical alignment of curriculum, the district cannot assure that there are no gaps or overlaps as students progress between grades and between the Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School.

5. The district does not have an established, documented process that ensures the timely review and revision of curricula to guarantee that updated and comprehensive curricula will be implemented in all classrooms.

A. In the district's self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit, the district noted that Indicator 1b[9] described the district's current practice "Not At All Well." (Possible responses were Not At All Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)

B. The district does not have a formal process for continuous curriculum review.

1. When the review team asked content coordinators how they use data to revise curriculum, the coordinators said that they do an immediate analysis of common assessments to revise curriculum for the second semester. One coordinator said that common finals are used to adjust curriculum for the following year.

C. In the 2010 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) report for Somerset High School, the committee noted that the high school did not have a formalized structural

[9] The district has a curriculum review and revision process that is comprehensive and addresses identified needs. This process includes teacher input, program evaluation, and regular review of assessment results.

curriculum revision process. In Somerset Berkley Regional High School's Five-Year Progress Report to NEASC, the school reported that a curriculum development process and review cycle was still "in process," and cited the absence of a director of curriculum in the central office as the reason.[10]

D. A district leader told the review team that the district is in the process of creating a curriculum review cycle.

E. The superintendent's 2015 Somerset Public Schools Entry Plan lists among Next Steps, the creation of a curriculum review and instructional materials review cycle.

Impact: Without a clearly documented and articulated process to review and revise curricula, it is difficult to ensure that curriculum content and implementation are viable for all students or that all students have access to high-quality, continuously improving, grade-level curricula.

6. The district has not had sufficient or consistent K-12 curriculum leadership in the past five years to ensure alignment, fidelity, and effective delivery of the district's curricula. The elementary schools have not had adequate leadership to sustain improvement initiatives. Curriculum is inconsistent at the elementary level.

A. The superintendent reported in his 2015 Entry Plan that the autonomy that K-5 schools have had in recent years has created large inconsistencies in policies, procedures, and expectations for curriculum and student learning.

1. In his Entry Plan, the superintendent stated that surveys, interviews, and conversations with teachers and stakeholders indicated concerns that as a result of "varied expectations of students across elementary schools and significant inconsistencies … in teaching and learning expectations, instructional materials and school practices … students can have very different experiences from one classroom to another and from one teacher to another… [affecting] readiness for the next grade or school." Among the inconsistencies cited was curriculum alignment to the "Common Core State Standards [sic]."

2. A district leader told the team that each school is "in a silo," noting "There is no cohesion [between schools]."

3. Elementary teachers told the review team that there are a lot of inconsistencies among the schools about materials and resources, how the curriculum is used, and curriculum fidelity in the classroom.

    a. Elementary teachers said that principals had their own visions and ran their schools differently from each other. After one elementary school was closed and students and teachers were re-districted, the differences became more apparent.

[10] The superintendent reinstated the position of director of curriculum and assessment in the 2015-2016 school year following a one-year vacancy in the position because of budget cuts. The new director began her tenure on July 1, 2015.

4. The team was told that several years ago there was a mid-year effort to align the Math Expressions program to the 2011 Frameworks. Many meetings were held and documents were created. At the time of the onsite those documents were not being used.

    a. Teachers told the reviewers that they had attempted to follow the alignment documents but did not have support and found them to be too cumbersome. As a result, they stopped using the alignment guides.

5. Teachers reported that they spent time during the previous two school years developing common grade-level curriculum documents but individual schools have continued to make decisions in isolation about instructional materials and curriculum implementation.

6. The superintendent indicated that the elementary schools needed to be more aligned with each other. At the elementary level, he said that his goal was to have "One school with three campuses."

B. Curricular leadership at the elementary level is limited. Elementary principals do not view themselves, and others do not view them, as curriculum leaders.

1. Principals told the team that at some point in the past, each of the elementary principals (including the principal of the Wilbur School, now closed) became responsible for coordinating a specific content area. With principal turnover, the practice stopped.

2. When asked about their role as educational leaders in their schools, principals told the team, "We're not leaders," noting that they were caught up in management and did not have time to be in classrooms. Teachers agreed and told the reviewers that although it is the principals' place to be responsible for the curriculum, principals have too many demands on their time.

3. Teachers, principals, and central office staff expressed a need for curriculum coordinators at the elementary level. Elementary teachers expressed concern that there were not enough "people in the middle" at the elementary schools to ensure that once developed, curriculum would be implemented faithfully.

C. While coordinators in grades 6-8 and 9-12 provide curricular leadership, their teaching responsibilities limit their role as curriculum leaders.

1. Content coordinators for grades 6-8 and 9-12 receive a stipend and are responsible for curriculum within their schools. All their coordination responsibilities must take place during their one period free from teaching each day because they carry an 80 percent teaching load.

2. High-school coordinators described their numerous duties to the team, including: providing curriculum maps to teachers, promoting best practices, supervising classroom practice

(conducting 50 percent of the observations required by the educator evaluation system), and using data to inform the next year's curriculum.

3. Middle-school teachers told the team that their coordinators are responsible for curriculum in their school, and that their responsibilities were similar to those of the high-school coordinators. Middle-school coordinators also carry an 80 percent teaching load.

4. Classroom teachers told the review team that content coordinators in grades 6-8 and 9-12 report to the director of curriculum and assessment and are responsible for departmental curriculum within their school. While they observe classrooms, they have no evaluative responsibilities.

D. District leaders expressed concern about the urgent need to ensure consistent curriculum leadership throughout the district, K-12.

E. In response to the need for curriculum alignment among the schools, the superintendent created a strategic vision for the district and is developing action plans based on that vision.

1. However, a document review indicated that the plans have not identified who will be responsible to complete each task, the desired outcomes, required resources, expected dates of completion, or progress benchmarks.

F. The superintendent reinstated the position of director of curriculum and assessment in the 2015-2016 school year following a one-year vacancy in the position because of budget cuts. The new director began her tenure on July 1, 2015.

1. The new director of curriculum and assessment is responsible for the development, implementation, and oversight of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, K-12. The position does not have evaluative responsibilities.

Impact: Without sufficient consistent curriculum leadership at the district and school levels and without sufficient time allotted to provide oversight to the process of curriculum development, implementation, and review, the district cannot ensure that curriculum is high-quality, aligned, documented, and cohesive, or that teachers are making consistent or effective use of these materials. Without such curriculum leadership, the district cannot ensure that the taught curriculum is aligned to the 2011 Frameworks or is aligned vertically between grades and horizontally between levels, thereby hindering the districts' ability to provide all students access to their grade-level curricula.

Recommendations

1. **The district should provide sufficient curriculum leadership and support to ensure the consistent development, alignment, and effective implementation of the curriculum.**

   A. The district should consider revising the responsibilities of the director of curriculum and assessment K-12 to ensure that the director has the authority to evaluate staff, including content coordinators and principals.

   B. The district should provide sufficient curriculum leadership and support to teachers in the core content areas, especially at the elementary level, to ensure the consistent development, alignment, and effective delivery of the curriculum.

      1. The superintendent should clarify the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for all principals to ensure that their main role is to serve as the educational leaders of their schools.

         a. Principals need to fully understand their role as educational leaders with responsibilities to monitor and support curriculum development, to supervise and promote instructional improvement, and to analyze, track, share and act upon achievement data and other relevant data and information.

         b. Principals should identify time every day to be in classrooms either in an informal "walkthrough" capacity or a formal observational capacity.

      2. The principals' role should include leading frequent conversations about curriculum, instruction, and assessment and ensuring that teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity.

