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Carver Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2014–2015 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Carver Public Schools was conducted from April 28–May 1, 2015. The site visit included 28 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 88 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, high school students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted2 focus groups with 17 elementary school teachers and 5 middle and high school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A. Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 52 classrooms in 2 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**

Carver has a town administrator form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. The five members of the school committee meet monthly, more frequently during the budget process.

The current superintendent has been in the position since the 2006–2007 school year. The district leadership team, called the Administrative Leadership Team or ALT, includes: the superintendent; the director of curriculum, instruction and technology; the director of special education; the assistant superintendent for business and finance; the middle/high school principal; the middle/high school assistant principal and mentor director; the middle/high school assistant principal and director of comprehensive health and athletics; a third middle/high school assistant principal; the elementary school principal; two elementary school associate principals; the director of literacy; and the math coach. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past five years. The district has two principals leading two schools. In 2014–2015 there were 122.1 FTE teachers in the district.

In the 2014–2015 school year, 1,641 students were enrolled in the district’s 2 schools:

**Table 1: Carver Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2014–2015**

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Governor John Carver Elementary School | ES | PK–5 | 784 |
| Carver Middle-High School | MS/HS | 6–12 | 857 |
| **Totals** | **2 schools** | **PK–12** | **1,641** |
| \*As of October 1, 2014 | | | |

Between 2011 and 2015 overall student enrollment 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 were similar to the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 50 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: $12,545 as compared with $12,544. Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Carver is a Level 2 district because Carver Elementary and Carver Middle/High are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.**

* Carver Elementary is in the 25th percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 with cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) of 59 for all students and 55 for high needs students; the target is 75.
* Carver Middle/High is in the 36th percentile of middle/high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 56 for all students and 49 for high needs students; the target is 75.

**The district did not reach its 2014 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets for ELA, math, and science.**

* ELA CPI was 86.1 in 2014, below the district’s target of 90.3.
* Math CPI was 79.8 in 2014, below the district’s target of 84.8.
* Science CPI was 74.8 in 2014, below the district’s target of 81.0.

**ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate in all the tested grades at Carver Elementary and within 1 to 2 percentage points of the state rate in all the tested grades at Carver Middle/High School.**

* ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 66 percent in 2011 and 2014, 3 percentage points below the 2014 rate of 69 percent.
* ELA proficiency rates at Carver Elementary were below the state rate by 4, 19, and 3 percentage points in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, respectively.
  + Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 4 percentage points in the 3rd grade and by 10 percentage points in the 4th grade.
* ELA proficiency rates at Carver Middle/High were below the state rate by 1 percentage point in the 6th grade, equal to the state rate in the 7th grade, and below the state rate by 2 percentage points in the 8th grade; the ELA proficiency rate was above the state rate by 1 percentage point in the 10th grade.
  + Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 8 percentage points in the 8th grade and by 1 percentage point in the 6th grade, and decreased by 3 percentage points in the 7th grade.

**Math proficiency rates and performance varied by grade.**

* Math proficiency rates for all students in the district were 56 percent in 2011 and 57 percent in 2014, 3 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 60 percent.
* Math proficiency rates in the district were above the state rate by 3 percentage points in the 7th grade, and by 1 and 2 percentage points in the 3rd and 10th grades, respectively.
  + Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 5 percentage points in the 5th grade, by 4 percentage points in the 8th grade, and by 3 percentage points in the 3rd and 10th grades.
* Math proficiency rates were below the state rate by 9 percentage points in the 8th grade, by 8 percentage points in the 4th grade, and by 5 percentage points in the 5th and 6th grades.
  + Between 2011 and 2014 the math proficiency rate decreased by 4 percentage point in the 6th grade.

**Science proficiency rates were below the state rate for each tested grade and in the district as whole.**

* 5th grade science proficiency rates were 43 percent in 2011 and 45 percent in 2014, 8 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 53 percent.
* 8th grade science proficiency rates increased from 28 percent in 2011 to 31 percent in 2014, 11 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 42 percent.
* 10th grade science proficiency rates increased from 57 percent in 2011 to 60 percent in 2014, 11 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 71 percent.

**Carver students’ growth on the MCAS assessments on average is comparable with that of their academic peers statewide in ELA and in mathematics.**

* On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 49.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.
  + ELA median SGP was 67.5 in the 10th grade.
  + ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 4th grade (median SGP of 37.0) and in the 7th grade (39.0).
* On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 47.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.
  + Math median SGP was 60.0 in the 7th grade.

**Carver reached the 2014 four-year cohort graduation target of 80.0 but did not reach the five-year cohort graduation target of 85.0 percent.[[1]](#footnote-1)**

* The four-year cohort graduation rate increased from 86.2 percent in 2011 to 95.0 percent in 2014, and was above the 2014 state rate of 86.1 percent.
* The five-year cohort graduation rate was 85.8 percent in 2010 and 83.9 percent in 2013, and was below the 2013 state rate of 87.7 percent.
* The annual dropout rate for Carver decreased from 2.4 percent in 2011 to 1.1 percent in 2014, below the 2014 statewide rate of 2.0 percent.

Carver Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

***Leadership and Governance***

**1. The district is led by an administrative team notable for its culture of collaboration and its inclusion of central office leaders, school administrators, and teachers.**

* 1. Interviews and a document review indicated that since arriving nine years ago, the superintendent has sought to create a dynamic administrative team. To achieve that goal, the superintendent has created a districtwide administrative team, two school-level administrative teams, and a group identified as the curriculum team leaders.
     1. The districtwide Administrative Leadership Team (ALT) is composed of: the superintendent; the assistant superintendent for business; the directors of curriculum, special education, and literacy; the principals and assistant/associate principals; as well as the math coordinator and coach. The team meets twice a month.
     2. The school-level administrative teams meet monthly at each school. In addition to the administrators at each school, the superintendent and directors of curriculum and special education attend.
     3. The curriculum team leaders convene nine times during the school year in addition to three days during the summer. The superintendent, the directors of curriculum and special education, the administrative leadership teams from each school, as well as the department heads and grade-level lead teachers make up the team.
  2. Interviewees described various team members as the instructional leaders in the district.
     1. Central office directors characterized the leadership team members, in general, and the lead teachers, in particular, as instructional leaders.
     2. An administrator described the middle/high school department heads as instructional leaders and high school teachers endorsed that description.

**C.** Team members are held in high regard.

1. The superintendent credits the operational culture created by the principals with eliminating teachers’ association grievances in the past several years.

2. The superintendent told the team that teachers sought greater leadership roles and principals supported them, resulting in the creation of the lead teacher position two years ago at the elementary school.

3. Members of the school committee expressed support for the superintendent; one expressed the belief that she does a “phenomenal” job. They also displayed a trust of the superintendent’s judgment in hiring the best personnel to implement district initiatives.

**Impact**: A broadly constituted leadership group, which meets frequently, ensures comprehensive collaboration and communication about substantive matters and creates a climate for staff buy-in of the decisions made by district leaders.

**2. Because of the efforts of a broad coalition of stakeholders, the district is poised to realize its decade-long goal to replace the elementary school.**

**A.** When the superintendent was hired nine years ago, the school committee charged her with initiating the process for the construction of a new elementary school.

1. Interviews and a document review showed that between 2009 and 2011, three consecutive attempts at voter approval to fund the construction of the school were narrowly defeated each time.

1. Newly employed in January 2014, the town administrator has been charged by the board of selectmen with constructing a new elementary school.

The town administrator has restored the elementary school building committee.

1. Eight of the eleven building committee members are new to the committee.
2. A town official expressed the view that the current composition of the committee is more broadly representative of the entire community resulting in a greater level of trust in the decisions and recommendations of the committee.
3. A school committee member expressed the belief that committee discussions were transparent and needed to focus on the impact on each household’s tax burden to ensure voter approval of the new school construction.

**C.** The town’s buildings study committee proposed the construction/renovation of three new public facilities in Carver, including a new elementary school. The town hired the Edward J. Collins, Jr., Center for Public Management to an independent assessment of the proposal. In June 2014 the firm published its findings, which state on p. 26: “Based on the above analysis, the Collins Center project team believes ample evidence exists to support the need for a new/renovated elementary school facility for the Town of Carver.”

**D.** Representatives from both the school district and the town expressed optimism that voters will understand the need for an expenditure of funds for the construction of the new elementary school at a meeting tentatively scheduled toward the close of the current calendar year.

Critical stakeholders, including the superintendent, the town administrator, and a representative of the board of selectmen, told the team that they are increasingly confident that the new school will be built.

Representatives from the teachers’ association said that they had been advocating for a new school building, and they expressed confidence that the building proposal would be approved.

A school committee member who is also on the building committee expressed the view that the groundwork for the acceptance of the proposal had been laid.

**Impact**: If the broad coalition of stakeholders can maintain open communication, cooperative efforts––and the positive momentum for the proposal to build a new elementary school–– the goal will likely be achieved. A new school will provide students with a 21st century educational environment that is healthy, safe, and conducive to learning.

***Curriculum and Instruction***

**3. The district has sufficient curricular and instructional leadership to guide curriculum renewal and instructional improvement*.***

**A.** There is dedicated district-level leadership structure and personnel to improve curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

1. The Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT) meets nine times a year plus three days in the summer to oversee and monitor all aspects of the academic program. The CLT is composed of: the superintendent; the director of curriculum, instruction, and technology; the director of special education; the elementary school and middle/high school administrative teams; the middle/high school department chairs; and elementary school lead teachers.

2. The director of curriculum, instruction, and technology and the director of literacy described their districtwide responsibilities, divided by content areas, for curriculum oversight and development, instructional improvement, assessment, and data analysis.

* + - 1. In addition to providing districtwide leadership, each director plans multiple opportunities for principals, teachers, and lead teachers at the school level, grade level, and departments to interact productively on curricular and instructional topics.
      2. In addition to conceptual framing and planning, each director attends and leads various team meetings, conducts walkthroughs and observations, and evaluates teachers.

**B.** Principals and teachers described multiple curricular and instructional leadership roles at the school level.

1. The elementary and the middle/high school principals have set some expectations for teaching and learning at their schools, and monitor and support curriculum development and instructional improvement through the educator evaluation system.

2. At the elementary school, the principal has stayed current with assessment development and data analysis. This takes place through monthly faculty meetings as well as in CLT and grade-level meetings.

3. Elementary school coaches for reading, Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI), and math also provide guidance for instructional improvement. Coaches model and observe lessons and provide non-evaluative feedback to teachers.

4. Elementary, grade-level lead teachers (K–5) and middle/high school department heads (grades 6–12) also engage in efforts to improve teaching, learning, and curriculum.

The district created and negotiated the role of grade-level lead teacher two years ago to provide teachers with a larger leadership role for teaching and learning K–5. Six lead teachers have participated in professional development to prepare for and assume their new roles.

Lead teachers attend CLT meetings and are required to meet with grade-level colleagues as a Professional Learning Community (PLC) once a month after school for an hour, principally for data analysis. The literacy director, the math coach, or the director of curriculum and instruction and technology lead the PLC meetings, depending on the subject/data on the agenda.

* + - 1. Each week, most grade-level teacher cohorts meet again during the school day––some formally, some informally––during common prep time. The district does not and cannot mandate teacher attendance at these additional meetings. As a result, the frequency of grade-level meetings and participation to discuss student progress and refine teaching varies across grades.
      2. At the middle/high school, department heads meet monthly with teachers in grades 6–12 after school. Regular departmental PLC meetings also take place twice over a seven-day cycle during the school day during the newly created Crusader Block. PLCs can include all teachers in a department or only two or three departmental teachers who share a common prep time. Currently PLCs are focused on developing and aligning curriculum units to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.
  1. All district and school leaders monitor instruction and fidelity of curriculum implementation through classroom observations followed by written or oral feedback to teachers.
     1. District leaders, principals, and department heads (grades 6–12) serve as primary evaluators. They conduct formal and informal observations and are responsible for writing summative evaluations and rating teacher performance.
     2. Lead teachers (grades K–5) describe themselves as “secondary” evaluators. They also conduct walkthroughs and provide informal feedback to teachers. They do not rate teachers’ performance or write summative evaluations. They may be asked to share their observational notes with primary evaluators.