      3. The district should consider revising the structure of the coordinators' positions to provide consistent, collaborative content leadership in curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and to ensure horizontal and vertical alignment of curriculum.

         a. The district might consider a range of organizational structures, including: K-12 coordinators; K-8 and 9-12 coordinators; K-5, 6-8, and 9-12 coordinators; or a combination of coordinators and coaches/lead teachers.

         b. Coordinators should provide ongoing, embedded professional development to fully implement the district's curriculum initiatives and to build teachers' ability to meet the needs of all students.

         c. Under the guidance of the director of curriculum and assessment, coordinators working with principals and other leaders should lead conversations about curriculum, instruction, and assessment so that the schools can make meaningful progress and

ongoing adjustments to curriculum and instruction, based on formative and summative student assessment data.

4. Time should be provided to complete this work.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation the district will have clearly defined, dedicated, and comprehensive curriculum leadership and a more effective and aligned system for curriculum development, revision, and delivery. Curriculum will be more cohesive and functional, ensuring that all students have access to a high-quality curriculum that meets their diverse learning needs. A workable cycle of curriculum improvement and revision ensures that curricula are dynamic and will continuously evolve as frameworks are revised at the state level.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *District Standards and Indicators* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/district-standards-indicators.pdf) identify the characteristics of effective districts in supporting and sustaining school improvement.
- ESE's *Conditions for School Effectiveness* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/school-effect-conditions.pdf) identify the research-based practices that all schools, especially the state's most struggling schools, require to effectively meet the learning needs of all students. This tool also defines what each condition looks like when implemented purposefully and with fidelity.
    - The *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/school-effect-self-assessment.pdf) is a tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.
- *Turnaround Practices in Action* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/practices-report-2014.pdf) is a practice guide that highlights practices and strategies observed in turnaround schools that have shown significant and rapid gains in student achievement. It presents key practices for consideration as avenues to improve and sustain ongoing and future turnaround efforts.
- The *Turnaround Practices in Achievement Gain Schools Video Series* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/support-for-level-3-4-and-5-districts-and-schools/school-and-district-turnaround/turnaround-in-massachusetts/turnaround-practices-in-achievement-gain-schools-video-.html) highlights the work of three Achievement Gain schools referenced in the Turnaround Practices report. In these videos, the school staff and leadership tell their unique turnaround story through the lens of the four high leverage turnaround practices (leadership, intentional practices, student specific support, and climate and culture). Each video has an accompanying Viewing Guide.

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/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/ese/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- *Characteristics of an Effective Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

- ESE's *Calibration Video Library* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.

- 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.

2. **Concurrent with the development as soon as possible of high-quality curriculum aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks, the district should document and share a multi-year process for the regular and timely review and revision of K-12 curricula. This process should be collaborative and supported by necessary resources.**

   A. Using Understanding by Design (UbD) and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles, the district should develop complete, documented, and vertically and horizontally aligned curricula for every content area that are aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks.

1. The district should develop a common curriculum template to be used for all curricula K-12. The template should include curriculum units, objectives, instructional resources, instructional strategies that meet all learners' needs, timelines, and a balanced set of formative and summative assessments.

2. The district should communicate to teachers the plan for completing the curriculum.

3. The district is encouraged to refer to ESE's Model Curriculum Units to identify essential components of a comprehensive curriculum and to support teachers as they translate their curricula into instructional practice.

B. The district should develop a multi-year plan for curriculum review and renewal.

1. The plan should be based on valid research and analysis of state and common assessment data, including District-Determined Measures (DDMs), and should involve professional staff including teachers and special educators.

2. The plan should provide a timeline for when K-12 curricula in each content area will be regularly reviewed and updated, identify participants, and dedicate time for this ongoing work.

    a. The plan should include regular meetings to align the curriculum horizontally (across schools) and vertically (between grade levels).

C. The district should identify resources that are needed to support this work at all levels, including time during and after school and during the summer and compensation, if appropriate.

D. Practices should be established in this plan to ensure that curriculum materials are regularly reviewed and monitored for effectiveness and currency and identify which materials, including textbooks, need revision or replacement.

E. The district should consider the use of a web-based curriculum management tool to help staff collaboratively develop, monitor, and manage curriculum units, lessons, and multiple forms of assessments.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean a clearly articulated and comprehensive curriculum review process to guarantee currency of curriculum, dedicated time to complete the work in a timely way, and a system for reviewing and updating instructional materials. Completion of this work will ensure that a comprehensive and coherent curriculum will be implemented in all classrooms. As a result, all students will have equal access to a high-quality education that prepares them for college and career.

Recommended resources:

- *Local District Common Core Implementation – Progress and Capacity Rubric* (http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/District%20Common%20Core%20Capacity%20Rubric%20%2013

0910.pdf) from the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is a tool for districts to use to assess their progress on Common Core implementation and to identify areas of strength and improvement.

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. It includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.

- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- The *Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.

- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.

- *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.

3. **To improve instruction ---and ultimately achievement--- across the district, the review team recommends that district leaders set clear priorities to enable sound implementation of the teaching and learning initiatives that it has identified. The overarching goal should be to ensure that effective high-quality instructional practices are commonly understood and consistently implemented across all schools.**

   A. The district should set clear priorities as it implements the teaching and learning initiatives identified in the strategic plan and by district leadership: Literacy Action Plan, STEAM Action Plan, Technology Action Plan, and implementation of Understanding by Design (UbD), and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies.

B. The district should integrate building teachers' ability to improve instruction into its improvement plans.

C. The district should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.

D. Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they work to improve instruction.

1. Job-embedded professional development should focus on elements of expected instruction, and especially skills associated with differentiation, student engagement, and the development of students' high-order thinking.

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, helpful feedback that helps them to continually improve their instruction.

E. Using grade-level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time and/or professional development days, the district is encouraged to discuss ideas and strategies.

1. The district should review and if possible modify teaching schedules so that teachers at all levels have regular, frequent and/or grade-level common planning and meeting time that can be used to collaboratively reflect on and improve curriculum and instruction.

2. Administrators are encouraged to empower teachers by providing time for them to observe effective practice in classrooms.

3. Teachers and leaders might consider watching videos of effective practice and discussing instructional strategies as a way to calibrate expectations.

F. The administrative team is 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.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean a common understanding among educators of what constitutes effective instruction and a coordinated plan for instructional improvement. A district that provides high-quality instruction to all students develops and sustains a culture of continuous improvement that results in increased student achievement and growth.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/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/ese/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- *Characteristics of an Effective Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

- *Connecting Math and Literature* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/instructional.html, bottom of web page, is a resource for K-8 teachers for creating a math library for children to connect math and literature.

- ESE's *Calibration Video Library* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.

- 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.

Assessment

Contextual Background

With a limited number of assessments in place, limited time for teachers and administrators to analyze data, and a staff with little training in data analysis, the district is a long way from having systems in place that enable staff at all levels to make data-driven decisions. Limited assessment data also means that district and school staff have limited knowledge of their students' strengths and needs and so cannot design and provide appropriate support to students. Teachers have not developed the skills to use assessment results to guide their instruction and to monitor student growth. As a result, building assessment systems will be a slow process and one in need of ongoing professional development.

Strength Finding

1. **The high school uses schoolwide rubrics to determine students' progress in meeting academic, civic, and social expectations.**

   A. In response to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) recommendations in its 2010 report that Somerset High School "develop and implement a process to assess school-wide and individual student progress in achieving the academic expectations in the mission based on school-wide rubrics" and that the high school "develop and use agreed upon levels of performance indicators to assess the progress of all students in meeting the school's stated civic and social expectations," the Somerset Berkley Regional High School has created and since 2013 has been using rubrics to measure students' achievement of the school's academic, civic, and social expectations.