**Impact**: The district has created a multi-leveled, well-staffed leadership team designed with the key roles and structure to improve curriculum, instruction, and assessment. With clear goals and expectations set by leaders, the district and each school can create a well-informed and supportive culture to engage teachers in the focused work of improving student achievement.

**4. The district has made fine progress in developing a K–12 benchmarked writing program aligned to the Anchor Standards for Writing in the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.**

1. The writing program was identified as an initial focus to align ELA/English curriculum and instruction to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.
2. The superintendent noted that one rationale for improving the writing program was to carry over students’ developing literacy skills to writing. Another administrator noted that the teachers were also primary supporters of improving student writing, particularly in light of the new writing standards in the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.
3. A first step was to investigate successful writing programs in other districts and then to work with a consultant at both schools to design a more comprehensive program.
4. At the elementary school, the consultant worked with every grade-level team to review the frameworks and to create mastery benchmarks, writing prompts, and rubrics. Writing prompts are now given and assessed multiple times each year at each grade. They include “open response” prompts as well as more complex skill development such as “research” writing that requires students to support claims with evidence.
5. Elementary grade-level teams review students’ benchmarked writing assessments during PLC meetings with the literacy director and lead teachers. The literacy coach also works with lead teachers to evaluate writing assessments in order to identify strengths and challenges vertically K-5 and to discuss how to improve the teaching of writing.
6. To support teachers to develop and to assess students’ writing skills, starting in 2011 the district adopted and provided professional development districtwide for *Empowering Writers* and *Keys to Literacy*.
7. The writing consultant also worked with the academic departments at the middle/high school to develop a more systematic approach to teaching and assessing writing. This entailed developing and clarifying writing expectations for each grade level, setting benchmarks, developing writing assessments, and creating and revising the rubrics several times.

The middle/high school now has common writing assessments given several times a year.

Developing students’ writing skills is now incorporated into all departments at the middle/high school. Writing assessments are collaboratively scored by English, math, science, and social studies teachers who have had professional development to learn to evaluate student writing.

A district leader noted that the science and social studies departments have also adopted the ELA writing component of the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* in course work. Each department has adjusted expectations for students about writing and summer reading. These departments are also working with the math and English departments about text styles and complexity as well as developing students’ skills to analyze multiple texts in writing.

**Impact**: The district has developed a new and more challenging writing program aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* for students in all academic areas K–12. In doing so, the district has provided students with the opportunity to learn to write well in multiple content areas and to develop more complex styles and types of writing. Good writing skills can provide lifelong benefits to students and help them succeed in both college and career.

**5. The district continues to make progress aligning the mathematics curriculum to the *2011 Massachusetts Math Curriculum Framework*.**

* 1. In 2012, the district developed a migration plan to align curriculum, instruction, and assessments to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*. District leaders, department heads, and the new lead teachers were key in implementing the plan. The effort began with mathematics; in math, alignment is now complete K–2 and for Algebra I.

**B.** At the elementary school, interviews and a document review indicated that there has been progress in aligning mathematics instruction to the *2011 Massachusetts Math Curriculum Framework*.

1. District leaders stated that 100 percent of the mathematics curriculum K–2 was aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Math Curriculum Framework*. Leaders also stated that approximately 80–90 percent of the math curriculum in grades 3–5 was aligned.

District leaders and lead teachers confirmed that they used ESE crosswalk documents to identify curriculum modifications and changes from the 2006 frameworks to the 2011 frameworks and then reviewed them with teachers.

Resource tools for grade-level teachers were developed to identify where the *Everyday Mathematics* program (2007 edition) was aligned to the 2011 frameworks. Resource tools include topics, standards, and references to content in *Everyday Mathematics* for teachers to use in core instruction for all students. In addition, the tools identified differentiated resources for intervention and enrichment.

Pacing guides for K–5 mathematics were also developed to identify specific standards by textbook chapter. These guides include some teaching notes, homework assignments, and time on topic.

In addition, math power standards were identified and common assessments were developed for 2013–2014 to measure students’ mastery of the power standards.

Teachers in grades 1–2 use the new edition of *Everyday Mathematics*, which is aligned to the common core state standards. Last year, they ensured that the district’s common assessments were aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Math Curriculum Framework*.

Although teachers in grades 3–5 have attempted to align the older textbook edition of *Everyday Mathematics* to the 2011 framework, teachers and leaders noted that there are still gaps.

a. District leaders reported that the most recent edition of *K–6 Everyday Mathematics* has been purchased for all K–6 classes. All K–6 teachers attended a four-day Math Academy in the summer 2014. The Math Academy highlighted alignment to the 2011 frameworks and “examined how *Everyday Mathematics* translated the crosswalks documents.” The Math Academy was facilitated by: the K–5 math coach; the K–12 director of curriculum, instruction, and technology; lead teachers; and the *Everyday Math* Massachusetts PD consultant.

When asked to describe the math curriculum, elementary teachers stated that the textbook––rather than local documentation that guides what and how they should teach––is the curriculum. A district leader said that the district gives new teachers a textbook rather than a fully developed curriculum, adding that if one would ask the (elementary) teachers to describe the curriculum, they would say “[the]textbook.”

**C.** At themiddle school, mathematics curriculum documents provide for lessons aligned to the 2011 framework and vertical alignment of standards for grades 6 to 8.

1. Recently created curriculum maps (2012–2013) for middle school mathematics document a month-by-month sequence of topics with reference to “common core standards.” In addition, teacher-developed “Big Ideas” documents focus on vertical alignment for power standards for grades 6 to 8. Additional maps translate “common core language” into district “benchmark language.”

2. A review of middle school maps for topics and content standards/skills indicated that the documents provide guidance about what standards to teach and assess, but do not qualify as guiding documents of a fully formed curriculum. Although the documents give some information to inform lesson planning, they are missing a number of key components that could enrich and expand teaching and learning at this level.

**D.** The Curriculum Matrix submitted to ESE for the review noted that math curriculum alignment for grades 6–12 was still “In Progress” with a notation that Algebra 1 was complete and geometry was in progress.

1. A district leader noted ongoing content alignment at the high school in mathematics, but said that curriculum maps had not been changed, perhaps because of the time spent on meeting recommendations from the 2012 NEASC report.

2. Middle/high school teachers stated that although common assessments aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* were in use, teachers continued to work on integrating “the common core standards” for mathematics.

**Impact**: If the district can continue to make progress in developing and documenting math curriculum that serves as an informative guide for a standards-based learning and teaching system, Carver’s students can have full and equal opportunities with their peers statewide to master the knowledge, skills, and understandings required in the *2011 Massachusetts Math Curriculum Framework*.

**6. The district continues to make progress in aligning the ELA/English curriculum documents to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.***

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that there have been several attempts to align the elementary ELA curriculum with the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* over time.
2. District leaders noted that they worked with elementary grade-level teachers to align the 2007 edition of *Reading Street* to previous frameworks.
3. Teachers said that in order to begin to align the *Reading Street* program to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*, the district purchased and implemented benchmark assessments for the newer edition of *Reading Street* that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards, although the textbook in use is the older, unaligned 2007 edition.
4. Teachers said that they now use the new assessments to guide their planning and teaching, noting that the older version of the textbook does not have compatible readings. Teachers said that they review the assessments to see what is required and then “backfill” the content, using either the textbook or other resources. Several agreed that they are “cobbling it together.”
5. A district leader noted that she and the grade-level lead teachers have worked with teachers to fill in the resource/content gaps in order to administer the new *Reading Street* assessments. She then added that recently, there has been more time focused on professional development for new methodologies such as Close Reading and vocabulary instruction [rather than spending time working on alignment to the new state frameworks].
6. One leader said that alignment for writing K–5 was more certain, noting that in reading, the standards were being addressed in class but the reading program (textbooks) was not aligned to current state frameworks.
7. A district leader said that the district did not have a fully developed and documented curriculum for reading at the elementary level.

a. District leaders reported that Reading Street, My Sidewalks, Enhanced Core Reading Instruction, and Wilson and Orton Gillingham make up the elementary reading curriculum.

1. Leaders and teachers stated that the district intends to purchase the new edition of *Reading Street* for the 2015–2016 school year. At that time, they will again review the program for alignment to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*.
   1. A district leader stated that staff will need to look at each unit in the new text and identify which standards are met; this has been done for writing but not for reading.
2. The only elementary ELA curriculum documents submitted to the review team were “literacy initiative” plans consisting of grade-level “Whole Group/Small Group Reading Plans.” These documents list activities and topics (e.g., sections such as, “read aloud,” “preview and begin to read first half of anthology story,” and “amazing words”). The plans also indicate the required number of minutes for whole-group and for small-group instruction. These documents make no systematic reference to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* to enable teachers or leaders to understand which standards are being addressed.
3. Alignment of the middle/high school ELA curriculum to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* is evident in many curriculum unit plans submitted to the review team. These units are modeled after Wiggins’ and McTighe’s *Understanding by Design (UbD)* format.

1. Most of these thoughtful and detailed UbD curriculum units include reading and writing standards that will be taught as well as details on how students will be assessed. Units vary in their descriptions and details of alignment to the 2011 state frameworks.

2. The better-developed units include explicit references to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* in terms of what will be taught and how it will be assessed. They include reading standards and outline key ideas and details as well as standards for craft and structure. In addition, the units provide detail on writing standards by describing text type and purpose, production and distribution of writing, and research to build and present knowledge. Standards-based assessments are clearly noted in these unit plans.

3. The incomplete units include sparse notations such as “Framework: 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks for English Language Arts as well as Common Core Standards for English Language Arts,” which is confusing since the state frameworks incorporate the common core standards. It is unclear in these units which specific frameworks are addressed when the unit is taught.

4. Some units make no reference to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*, perhaps because they are intended for lessons for English courses in grades 11 and 12.

5. The curriculum matrix submitted by the district for the review indicated that all ELA curriculum alignment is still “In Progress.”

6. Middle/high school teachers stated that although common assessments aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* were in use, teachers continued to work on integrating “the common core standards” for ELA.

**Impact**: If the district continues its work to develop documented curriculum maps and/or unit plans that are fully aligned to the frameworks and vertically aligned from grade level to grade level, it can ensure that Carver’s students have access to grade-level curricula.

**7. In most observed classrooms positive conditions for teaching and learning were established.**

The team observed 52 classes throughout the district: 15 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, and 26 at the elementary school. The team observed 19 ELA classes, 21 mathematics classes, and 12 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed was one special education class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

* 1. The review team observed clear and consistent evidence that the tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students was positive and respectful (#1) in 100 percent of observed elementary lessons, in 91 percent of observed middle school lessons, and in 87 percent of high school lessons.

In a grade 5 lesson, the teacher showed a respectful, supportive, and encouraging tone while small groups worked on challenging topics and exercises.

In grade 1 and grade 6 ELA lessons, students were polite to each other during presentations of “precious” and “treasured” objects and worked to developed speaking skills to ask questions and compliment speakers.

An observer noted, “Excellent student-teacher interactions” about a challenging high school science lesson, where students worked to master the process of converting word equations to math equations and formulas.

* 1. In observed classrooms rituals and routines clearly and consistently promoted transitions with minimal loss of instructional time (#4) in 92 percent of elementary lessons, in 82 percent of middle school lessons, and in 73 percent of high school lessons. Behavioral standards were clearly communicated at the middle/high school with banners in classrooms and hallways stating, “Be respectful, Be responsible, Be the best that you can be.”
  2. Observers noted that teachers clearly and consistently implemented strategies that promoted a safe learning environment where students gave opinions, made judgments, explored and investigated ideas (# 13) in 77 percent of elementary lessons, in 82 percent of middle school lessons, and in 73 percent of high school lessons.

1. In a high school English lesson students were animated and easily shared observations and opinions about the relationships among characters in “Death of a Salesman.”
2. When a grade 6 student struggled to put a math problem on the board, the teacher discretely helped the student in a soft voice that was inaudible to the rest of the class.
3. When a kindergarten student wrote an incorrect answer to a math problem on her white board, the teacher asked the student for permission to discuss her answer with the small group, noting: “Sometimes you get a different answer and that is why we practice.“

**Impact**: When the tone of classroom interactions evokes respect and trust, teachers and students can focus on teaching and learning. Respect and trust also create the conditions where everyone can do their best work. In addition, smooth and virtually invisible classroom management permits students to more easily engage in and sustain academic work. When students feel safe and supported, they can also more easily tackle difficult content and challenging tasks.