   1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the high school has developed separate rubrics for each academic, civic, and social expectation.

      a. For example, a rubric entitled Analytical Reading #1 assesses how well students "read analytically to support conclusions drawn from text." A rubric entitled Technology Literacy #6 determines how well students demonstrate technological literacy to facilitate learning.

   2. The rubrics are aligned with the 2011 frameworks.

   3. Each course description in the program of studies lists the rubrics students will be measured against. Teachers administer each rubric a minimum of three times per semester. Students receive their rubric ratings, and parents are informed of their children's ratings on first and second semester report cards.

   4. At the time of Somerset Berkley Regional High School's NEASC Five-Year Progress Report, the rubrics committee was determining how best to analyze and present this comprehensive data to the school and the community.

Impact: For the students at Somerset Berkley Regional High School, the school's academic, civic, and social expectations are not just words. Students' proficiency against a detailed rubric assessing each expectation is measured regularly across the span of their courses. These measurements over time provide information about students' growth. At the same time, these assessments help the school ascertain progress toward district and school goals and make needed adjustments to programs, policies, services, and practices.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. The district is in the early stages of establishing a system and a culture for using student assessment results to make data-driven decisions for continuous improvement.

A. Assessment data is limited across the district.

1. A document review indicated that in 2015-2016 all three elementary schools for the first time planned to administer the same assessments. Several assessments measure growth across the school year.
    a. The assessments include Fountas and Pinnell Benchmarking, Houghton Mifflin Common Unit Assessments, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy), STAR Reading, STAR Math, and Writing Benchmarks.
    b. There have been challenges in the first year of implementation of the same assessments across three schools.
        i. Principals reported that while DIBELS had previously been in use, some teachers did not receive their students' results because a DIBELS team administered the assessment.
        ii. Also, because the district is piloting two language arts programs in 2015-2016, all teachers are not administering the Houghton Mifflin common unit assessments. Instead teachers are administering a range of program unit assessments, depending upon the program being piloted.
        iii. In 2015-2016 STAR Reading and STAR Math are in place for the first time and some schools are administering Fountas and Pinnell benchmarking tests for the first time.
2. The middle school administers STAR reading four times a year to determine whether students need extra support.
    a. The middle school also has had in place for several years locally developed common mid-year and final assessments as well as some common unit assessments in ELA, math, and science.
3. High school leaders reported reviewing SAT, PSAT, and Advanced Placement results.

a. The high school also has common final exams in English, math, and science as well as common mid-year exams in math and science.

4. Content coordinators reported departmental analysis of common assessment results for curriculum revision. The focus is on improving the course for a new group of students.

B. Time for analysis of the available assessments has been limited, but in some cases has been expanded under the new superintendent's leadership.

1. In 2015-2016 for the first time, elementary teachers have 45 minutes of common planning time 15 times a year.

2. Middle-school teachers have two content and two grade-level meetings every six days. Middle school content coordinators facilitate some of this meeting time and report on it at the principal's leadership team.

3. In 2015-2016 high-school teachers have common planning time.

C. Review of assessment data may take place more formally and with greater frequency during the next school year.

1. The superintendent has called for the development of data teams at each school.

   a. Each elementary school has a data team, although principals reported that their data teams are small.

   b. The high-school principal and the content coordinators review data together at leadership meetings; this is, in effect, the high school data team.

      i. Interviewees reported that high-school teachers generally review data informally.

      ii. High-school teachers reported having little data beyond MCAS results and common assessment results for their own students.

2. District administrators said that that data collected, analyzed, and disseminated at schools is available for their review. However, principals reported that they do not review data during their infrequent meetings with the superintendent.

   a. At the time of the site visit, the district did not have a data team.

   b. The superintendent reported that he did not think anyone in the district "looks across the board at all the data."

D. Interviewees, including the superintendent, reported that teachers have not had training in data analysis and in making instructional decisions based on data.

E. The team found little evidence of teachers, schools, or the district using assessment results to make data-driven decisions to improve student achievement.

Impact: With little assessment data and limited time and training for analysis of data, district staff, from the superintendent to the principals and teachers, have an incomplete understanding of their students' strengths and needs and so cannot make informed decisions to guide instruction, evaluate programs, and provide programs and supports where they are needed.

Recommendation

1. **The district should continue to develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and use of student performance and other pertinent data.**

   A. The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.

      1. Building on the practices being established at some levels, the district should establish systematic, consistent processes for the collection, analysis, and use of assessment data.

         a. This includes ensuring that a balanced system of formative, benchmark, and summative assessments is in place in all subjects, levels, and areas.

   B. Ongoing, targeted training in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided to all staff in each school, grade level, and subject.

   C. The district should continue establishing data teams for the district and each school which would be responsible for the collection, analysis, and use of student assessment data.

   D. District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student performance data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making, including budget development, District and School Improvement Plans, and the evaluation of education programs and services.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean clarity and consistency in the district's use of data for decisions making. It will help all staff to evaluate programs, texts, and services. It will help district leaders and teachers to understand, and provide professional development for, the analysis and use of data to improve instructional skills and raise student achievement. It will enable the district to provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

Recommended resources:

- 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.

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/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 *Student Growth Model* web page (http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/) provides links to tutorials and documents that explain the Student Growth Model, along with research supporting the model, materials to help education leaders present the model, and links to student growth data.

Student Support

Contextual Background

In recent years the district has seen slowly increasing proportions of economically disadvantaged students and rising numbers of students with autism and social-emotional challenges, particularly in some schools. This change has challenged the traditional teaching practices of the teaching staff and the district's ability to provide for needs.

While the teaching staff is well-grounded in content knowledge, its toolbox of instructional strategies --- including differentiated pair and small-group work, hands-on activities, formative assessment, and project-based learning---is limited. Response to Intervention (RtI) teams operate on a widely varying basis with little data or fluid progress monitoring at some schools. School leaders reported a tendency for teachers to refer students with disabilities for out-of-district services. The district (K-12) has provided limited professional development in teaching strategies for reaching all learners. In addition, the district has not closely tracked the needs of subgroups, instead providing materials and staffing on a school-by-school basis in a way that does not appear well matched to need.

The superintendent has acknowledged the absence of a systematic intervention process in the district and addressing it is one of the key points of his 2015 Entry Plan. He plans to systematize intervention teams and provide additional staffing.

The superintendent has also identified services for students with disabilities as an area of need. The special education department, with five department leaders in six years, has not provided a continuum of services for students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). District leaders and teachers expressed optimism about the recent hiring of an interim director of special education who has begun to assess the program and plan improved services. In addition, the district has engaged an outside agency to conduct a review of the special education program to help the district move in the right direction.

Finally, the high school is experiencing an increase in absence, some of it chronic, particularly so in grades 11 and 12. District policies and practices about tardiness and absence have not encouraged regular attendance at the high school.

Strength Finding

1. **The superintendent has recognized that two areas of high need in the district are the establishment of an effective Response to Intervention (RtI) approach districtwide and improved services for students with disabilities. The district has begun to act upon those needs.**

   A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the superintendent has made public a thorough review of the RtI process including the formation of teams, their membership, operating procedures, and purposes.

      1. The superintendent told the team that in the upcoming budget, he would propose some staffing changes to share resources for intervention services.

   B. The superintendent has proposed a restructuring of the special education department and has begun to move toward this goal.