***Assessment***

**8. The elementary school has developed an effective data system through which it collects, analyzes, and disseminates student assessment and other pertinent data. It uses data to inform decisions about students, programs, and instruction and to prioritize goal development and resource allocation.**

**A**. The elementary school and the district have prioritized the use of student assessment and other relevant data to improve student achievement and inform all aspects of its decision-making. The Improvement Plans of both the school and the district focus considerable attention on specific action steps, implementation strategies, and progress monitoring systems by which assessment data will be generated and used in order to advance strategic goals.

1. The elementary data system is comprehensive and coordinated with the ability to collect, analyze, and disseminate data from a battery of student assessments, including standardized, benchmark, and common summative and formative assessments. Data is used to monitor student progress, measure achievement, and assess the effectiveness of instruction and the curriculum.

a. A document review indicated that key student assessments K–5 (and sometimes grade 6 at the middle school) currently include: DIBELS-Next (ELA, K–6); GRADE (ELA, 3–6); Reading Street (ELA, 1–6); Writing Benchmarks (K–6); CBMaze (Math, 1–5); Everyday Math (1–5); Baseline Tests (ELA and Math, 1–5): weekly spelling tests (1–5); and common teacher developed formative math assessments (K–5).

i. District administrators said that every student receives at least one data point/test score each month and that targeted assessments are administered more frequently for students needing more intensive academic support in order to provide a timely and effective progress monitoring system.

2. The Data Collection Team (DCT) directs and coordinates the elementary data system. Interviewees said that the DCT is composed of reading specialists, Title I teachers, coaches, and the district’s directors of literacy and the curriculum. The DCT is responsible for overseeing the school’s assessment program, and for the collection, analysis, and timely distribution of all student assessment data.

* + - * 1. Interviewees stated that the DCT meets regularly throughout the school year to compile and process assessment data and to meet with individual grade-level teacher teams to communicate and analyze the results of relevant student assessments in both aggregated and disaggregated formats.
        2. The elementary school, however, does not currently provide teachers with formal common planning time during the school day. Interviewees said that regularly scheduled meetings of grade-level teachers cannot be required during the school day and are limited to monthly team meetings after school, as well as two or three additional meetings per year with the DCT. Teachers expressed concerns with the timeliness and adequacy of data analysis and dissemination processes and proficiencies, as a consequence.

i. District leaders reported that 45 minutes of daily planning time is provided for all elementary teachers at each grade level to meet if they choose. The teachers’ collective bargaining agreement does not mandate common planning time but the schedule allows it.

3. School and district leaders provided a number of specific examples of how the analysis of student assessment data has been used to improve the elementary school’s academic programs. For example, DIBELS data led to the adoption of the research-based *Reading Street* program. MCAS math data identifying students’ difficulties working with fractions resulted in significant changes in curricular emphasis and pacing. Writing benchmark data informed important revisions to the K–5 writing program and the expansion of and refinements to the school’s menu of academic intervention programs and services.

4. Interviewees indicated that the analysis of student assessment results have enabled school leaders to more carefully examine the efficacy of instruction by teacher and grade level and to make substantial modifications and timely improvements to instruction. For example, DIBELS-Next data showed the need for greater focus on phonics instruction, and Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI) data resulted in the addition of specific research-based teaching strategies, as well as an ECRI coach, to support enhanced reading instruction in the primary grades.

5. Although the DCT does not have access to an efficient and integrated data management system, it makes effective use of a variety of alternative communication vehicles, including spreadsheets, Power Point presentations, individual data packets, and detailed data analyses reports. Using these tools, the DCT disseminates appropriate student performance information to key stakeholders, including teachers, parents, the superintendent, and the school committee.

a. District leaders reported that the district has access to an efficient and integrated data management system for kindergarten through grade 5 (through the University of Oregon) and for grades 6–12 (through Jupiter). Also, Baseline Edge software is available to track educator evaluation data districtwide.

**Impact**: Progress has been made at the elementary school in creating a culture of data use and inquiry that can support ongoing improvements in instruction, the curriculum, and student achievement. As a result, teachers and leaders are better able to make informed decisions and timely revisions to their curriculum, assessment practices, professional development programs, and classroom instruction. Ultimately, the systematic collection, analysis, and communication of student assessment results and other pertinent data can result in significant and lasting improvements in learning opportunities and outcomes for all students.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**9. The district has implemented an educator evaluation system that is consistent with the new educator evaluation regulations. Leaders are focused on consistency and calibration of expectations among evaluators in evaluating educators.**

**A.** A review of a random sample of personnel files with completed summative evaluations and formative assessments/evaluations indicated that a full two-year cycle of evaluations had been completed in June 2014.

1. The district tracks evaluation activities for each licensed staff member centrally in writing, including type of educator plan, length of plan, evaluators’ names, completion of announced observations, formative assessment/evaluation and summative evaluation status, and goal completion information.

2. A document review indicated that all evaluators have been trained in the educator evaluation system. Training for administrators and teachers was completed in 2013. New staff receive training through the mentor programduring their first year.

**B.** The district submitted its District-Determined Measures (DDMs) Implementation Plan to ESE in 2014; the district calls DDMs Mutually Agreed upon Measures or MAUMs.

1.The Plan identified MAUMs for most educators and requested an extension for a few. ESE’s Center for Educator Effectiveness reviewed the plan and granted the district an extension. At the time of this writing, the Center was reviewing this year’s update, which included a request for an additional extension that would result in Student Impact Ratings being determined for some educators in 2016-17 and all educators in 2017-18.

**C.** The district uses electronic forms provided by Baseline Edge for both summative evaluations and formative assessments/evaluations. Signatures of both parties are electronic and the final hard copy assessments/evaluations are kept in personnel files.

**D.** The superintendent observes some classes, reads every completed evaluation of licensed staff, and is the primary evaluator for principals.

**E.** The team was told that primary evaluators must share all written evaluations and ratings with the superintendent. The superintendent and the evaluator discuss the evidence and the superintendent verifies that the final rating accurately reflects the evidence.

**F.** A review of randomly selected personnel files for 31 teachers and all administrators indicated that evaluators are gathering detailed information about the specifics of instruction based on classroom observations.

1. Evaluators noted that a consultant from Research for Better Teaching (RBT) works with primary and secondary evaluators once a month to calibrate expectations among evaluators in evaluating teacher performance and to help implement the evaluation system.

**G.** Teachers’ evaluations overall were informative, but only 20 percent included recommendations or suggestions to improve performance.

1. All had goals and 90 percent had SMART goals (specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked).

2. District leaders reported that recommendations for professional development are not included in summative evaluations because all teachers are required to attend job-embedded professional development that is specific to grade levels and schools.

**H.** All administrators’ evaluations had SMART goals and were both informative and instructive, but did not contain any recommendations for targeted professional development or sources of support.

1. District leaders reported that all administrators are required to attend the following professional development activities:

* Research for Better Teaching: Skillful Leader III (three-year course in district meeting monthly)
* Research for Better Teaching: Analyzing Teaching for Student Results (in district with one year follow-up with guided classroom walkthroughs)
* Research for Teaching: Data Coaching (in district with one year follow-up with guided PLC data meetings)
* Keys to Literacy three-course series
* Benchmark Writing course series
* MARC (Mass Aggression Reduction Center) Preventing Bullying
* Series of legal seminars about changes in the laws governing schools
* Training on the educator evaluation system

**I.** The team reviewed 11 additional evaluations, and noted some level of feedback with instructive comments, but none of the evaluations recommended targeted professional development or sources of support to improve performance. None contained any reference to student learning; reference was made to improving observed behavior in the observed lesson.

I**mpact:** By implementing its new educator evaluation system, the district has begun a process to provide all educators with the meaningful and continuous support and feedback necessary to improve professional practice and to prioritize and promote student achievement. The superintendent’s engagement in discussing ratings and evidence with evaluators is a strong signal that consistency of expectations among evaluators in evaluating educators is an important aspect of the process.

**10. The district plans, executes, and supervises substantial professional development offerings and other opportunities to meet the licensed staff’s professional requirements and selected developmental needs.**

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that a Professional Development Committee is in place.
   * 1. The Committee plans professional development (PD) activities for four of the district’s five full days of PD each year. Planned PD is aligned with the four priority goals of the DIP and follow-up evaluations are conducted.

a. In addition to the four days of professional development, there is one day per year for development activities based on teachers’ personal choices. The committee must approve these choices; the superintendent is sometimes involved in approving the plans.

* + 1. The review team was told that the Committee operates in alignment with the Administrative Leadership Team’s improvement plans, which are aligned with the DIP.
    2. The leadership teams at the district and school levels meet regularly to assess progress on district priorities; they in turn generate topics and job-embedded professional development led by team leaders, coaches, and department heads.

1. The Committee develops schedules for workshops and events and publishes them annually.

1. Districtwide PD activities cover a broad range of needs such as licensing, relicensing, IPDPs and support to meet various district and school improvement needs. Examples include Math Academy, Close Reading, Keys to Literacy, and Teachers as Scholars.

2. There is also training for topics such as handbook details, new laws and regulations, degree attainment for salary lane movement, state requirements for professional status eligibility, educator development, RBT (Research for Better Teaching) requirements, and the mentor program.

3. Team leaders, coaches, and department heads also provide job-embedded professional development through coaching and feedback after walkthroughs.

**C.**  Research for Better Teaching (RBT) has led PD sessions about calibration of expectations of educator feedback in evaluating educators for four days in the summer and once a month during the school year.

**D.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district spends over $230,000 annually on educator development activities/events.

1. Some events do not affect the district’s budget but are encouraged to meet the developmental needs of staff.

**E.** Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) are maintained at the school level and are used to track license expiration and relicensing issues. Principals sign off on each event in the plans. The events must be aligned with district priorities and/or an educator’s teaching or support discipline.

**F.** A school committee member stated that PD is often generic and that many choices are offered to staff. The member expressed the belief that staff was getting the needed PD to help students.

**Impact:** Teaching and learning can improve when the district makes a concerted effort through its PD programs and resource allocation to address district and school priorities. In addition to planned events and activities, job-embedded PD can help leaders and teachers improve teaching skills. Through its professional development programs, the district is creating a culture that supports professional growth, which is key to improving student achievement.

***Student Support***

1. **The district provides a number of school-day, after-school, and summer programs to support children’s behavioral, social/emotional, and learning needs. These programs are designed for all students.**

**A.** The district offers a number of school day-programs that support students’ behavioral and social/emotional needs and help them accomplish their learning goals.

1. The Supporting Progress and Independence (SPI) program supports children in elementary school whose behavior stands in the way of success in the regular classroom. Students check in, benefit from small-group specialized instruction, and have access to staff members for learning support. The goal is for all children in this program to have the skills necessary to perform successfully for the full day in the mainstream classroom by middle school.

2.The students in the Middle School Assistance Program (MAP) and Graduation Assistance Program (GAP) are identified as most in need of support to meet expected academic goals. Attendance, disciplinary referrals, personal challenges, family crises, and low academic performance are criteria for entry into the program. These programs serve general education students and students with disabilities. Typically, middle school students spend more time in this classroom while high school students check in or drop in during the day when they need emotional support. Staff also provides counseling and instruction to help students improve social skills.

3. The Student Assistance Team (SAT) at the elementary school and the Alert Team at the middle/high school meet every two weeks with a designated team of school staff including principals and/or assistant principals, guidance, adjustments counselors, and psychologist.

a. If a student has academic problems, the team may suggest alternate strategies. However, most concerns center on discipline referrals, attendance, personal issues, and family crises.

b. If behavioral and social/emotional issues are not resolved in the SAT or the Alert team, those teams may convene an Instructional Support Team (IST) at the elementary level or a Building-Based Support Team (BBST) at the secondary level. With limited data and infrequent meetings, the IST and BBST function primarily as a move toward evaluation for special education services.

i. Interviewees told the team that these teams are convened only when needed, perhaps once or twice per year.

ii. Some procedures are similar to typical RTI teams. In addition to the regular members of the SAT and Alert teams, teachers may sit on the IST and BBST. Progress is monitored over 6 to 8 weeks before a recommendation is made.