      1. The superintendent hired a new interim director of special education in early January 2016.[11] The director told the team that she has begun to assess the distribution of services and plan for more equitable caseloads as well as to define staff roles and department practices. She also seeks to put in place a continuum of services and to bring students back from out of district placements when feasible.

      2. At the start of the 2015-2016 school year, the superintendent named facilitators to coordinate elementary, middle-school and high-school teams. Psychologists formerly presided at team meetings.

      3. The district has hired an outside agency to review the special education program.

      4. The superintendent said that some of the needed changes may take place as early as September 2016.

Impact: The superintendent, in his second year as superintendent of the Somerset Public Schools and first year as superintendent of the Somerset Berkley Regional High School, has sent a clear message to all stakeholders that Response to Intervention is a priority for the district. Also, the need for stable leadership to ensure high-quality and equitable student support is beginning to be addressed.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. **In observed K-12 classrooms, differentiation was not systematically or consistently used. Support services and the components of Response to Intervention (RtI) teams vary from school to school.**

   A. Differentiated instruction was inconsistently employed in observed K-12 classrooms.

[11] District leaders reported that the interim director was given a three-year contract beginning on July 1, 2016.

1. The review team observed strong and moderate evidence of instruction differentiated to address individual student needs in 50 percent of elementary, in 40 percent of middle-school, and in 13 percent of high-school classrooms

2. Strong and moderate evidence of the use of appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs was observed in 56 percent of elementary schools but in only 40 percent at the middle school and in only 26 percent at the high school.

3. Teachers and administrators at all levels indicated a limited understanding of differentiating instruction and administrators acknowledged that differentiation was not systematically or consistently used in K-12 classrooms.

    a. Some teachers said that they were "sometimes at a loss to plan for [students'] needs" others noted that differentiation was "not the reality in the majority of classrooms."

4. Staff reported little district professional development on differentiation in the last five years.

B. RtI teams in the district, also referred to as Instructional Support Teams (elementary) or the Intervention Team (high school), vary widely in composition, meeting frequency, use of data, and methods of progress monitoring.

1. The Chace Elementary School , which follows a traditional Response to Intervention (RtI) model, is well poised to deliver an effective program of intervention.

    a. Team members include the psychologist who leads the team, a reading teacher, a teacher from each grade level, a special education teacher, and a reading specialist. The team meets during school hours weekly as needed.

    b. The team requires teachers to supply the following information before the meeting: a DIBELS assessment, a running records assessment, a grade-level assessment, and an observational assessment.

    c. The team suggests classroom accommodations to the referring teacher. The student's progress is monitored and reported back after six weeks. The cycle may be repeated a second time before the child is referred for special education services.

2. Teachers at the North Elementary School reported that several years ago they had an RtI team similar to the team at Chace. The team was voluntary and met outside school hours. Given schoolwide changes and new demands on teacher time, the voluntary committee has disbanded. Interviewees told the team that a single individual continues some of the work.

3. The South Elementary School has had difficulty implementing an RtI process.

4. The secondary-level teams meet weekly. The teams have an administrator, a guidance staff person, a nurse, a reading teacher, and some additional support personnel such as the

director of special education and the behavior specialist at the middle school and the resource officer and adjustment counselor at the high school.

a. Teams do not typically include teachers although the referring teacher is invited to attend.

b. The secondary schools have fewer standardized assessments available and consequently a diminished ability to measure progress other than behavioral changes.

c. At the middle school, following up on students is said to be informal and fluid. Guidance staff can follow up on behavioral referrals.

d. High school staff makes referrals via email. Interventions may take the form of classroom observation, counseling, peer mediation or assignment to an alternative class for students who are best supported in smaller classes.

5. Progress monitoring data is limited. Interviews with school and program leaders indicated that teachers may receive results when available but have limited familiarity with interpreting it.

   a. Support staff such as psychologists, paraprofessionals, and reading teachers often administer standardized assessments and deliver the results to teachers.

      i. The middle school and South Elementary School have provided some teacher training for administering literacy assessments previously done by support staff.

   b. Some test administrators reported that because there has been little professional development in the use of data they transfer the information to a grid to make it more comprehensible to teachers.

6. Administrators spoke of a culture of referring underperforming students for services outside the classroom, including special education services. They said that the district has begun to provide interventions in the classroom.

Impact: That school-based structures and practices operate without clear direction from the district means uneven support for students, making it difficult for the district and its schools to improve students' well being and achievement.

3. Resources such as reading and literacy programs, services, and support personnel vary among schools. District leaders and teachers spoke of the need for additional support, in particular for students with social-emotional challenges.

A. Support services within the weekly school cycle vary by school. The time allotted is influenced by personnel available to provide services.

1. At North Elementary School, the four classes per grade and the number of support staff allows teachers to divide literacy instruction into learning groups four times per six-day cycle with reading services offered to those who need them the remaining two days. Each grade is split into two reading classes, one advanced literary circle, two grade-level groups, and one group below grade level that receives support in phonics.

2. The Chace Elementary School has implemented "RtI time," or an intervention block, for 30 minutes daily in 2015-2016, up from twice per week in 2014-2015. During this time, interventionists pull out students for services while teachers conduct reading groups.

3. At South Elementary School interventions in mathematics are scheduled daily for 30 minutes at the end of the math block and literacy interventions are scheduled for 45 minutes daily. During these times classroom teachers and paraprofessionals facilitate Tier 2 interventions and while the reading and mathematics interventionists provide Tier 3 services.

4. The middle school, which is not a Title I school, has few designated staff to provide interventions.

    a. Students can take advantage of the Homework Club or before- or after-school help from teachers.

    b. During an eighth period block the reading teacher provides reading clinic once per week for identified students. This eighth period is considered an enrichment block. While some children have band or art, others receive additional help from teachers at that time. Identified students also receive help before or after school.

    c. The middle school does not have staff for math interventions, but it has increased math time for all students by 50 percent. Math classes now meet 10 times in a 6-day cycle.

B. Leaders and teachers frequently mentioned needs for staffing support, in particular for those students with social-emotional needs.

1. Middle-school staff cited a need for behavioral support, counseling, and a reading specialist. South Elementary School and the middle school share a psychologist. Neither school has an adjustment counselor for the increasing population of students with social-emotional needs.

C. In his Entry Plan, the superintendent acknowledged the need to develop RtI teams in the K-12 schools. He reported to the team plans for adding some much-needed resources to the elementary schools in the 2016-2017 academic year.

Impact: When a district does not have supports well matched to students' needs, it is likely that some students are not fully participating in the academic program.

4. The district has not provided a continuum of services for students with disabilities. District leaders said that staff have overidentified students with disabilities for out-of-district placement. They have recognized that services were not always matched to students' needs and staff members were not used as efficiently as possible. Leaders are beginning to address these issues.

A. The special education department has a culture of educating students with disabilities in the most inclusive environment possible.

1. According to the most recent available ESE data, in 2014-2015 69 percent of the districts' K-8 students with disabilities were taught in full inclusion, compared with 62 percent of their state peers. In 2014-2015 at the high school, 64 percent of students with disabilities were taught in full inclusion, a rate equal to that of their state peers.

B. However, some students with disabilities receive their education in a setting outside the district.

1. According to the most recent available ESE data, in 2014-2015 5.7 percent of the district's K-8 students with disabilities (14 students) and 9.8 percent of high-school students with disabilities (12 students) were taught out of district.

2. The superintendent told the team that while the schools reported low numbers of out-of-district students, public stakeholders and administrators believed the proportion was too high.