4. The elementary school has implemented two new initiatives: Responsive Classroom and Second Step. Interviewees said that the programs have meant substantial improvement in classroom behavior and fewer disruptions.

5. Positive behavioral incentives generate a number of rewards, awards, and other opportunities for individual student recognition. Interviewees said that the district has seen a reduction in disciplinary referrals as well as more appropriate student behavior.

**B.** The district has a variety of summer-school programs as well as a year-long activity program.

* + 1. Summer-school offerings include extended year programs for students with disabilities and credit recovery for middle and high school students.
    2. The Young People’s Alliance (YPA) runs a daily program for middle school students, which is overseen by adults and taught by high school students. The offerings include fitness, art, homework tutoring, and two sessions of discussion groups with the teen leaders. The YPA also runs three weeks of summer activities. Volunteers, the town, and community and local businesses support the program.

1. The district employs two adjustment counselors in the elementary schools and two at the secondary level. In addition, the guidance department head is an adjustment counselor with a significant caseload. The school district also employs a school psychologist and a board certified behavioral analyst to conduct testing and to support the various programs.
2. District leaders reported that a full-time school resource officer has been hired for the 2015–2016 school year.
3. Additional school programs primarily support learning.
   * + 1. Middle school students who need additional instruction in math are placed in an extra course, Math Plus. Reading intervention and a study-skills course are also offered.
       2. Collaboration with Cape Cod Community College and grant funds have resulted in a dual enrollment program for high school students. Collaboration with Bridgewater State College is designed for students with disabilities who are transitioning to school or career.
       3. Student and guidance handbooks contain a list of services and resources for families, such as counseling centers, drug, alcohol, and domestic-abuse hotlines; handbooks are provided to every student and family.

**Impact**: The variety of support services creates a strong safety net for students who are experiencing difficulty because of economic circumstances, family difficulties, personal crises, or academic challenges. The resources of the district and the community are brought to bear to help these students reach their academic and personal goals.

***Financial and Asset Management***

1. **The district operates in a constrained fiscal environment where enrollment is declining and spending increases are limited. Despite these challenges, the district has successfully garnered additional resources in certain key areas.**

**A.** Enrollment has steadily declined in recent years. According to ESE data, from fiscal year 2010 to fiscal year 2014, enrollment dropped by 7 percent (133 students).

1. Over this same period, total spending on education and operations has risen by 6 percent ($1.3M). In the most recent three years, spending increased by less than 1 percent in fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013, and slightly declined in fiscal year 2014.

**B.** To inform the town about the needs of the district, the district presented a “needs based” budget for each school in fiscal year 2016 that included justifications for the increases.

1. In formulating its budget, district leaders said that they involved the parent council, teachers, and the entire leadership team before making a final presentation to the school committee. Once adopted by the school committee, the budget was presented to the town administration and the board of selectmen.

a. However, elected town officials told the review team that they are determined to remain at the 2.5 percent allowable spending increase level. Voters endorsed the budget at town meeting with amendment.

**C.** The district has had some success in generating funds for certain capital investments.

1. Interviews and a document review indicated that the district and the town developed a joint Carver 10 Year Capital Plan. At the April 2015 Town Meeting, voters approved a capital improvements budget that included $200,000 for technology improvements and textbooks for the school district.

**Impact**: The district will continue to grapple with managing declining enrollment, limited funds, and the need to support its students. New capital funds will allow it to make improvements that can be demonstrated to the community as necessary to the achievement and success of its students.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

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

Curriculum and Instruction

**13. The district does not consistently use a research-based instructional model(s) and teachers and administrators do not share a common understanding of the district’s expectations for effective instruction.**

**A.** When asked what the components of good teaching are in Carver, interviewees at the elementary level described a number of components.

1. In one interview, a leader noted that good teaching entailed fidelity to the programs (i.e., the *Everyday Mathematics* and *Reading Street* textbooks). The leader described “consistency and explicit instruction,” which was explained as “phonics, a scope and sequence based on research and everyone teaches it the same way such as a prescribed routine to introduce the ‘card,’ i.e., the name of the letter.”

2. In another interview, the same leader reinforced how literacy was taught, with “all teachers implementing ECRI [Enhanced Core Reading Instruction][[2]](#footnote-2) with clear routines for core phonics instruction.”

3. For mathematics, a leader referenced the workshop model, and said that “Everyone doesn’t have to be on the same page, but they must understand the standards and be able to gauge where the students are,” The leader noted that this meant using the data to break up students into small groups and doing independent practice.

4. In another interview a leader said that important components for good teaching K–5 were “hands-on activities,” especially in student centers as well as “good use of time to accomplish the tasks.”

**B.** When elementary teachers were asked about the expectations for good teaching they described the use of interventions, *The Skillful Teacher,* “I do/you do,” “think/pair/share” and “wait time.” When asked if there were other qualities, elementary teachers mentioned the *Responsive Classroom* as another component.

**C.** At the middle/high school, interviewees identified a few characteristics of high-quality teaching.

When asked to describe good teaching at the middle/high school, a leader said that everyone was moving away from Bloom’s Taxonomy and wanted to look at differentiated instruction and student engagement. The leader then described teaching at the high school as being “dependent on personal relationships and the connections” that teachers cultivated with students, and “[designed] to make the curriculum relevant.”

When asked about differentiation as a strategy, the leader stated that although middle/high school teachers were aware that there are differences in how students learn, teachers “may not know what differentiated instruction looks like.” As a result, this leader said, one “might see some exemplary teaching, but others use a stand-and-deliver model.”

In another interview, a leader stated that a characteristic of good instruction at the secondary level was “student engagement, meaning cognitive engagement, which needed to be better communicated [to teachers] because it was not always visible.” The interviewee concluded by stating, “Ultimately, the teachers are going to engage students where they are [in their learning].”

**D.**  The district has provided some professional development on differentiated instruction.

1. The district has organized several day-long professional development programs for teachers on differentiated instruction. For example, in August 2013, administrators attended a one-day workshop, “Defensible Differentiation: Clarifying the Target.”