3. Leaders attributed high out-of-district placements to over-identification of students for special education services and the absence of a continuum of appropriate services within the district, particularly for the growing number of students on the autism spectrum.

4. The special education department has begun to bring students back into the district after a review of their needs and district resources. The current interim director of special education is seeking to provide in-district programs when feasible.

C. School leaders said that choices made by former school administrators and special education leaders have created a system of service delivery that does not make effective use of resources. Leaders recognized that caseloads were unequal, and services were not always matched to the needs of the student or efficiently deployed.

1. For example, leaders said that in some cases services were delivered to small groups that did not maximize the ability of staff.

Impact: When a district does not efficiently use resources or provide sufficient support to all students, students do not have equitable opportunities to learn.

5. Policies and practices about tardiness and absence do not encourage regular attendance at the high school. This has contributed to consistently high rates of chronic absence in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 in recent years.

A. Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students who are absent more than 10 percent of the school year, typically over 18 days.

1. According to ESE data, in the 2014-2015 school year, the rates of chronic absence for grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 were 20.5 percent, 17.4 percent, 28 percent, and 35 percent, respectively.

2. The rates of chronic absence at the high school were 22.8 percent in 2012-2013, 18.9 percent in 2013-2014, and 25.1 percent in 2014-2015.

3. In 2014-2015 the rate of chronic absence in grade 8 was also elevated at 9.5 percent.

B. Staff said that the high school informs parents by letter when their child has accumulated 10 absences. If the student reaches 20 absences, a call is made to the home. Administrators meet twice per year with guidance and students who are failing courses.

1. School policy does not limit the number of times that a student may be excused for absence by a note from the parent.

2. Administrators said that teachers may give a failing grade to a student because of absence, but this is left to the teacher's discretion.

3. The handbook states that "excessive unauthorized absences (truancies) may lead to a student being dropped from the course and no credit received."

C. Students told the team that the attendance and tardiness policies encourage students to stay home rather than arrive late.

1. Staff members reported that rules about tardiness are strict. No more than one tardy arrival per quarter is allowed. Parents may excuse their child for an additional three late arrivals. After that, the student receives Saturday detention.

    a. Penalties for tardiness are incurred whether the student is 10 minutes late or 30 minutes late. The handbook states that if a student arrives 30 minutes after the start of the school day, the penalty is a one-day Saturday school.

2. One student expressed the view that schedules that start the day with a study do not encourage students to arrive at school on time.

Impact: Many students at Somerset Berkley Regional High School are losing too much instructional time. In addition, they are not developing habits such as punctuality and reliability that they need for college and career readiness. The more students come to school, the more likely they are to succeed academically.

Recommendations

1. **The district should carry out its plans to ensure consistent Response to Intervention (RtI) across all schools and distribute resources for intervention based on students' need.**

   A. The superintendent should require all schools to implement RtI as he outlined in his District Response to Intervention Guide.

      1. District leaders may want to review the team structure and progress monitoring protocols at Chace Elementary School with the intent of using the process or an adapted version within the districts. For example, they might consider whether some variation on the process would be advisable at the high school where behavioral and social-emotional problems tend to be more prevalent.

      2. The district should consider whether Chace staff could serve as a local resource for the other schools, providing information at a professional development day or inviting others to attend team meetings.

   B. The district should ensure that staff members are trained in the use and application of data to make plans and decisions about instruction. The districts should provide additional assessments for the middle and high school so that they can determine the effectiveness of interventions.

      1. At the high school, leaders and teachers could use early warning indicators to intervene with appropriate supports.

   C. The district should review existing support services such as literacy and math interventions (including Title I), psychologists, adjustment counselors, and paraprofessionals. The district should pay particular attention to the subgroups in each school so that all students have equitable access to these supports based on students' needs. Staffing between schools should be equitable so that there is sufficient staff to schedule and deliver interventions.

   D. The district should provide ongoing professional development on best practice teaching strategies and differentiation appropriate for a range of learners as well as the benefits of informal formative assessments for modifying lesson delivery.

      1. Leadership should provide training that will create systems and practices that will help teachers to take ownership of all students and effectively instruct the majority within the general classroom.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will likely mean a better functioning, adequately resourced RtI process that is equitable across schools and that will help all students reach their potential.

Recommended resources:

- The MTSS website includes a variety of helpful resources including scheduling information for elementary schools, student support teams, and tiered instruction for students with disabilities. http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/massachusetts-tiered-system-of-support/mtss-quick-reference-guides.html

- The *Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) includes tools for districts, schools, and educators that are aligned to the MA Educator Evaluation Framework and promote evidence-based best practices for inclusion following the principles of Universal Design for Learning, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, and Social and Emotional Learning.

- ESE's *Early Warning Indicator System* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to address systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.

2. **The district should continue to review programs, staffing, and the needs of students with disabilities. It should also continue efforts to bring students with disabilities back into the district from outside placements, and create programs that can serve these students' needs locally, as appropriate.**

   A. The district should continue the process of evaluating students who are educated out of district for placement in existing or new programs within the district when feasible.

   B. The district should review the RtI process and in-district evaluations to ensure that referrals are appropriate.

   C. The district should use the upcoming evaluation of the special education program to help guide its own decisions about special education services.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation the district will enhance its services for students with disabilities and support their well being and academic success.

3. **The superintendent, in consultation with high school leaders and the school committee, should make clear that regular attendance is expected and the norm. It should establish an attendance policy to improve students' attendance.**

   A. The high school principal should convene a representative group of student council members, parents, and staff to review current policies on tardiness and absence.

B. The school should establish an attendance policy so that students are expected to be in school daily. Absence for any reason should not total more than 10 days per year.

C. The school should consider revising student schedules so that they encourage punctuality and regular attendance.

1. For example, schedules might be revised so that students do not begin the day with studies.

2. Student days that go late into the afternoon or evening with sports, music, and extracurricular activities may encourage the school to use Saturday for detention. This practice, however, may be excessively punitive, especially for tardiness.

D. The school should institute pro-active practices that will address tardiness and excessive absence.

1. The school should identify someone to be charged with tracking student attendance and tardiness and communicating with parents frequently.

    a. The designated person should notify parents when their children are in danger of not receiving credit.

2. The school should consider offering a breakfast club or other positive reinforcement for punctuality.

E. The school should make a strong case for avoiding the loss of learning time caused by absence. For example, classes which require student engagement, group work, and other more active forms of learning are difficult to "make up" and can encourage student attendance by attraction.

F. The school should ensure adequate options for credit recovery or alternative settings where students can recover credits when needed.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation the district will ensure that students attend school regularly and arrive on time. It will enhance student learning and encourage a partnership with students' parents in preparing their children for school and career.

Recommended resource:

- *Every Student, Every Day: A Community Toolkit to Address and Eliminate Chronic Absenteeism* (http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/chronicabsenteeism/toolkit.pdf) is a set of Action Guides that provide information and resources to help ensure that all young people are in school every day and benefitting from coordinated systems of support.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 4-6, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Linda Greyser, Instruction
2. Katharine Lopez-Natale, Student Support
3. Richard Silverman, Curriculum
4. Patricia Williams, Assessment
5. Christine Brandt, *review team coordinator*

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the respective school committees: chair and vice-chair (Somerset Berkley Regional High School), and chair and one member (Somerset Public Schools).

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: the president, the vice president, the professional rights and responsibilities representative, the sick leave bank representative, and one building representative.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the director of special education, and the director of curriculum and assessment.

The team visited the following schools: Chace Street (Pre-K-5), North (K-5), South (K-5), Somerset Middle School (grades 6-8), and Somerset Berkley Regional High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 5 principals and focus groups with 3 elementary-school teachers, 3 middle-school teachers, and 13 high-school teachers. A mid-day snowstorm caused a delayed school closing in some schools, preventing the attendance of some teachers at the elementary focus group.

The team observed 57 classes in the district: 24 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 18 at the 3 elementary schools.

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

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 04/04/2016	**Tuesday** 04/05/2016	**Wednesday** 04/06/2016
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; interview with school committee members; teacher focus groups; document reviews; and visits to the North and South elementary schools and the middle school for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; interview with the teachers' association; interview with school committee members; teacher focus group; parent focus group; and visits to the Chace Elementary School and the middle and high schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders and students; visits to the North and South elementary schools, and the middle and high schools for classroom observations; and district debrief.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

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

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	27	1.5%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	19	1.1%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	71	3.9%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	2	0.1%	2,179	0.2%
White	1,640	91.0%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	2	0.1%	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	41	2.3%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	1,802	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

Table B1b: Somerset Berkley Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	14	1.5%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	13	1.4%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	20	2.1%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	--	--	2,179	0.2%
White	893	93.3%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	1	0.1%	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	16	1.7%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	957	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

]

Table B1c: Somerset Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	257	47.0%	14.1%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	354	64.7%	19.6%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	5	0.9%	0.3%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	547	100.0%	29.9%	419,764	100.0%	43.5%

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 5,633; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B1d: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
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	121	55.8%	12.4%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	113	52.1%	11.8%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	1	0.5%	0.1%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	217	100.0%	22.3%	419,764	100.0%	43.5%

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 5,633; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B2a: Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School English Language Arts Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	207	86.1	85.6	86.3	82.6	83.4	-3.5	-3.7
	P+	207	65%	63%	64%	57%	60%	-8	-7
4	CPI	206	84.6	83.1	87.4	83.7	78.5	-0.9	-3.7
	P+	206	64%	62%	70%	62%	53%	-2	-8
	SGP	190	55.0	56.0	58.0	48.5	50.0	-6.5	-9.5
5	CPI	197	82.6	87.3	88.1	87.7	87.3	5.1	-0.4
	P+	197	58%	65%	71%	72%	71%	14	1
	SGP	185	51.0	53.0	51.0	40.0	50.0	-11.0	-11.0
6	CPI	205	90.4	85.6	86.6	87.2	86.6	-3.2	0.6
	P+	205	75%	64%	63%	74%	71%	-1	11
	SGP	191	46.0	42.0	39.0	42.0	50.0	-4.0	3.0
7	CPI	220	92.2	92.4	92.4	90.6	87.0	-1.6	-1.8
	P+	220	83%	79%	78%	73%	70%	-10	-5
	SGP	205	51.0	44.0	59.5	53.0	50.0	2.0	-6.5
8	CPI	220	94.8	93.5	93.7	91.4	91.4	-3.4	-2.3
	P+	220	85%	87%	86%	82%	80%	-3	-4
	SGP	205	44.0	48.0	46.0	54.0	50.0	10.0	8.0
3-8	CPI	1,255	88.5	87.9	89.1	87.3	--	-1.2	-1.8
	P+	1,255	71%	70%	72%	70%	--	-1	-2
	SGP	976	50.0	50.0	48.0	47.0	50.0	-3.0	-1.0
10	CPI	250	97.8	99.3	99.0	97.0	96.7	-0.8	-2.0
	P+	250	93%	98%	97%	94%	91%	1	-3
	SGP	234	50.0	74.0	62.0	49.0	51.0	-1.0	-13.0

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

Table B2b: Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School Mathematics Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	208	79.6	83.7	84.0	81.6	85.4	2.0	-2.4
	P+	208	56%	64%	65%	66%	70%	10	1
4	CPI	206	82.9	82.9	83.1	78.6	77.2	-4.3	-4.5
	P+	206	55%	54%	59%	47%	47%	-8	-12
	SGP	190	62.0	64.5	59.0	52.5	49.0	-9.5	-6.5
5	CPI	197	81.3	82.9	82.3	80.2	83.6	-1.1	-2.1
	P+	197	60%	62%	62%	61%	67%	1	-1
	SGP	185	54.0	50.5	50.5	44.0	50.0	-10.0	-6.5
6	CPI	206	83.4	85.2	81.6	79.9	81.5	-3.5	-1.7
	P+	206	61%	67%	55%	58%	62%	-3	3
	SGP	192	47.0	56.0	47.0	48.0	50.0	1.0	1.0
7	CPI	220	79.6	78.0	78.8	80.8	73.0	1.2	2.0
	P+	220	56%	56%	57%	59%	51%	3	2
	SGP	205	52.0	52.0	64.5	63.0	51.0	11.0	-1.5
8	CPI	221	84.8	87.9	82.8	86.8	78.7	2.0	4.0
	P+	221	69%	74%	65%	73%	60%	4	8
	SGP	206	68.5	83.0	71.0	74.5	51.0	6.0	3.5
3-8	CPI	1,258	81.9	83.5	82	81.4	--	-0.5	-0.6
	P+	1,258	60%	63%	60%	61%	--	1	1
	SGP	978	58.0	62.0	59.0	56.5	50	-1.5	-2.5
10	CPI	250	92.7	97.4	95.2	94.4	89.9	1.7	-0.8
	P+	250	83%	92%	89%	87%	79%	4	-2
	SGP	233	58.0	60.0	54.0	52.0	50.0	-6.0	-2.0

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

Table B2c: Somerset Public Schools and Somerset Berkley Regional High School Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	197	79.9	77	81.6	76.9	78.2	-3	-4.7
	P+	197	52%	41%	54%	46%	51%	-6	-8
8	CPI	221	80.0	77.1	80.9	79.3	72.4	-0.7	-1.6
	P+	221	54%	43%	55%	50%	42%	-4	-5
5-8	CPI	418	79.9	77.1	81.3	78.2	79.4	-1.7	-3.1
	P+	418	53%	42%	54%	48%	54%	-5	-6
10	CPI	233	88.9	95.2	92.0	90.0	88.2	1.1	-2
	P+	233	69%	85%	76%	75%	72%	6	-1

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

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	393	74.9	75.0	77.0	75.2	0.3	-1.8
		P+	393	44%	45%	48%	46%	2	-2
		SGP	279	46.0	46.0	53.0	41.0	-5.0	-12.0
	State	CPI	93,277	76.5	76.8	77.1	79.5	3.0	2.4
		P+	93,277	48%	48%	50%	55%	7	5
		SGP	68,746	46.0	47.0	47.0	47.0	1.0	0.0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	244	--	--	--	79.6	--	--
		P+	244	--	--	--	55%	--	--
		SGP	172	--	--	--	50.0	--	--
	State	CPI	63,124	--	--	--	80.9	--	--
		P+	63,124	--	--	--	59%	--	--
		SGP	47,064	--	--	--	47.0	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	197	66.8	66.3	68.8	61.9	-4.9	-6.9
		P+	197	28%	29%	33%	25%	-3	-8
		SGP	139	48.0	49.0	54.0	38.0	-10.0	-16.0
	State	CPI	39,117	67.3	66.8	66.6	71.6	4.3	5.0
		P+	39,117	31%	30%	31%	39%	8	8
		SGP	28,234	43.0	43.0	43.0	44.0	1.0	1.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,541	66.2	67.4	67.8	70.1	3.9	2.3
		P+	18,541	34%	35%	36%	41%	7	5
		SGP	11,589	51.0	53.0	54.0	54.0	3.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	1,255	88.5	87.9	89.1	87.3	-1.2	-1.8
		P+	1,255	71%	70%	72%	70%	-1	-2
		SGP	976	50.0	50.0	48.0	47.0	-3.0	-1.0
	State	CPI	216,396	86.7	86.8	86.7	89.3	2.6	2.6
		P+	216,396	69%	69%	69%	75%	6	6
		SGP	172,652	50.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

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

Table B3b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015[12]

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	55	92.6	97.5	95.5	87.3	-5.3	-8.2
		P+	55	75%	93%	89%	75%	0	-14
		SGP	43	45.5	63.5	64.5	38.0	-7.5	-26.5
	State	CPI	28,061	91.0	93.1	91.5	92.1	1.1	0.6
		P+	28,061	76%	81%	79%	79%	3	0
		SGP	22,696	46.0	54.0	46.0	47.0	1.0	1.0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	35	--	--	--	94.3	--	--
		P+	35	--	--	--	86.0%	--	--
		SGP	30	--	--	--	39.5	--	--
	State	CPI	19,150	--	--	--	93.4	--	--
		P+	19,150	--	--	--	84%	--	--
		SGP	15,926	--	--	--	47.0	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	24	89.2	96.0	93.0	74.0	-15.2	-19
		P+	24	63%	88%	84%	50%	-13	-34
		SGP	17	58.0	--	73.5	--	--	--
	State	CPI	11,688	85.8	88.4	86.0	88.1%	2.3	2.1
		P+	11,688	60%	66%	63%	67%	7	4
		SGP	9,402	45.0	51.0	44.0	43.0	-2.0	-1.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	4,563	77.0	81.8	77.8	80.7	3.7	2.9
		P+	4,563	47%	57%	52%	58%	11	6
		SGP	2,514	59.0	65.0	52.0	59.0	0.0	7.0
All students	District	CPI	250	97.8	99.3	99.0	97.0	-0.8	-2
		P+	250	93%	98%	97%	94%	1	-3
		SGP	234	50.0	74.0	62.0	49.0	-1.0	-13.0
	State	CPI	69,751	95.8	96.9	96.0	96.7	0.9	0.7
		P+	69,751	88%	91%	89%	91%	3	2
		SGP	61,218	50.0	57.0	50.0	51.0	1.0	1.0

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

[12] State refers to the 10th grade state results.

Table B3c: Somerset Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	394	65.6	68.5	67.1	67.1	1.5	0.0
		P+	394	33%	36%	36%	39%	6	3
		SGP	281	57.0	61.0	59.0	52.0	-5.0	-7.0
	State	CPI	93,295	67.0	68.6	68.4	70.2	3.2	1.8
		P+	93,295	37%	40%	40%	43%	6	3
		SGP	69,106	46.0	46.0	47.0	47.0	1.0	0.0
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	245	--	--	--	71.7	--	--
		P+	245	--	--	--	49%	--	--
		SGP	173	--	--	--	57.0	--	--
	State	CPI	63,076	--	--	--	71.9	--	--
		P+	63,076	--	--	--	47%	--	--
		SGP	47,295	--	--	--	46	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	197	56.2	59.9	57.2	54.6	-1.6	-2.6
		P+	197	20.0%	21.0%	22.0%	19.0%	-1.0%	-3.0%
		SGP	141	58	64.5	58	49	-9	-9
	State	CPI	39,181	56.9	57.4	57.1	60.0	3.1	2.9
		P+	39,181	21%	22%	22%	27%	6	5
		SGP	28,451	43.0	42.0	43.0	44.0	1.0	1.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	3	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,625	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.4	2.8	0.6
		P+	18,625	32%	35%	36%	37%	5	1
		SGP	11,735	52.0	53.0	52.0	50.0	-2	-2
All students	District	CPI	1,258	81.9	83.5	82	81.4	-0.5	-0.6
		P+	1,258	60%	63%	60%	61%	1	1
		SGP	978	58.0	62.0	59.0	56.5	-1.5	-2.5
	State	CPI	216,363	79.9	80.8	80.3	83.1	3.2	2.8
		P+	216,363	59%	61%	60%	66%	7	6
		SGP	173,217	50.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

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

Table B3d: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015[13]

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	55	77.8	89.4	82.6	80.9	3.1	-1.7
		P+	55	53%	68%	61%	60%	7	-1
		SGP	43	59.5	60.0	61.0	40.0	-19.5	-21
	State	CPI	28,091	80.4	80.3	80.6	78.9	-1.5	-1.5
		P+	28,091	59%	61%	60%	58%	-1	-1
		SGP	22,925	48.0	45.0	47.0	47.0	-1.0	0.0
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	35	--	--	--	87.9	--	--
		P+	35	--	--	--	71%	--	--
		SGP	30	--	--	--	28	--	--
	State	CPI	19,126	--	--	--	81.2	--	--
		P+	19,126	--	--	--	63%	--	--
		SGP	16,085	--	--	--	46.0	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	24	75.0	88.0	75.0	70.8	-4.2	-4.2
		P+	24	50%	60%	44%	42%	-8	-2
		SGP	17	65.0	--	63.0	--	--	--
	State	CPI	11,742	71.4	70.0	70.8	69.7	-1.7	-1.1
		P+	11,742	41%	40%	40%	39%	-2	-1
		SGP	9,549	47.0	42.0	45.0	46.0	-1.0	1.0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	4,613	67.5	64.4	67.8	65.8	-1.7	-2.0
		P+	4,613	42%	39%	42%	41%	-1	-1
		SGP	2,589	59.0	45.0	53.0	53.0	-6.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	250	92.7	97.4	95.2	94.4	1.7	-0.8
		P+	250	83%	92%	89%	87%	4	-2
		SGP	233	58.0	60.0	54.0	52.0	-6.0	-2.0
	State	CPI	69,766	90.0	90.2	90.0	89.9	-0.1	-0.1
		P+	69,766	78%	80%	78%	78%	0	0
		SGP	61,548	50.0	51.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

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

[13] State refers to the 10th grade state results.

Table B3e: Somerset Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	123	61.6	64.3	68.8	63.4	1.8	-5.4
		P+	123	25%	19%	32%	27%	2	-5
	State	CPI	91,013	65.0	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	-1.0
		P+	91,013	31%	31%	33%	32%	1	-1
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	76	--	--	--	69.1	--	--
		P+	76	--	--	--	34%	--	--
	State	CPI	62,345	--	--	--	67.1	--	--
		P+	62,345	--	--	--	33%	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	63	48.8	58.5	64.3	48.8	0.0	-15.5
		P+	63	9%	17%	21%	11%	2	-10
	State	CPI	38,520	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	0.1
		P+	38,520	20%	20%	22%	22%	2	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	1	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	17,516	51.4	54	54	53.9	2.5	-0.1
		P+	17,516	17%	19%	18%	18%	1	0
All students	District	CPI	418	79.9	77.1	81.3	78.2	-1.7	-3.1
		P+	418	53%	42%	54%	48%	-5	-6
	State	CPI	210,454	78.6	79.0	79.6	79.4	0.8	-0.2
		P+	210,454	54%	53%	55%	54%	0	-1

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 B3f: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015[14]

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	48	71	87.1	80.6	75.5	4.5	-5.1
		P+	48	27%	60%	50%	44%	17%	-6%
	State	CPI	26,972	76.0	77.7	77.5	77.3	1.3	-0.2
		P+	26,972	46%	49%	49%	48%	2	-1
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	29	0	0	0	87.1	87.1	87.1
		P+	29	0%	0%	0%	59%	59%	59%
	State	CPI	18,419	--	--	--	78.6	--	--
		P+	18,419	--	--	--	52%	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	23	64.8	83	72.6	60.9	-3.9	-11.7
		P+	23	23%	45%	33%	22%	-1%	-11%
	State	CPI	11,625	68.8	70.3	70.0	71.2	2.4	1.2
		P+	11,625	32%	33%	33%	35%	3	2
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	3,935	61.8	63.0	62.6	62.3	0.5	-0.3
		P+	3,935	26%	28%	26%	27%	1	1
All students	District	CPI	233	88.9	95.2	92	90	1.1	-2
		P+	233	69%	85%	76%	75%	6%	-1%
	State	CPI	67,732	87.0	88.0	87.9	88.2	1.2	0.3
		P+	67,732	69%	71%	71%	71%	2	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.

[14] State refers to the 10th grade state results.

Table B4: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
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	2.2%	7.3%	2.8%	2.2%	0	0%	-0.6	-21.4%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	2.0%	--	--	--	--	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	1.3%	10.5%	2.9%	1.9%	0.6	46.2%	-1.0	-34.5%	3.5%
ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	0.9%	2.5%	1.3%	0.8%	-0.1	-11.1%	-0.5	-38.5%	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 B5a: Somerset Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2012–2015

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	96.1%	95.8%	95.8%	95.3%	-0.8	-0.8%	-0.5	-0.5%	94.7%

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

Table B5b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Attendance Rates, 2012–2015

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	92.6	92.7%	93.4%	92.4%	-0.2	-0.2%	1.0	1.0%	94.7%

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

Table B6a: Somerset Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	$17,841,581	$16,819,742	$18,374,685	$18,540,014	$18,440,610	$18,396,908
By municipality	$14,829,926	$14,473,082	$14,394,644	$12,754,834	$12,273,385	$13,204,811
Total from local appropriations	$32,671,507	$31,292,824	$32,769,329	$31,294,848	$30,713,995	$31,601,719
From revolving funds and grants	--	$960,557	--	$1,237,915	--	$1,376,194
Total expenditures	--	$32,253,381	--	$32,532,763	--	$32,977,913
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$4,104,261	--	$5,022,378	--	$5,109,544
Required local contribution	--	$10,467,269	--	$10,738,045	--	$11,107,578
Required net school spending**	--	$14,571,530	--	$15,760,423	--	$16,217,122
Actual net school spending	--	$21,044,754	--	$21,625,762	--	$22,222,944
Over/under required ($)	--	$6,473,224	--	$5,865,339	--	$6,005,822
Over/under required (%)	--	44.4%	--	37.2%	--	37.0%

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

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

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

Data retrieved 11/20/15

Table B6b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**	**Estimated**	**Actual**
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	$13,315,134	$14,754,853	$13,300,000	$40,776,986	$13,381,225	$50,244,452
From revolving funds and grants	--	$768,901	--	$800,133	--	$915,765
Total expenditures	--	$15,523,754	--	$41,577,119	--	$51,160,217
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$3,120,169	--	$3,771,018	--	$3,795,643
Required local contribution	--	$6,119,915	--	$6,253,551	--	$6,377,384
Required net school spending**	--	$9,240,084	--	$10,024,569	--	$10,173,027
Actual net school spending	--	$11,636,431	--	$12,888,817	--	$12,159,226
Over/under required ($)	--	$2,396,347	--	$2,864,248	--	$1,986,199
Over/under required (%)	--	25.9%	--	28.6%	--	19.5%

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

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

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

Data retrieved 11/20/15

Table B7a: Somerset Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2012–2014

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	$300	$260	$299
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$767	$723	$696
Teachers	$3,905	$4,766	$5,126
Other teaching services	$1,092	$1,137	$1,254
Professional development	$67	$122	$71
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$352	$407	$198
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$86	$106	$113
Pupil services	$912	$1,379	$1,068
Operations and maintenance	$1,002	$961	$890
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$2,428	$2,528	$2,944
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$10,913	$12,389	$12,659

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website
Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

Table B7b: Somerset Berkley Regional High School
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2012–2014

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	$385	$418	$435
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$829	$970	$1,380
Teachers	$5,023	$5,461	$5,413
Other teaching services	$652	$703	$438
Professional development	$103	$169	$112
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$362	$561	$340
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$583	$563	$656
Pupil services	$1,386	$1,662	$1,791
Operations and maintenance	$985	$1,177	$947
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$1,478	$1,823	$2,083
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$11,786	$13,508	$13,595

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	Average Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	**ES**	0%	6%	50%	44%	2.4
	MS	0%	13%	73%	13%	2.0
	HS	0%	9%	30%	61%	2.5
	Total #	0	5	27	24	2.3
	Total %	0%	9%	48%	43%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	**ES**	11%	33%	39%	17%	1.6
	MS	20%	27%	27%	27%	1.6
	HS	58%	8%	8%	25%	1.0
	Total #	19	12	13	13	1.4
	Total %	33%	21%	21%	23%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	**ES**	0%	50%	28%	22%	1.7
	MS	0%	33%	47%	20%	1.9
	HS	4%	46%	33%	17%	1.6
	Total #	1	25	20	11	1.7
	Total %	2%	44%	35%	19%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	**ES**	0%	44%	33%	22%	1.8
	MS	7%	20%	53%	20%	1.9
	HS	13%	42%	25%	21%	1.5
	Total #	4	21	20	12	1.7
	Total %	7%	37%	35%	21%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	**ES**					**7.5**
	MS					**7.3**
	HS					**6.7**
	Total					**7.1**

Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Average Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.	**ES**	6%	17%	39%	39%	2.1
	MS	0%	20%	73%	7%	1.9
	HS	4%	29%	38%	29%	1.9
	Total #	2	13	27	15	2.0
	Total %	4%	23%	47%	26%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	**ES**	6%	39%	56%	0%	1.5
	MS	0%	33%	60%	7%	1.7
	HS	21%	29%	33%	17%	1.5
	Total #	6	19	27%	5	1.5
	Total %	11%	33%	47%	9%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	**ES**	6%	17%	61%	17%	1.9
	MS	0%	27%	67%	7%	1.8
	HS	29%	25%	13%	33%	1.5
	Total #	8	13	12	12	1.7
	Total %	14%	23%	21%	21%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	**ES**					**5.5**
	MS					**5.4**
	HS					**4.9**
	Total					**5.2**

Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Average 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**	28%	22%	33%	17%	1.4
	MS	33%	27%	33%	7%	1.1
	HS	75%	13%	13%	0%	0.4
	Total #	28	11	14	4	0.9
	Total %	49%	19%	25%	7%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	**ES**	6%	39%	39%	17%	1.7
	MS	13%	47%	33%	7%	1.3
	HS	50%	25%	13%	13%	0.9
	Total #	15	20	15	7	1.2
	Total %	26%	35%	26%	12%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	**ES**	0%	0%	50%	50%	2.5
	MS	7%	7%	73%	13%	1.9
	HS	0%	21%	17%	63%	2.4
	Total #	1	6	24	26	2.3
	Total %	2%	11%	42%	46%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	**ES**	5%	26%	52%	16%	1.8
	MS	13%	13%	73%	0%	1.6
	HS	38%	17%	33%	13%	1.2
	Total #	12	11	29	6	1.5
	Total %	21%	19%	50%	10%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	**ES**					**7.3**
	MS					**6.0**
	HS					**4.9**
	Total					**6.0**