2. Another one-day session for middle/high school faculty was held earlier this school year. The topic was formative assessment and differentiated instruction.

3. When asked about follow-up at the school level after the professional development session on differentiation, interviewees shared several points:

One teacher noted that the session reinforced methodologies that he always used.

Another teacher said that the “main take-away was the need for clear objectives but there were still limited attempts to implement differentiation,” adding that   
schoolwide follow-up by teachers was more informal and based on discussions with colleagues. The teacher thought differentiation might become an objective.

Another interviewee noted that there had been follow-up at the next faculty meeting the next month where formative assessments were identified as a way to help differentiate. The speaker added that differentiation needed to become a goal.

**E.** Interviewees were asked how well teachers now understood how to differentiate instruction based on students’ learning needs and how well they were doing in implementing differentiation.

1. Teachers said that they had prepared for the session by doing a learning inventory to identify their students’ learning styles. The session consisted of different activities that helped teachers realize the need for clearly defined objectives and learning targets in order to differentiate teaching strategies. Teachers said that differentiation often means identifying different activities and approaches for the same content for different groups or individual students.

**F.** Although differentiation appeared to be a shared expectation, it has not gained much traction in classrooms.

1. In observed classrooms, teachers clearly and consistently communicated clear learning objectives aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks* (#8) in 27 percent of elementary and middle school lessons and in 33 percent of high school lessons.

2. In 26 middle/high school classrooms visited, 36 percent of middle school lessons demonstrated appropriate modifications for different learning needs/styles, or the presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity (#10). No observed high school lessons exhibited these characteristics. Observers characterized high school lessons as teacher-centered instruction presented in a large group format.

**Impact**: Without a clear definition of high-quality instruction, good communication, and follow-up support to implement key strategies, it will be difficult for the district to ensure excellence in pedagogy as the norm in every classroom, everyday, for every student.

**14. In observed classrooms districtwide, teaching was not consistently characterized by rigor and student engagement.**

The team observed 52 classes throughout the district: 15 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, and 26 at the elementary school. The team observed 19 ELA classes, 21 mathematics classes, and 12 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed was one special education class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

**A.** Teachers clearly and consistently planned and implemented lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations (# 7) in 31 percent of elementary lessons, in 73 percent of middle school lessons, and in 60 percent of high school lessons.

1. Examples of rigorous lessons that promoted higher-order thinking included: a grade 4 ELA lesson where students were learning to develop critical and analytical thinking and writing skills by solving a mystery using selective evidence from the text.

2. A reviewer described a grade 8 Pre-Algebra lesson as rigorous, noting that the teacher encouraged the students to think. The students were engaged in problem solving and supported and helped each other, eventually demonstrating proficiency with high level content and skill develop.

3. A missed opportunity was observed in two high school math classes where students spent their time individually reviewing for a test rather than engaging in a more stimulating shared exercise in pairs or small groups to review and apply concepts, to explain what they understood, or to discuss what they did not understand.

1. Teachers clearly and consistently provided opportunities for students to engage in higher- order thinking such as the use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (#11) in 31 percent of elementary lessons, in 55 percent of middle school lessons, and in 47 percent of high school lessons. In addition, students inquired, explored, applied, synthesized and/or evaluated knowledge (#19) in 31 percent of elementary lessons, in 91 percent of middle school lessons, and in 47 percent of high school lessons.

Examples of rigorous lessons that promoted higher-order thinking included: students in a high school English class were engaged in an intense discussion of the meaning of the word “they” in the context of the then-current Baltimore riots.

Students in a middle school social studies lesson worked in small groups to first discuss and analyze information, which was then shared during a whole class discussion.

In a grade 6 history lesson, students responded to challenges to make meaning of symbols and slogans and then applied their learning to obvious Carver symbols.

In a less effective elementary ELA lesson, a number of students demonstrated mastery of the learning objective, yet were required to respond to a continued series of same-level teacher-directed questions because the lesson did not provide opportunities for them to engage in deeper thinking or application of the topic or in any differentiated activity that met their learning needs.

1. Observers noted clear and consistent evidence that teachers used questioning techniques that required thoughtful responses that demonstrated understanding (#12) in 54 percent of elementary lessons, in 45 percent of middle school lessons, and in 60 percent of high school lessons.

Examples of questioning techniques that required thoughtful responses included: a grade 1 ELA class where students were asked “why” to justify their responses to opinion questions about an object brought in for a show-and-tell exercise and then were asked “What words can you use to describe it?”

In an example of less effective practice: in a middle school science lesson, the teacher’s questions on student projects focused more on the project components and procedures rather than on its content knowledge.

1. Students clearly and consistently articulated their thinking orally or in writing (#18) in 50 percent of elementary lessons, in 73 percent of middle school lessons, and in 47 percent of high school lessons.

1. There were infrequent requests for students to explain their thinking orally or in writing, such as the use of exit tickets or reflections. Teachers rarely challenged students’ responses by asking “How do you know?” or “Why” or “Why not.”

1. Students elaborated about content and ideas when responding to questions (#20) in 27 percent of elementary lessons, in 64 percent of middle school lessons, and in 27 percent of high school lessons.

Observers noted that frequently, follow-up questions were not posed to students. For example, in an elementary math lesson, students were required to give the correct, rote answers to problems but not asked to elaborate, to apply, or to explain them. In a middle school math lesson, students solved problems on the board and the teacher asked how many in the class got the problem “right” and then moved on to the next problem.

In an example of an effective lesson, students in a high school English lesson eagerly asked to be recognized and then passionately gave detailed analyses of characters in a play. They voluntarily interpreted the subtle use of language in the text, without prompting by the teacher, and applied the example in the drama to contemporary relationships and society.

**F.** In observed lessons at the middle school, there was inconsistent use of technology to expand content, to engage students, and to deepen students’ knowledge and understanding. Except for the middle school most teachers did not make use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning. Teachers made use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning (# 16) in 12 percent of elementary lessons (where there was little technology available), in 98 percent of middle school lessons, and in 40 percent of high school lessons.

**Impact**: Without consistent implementation of best teaching practices, the district cannot guarantee that all students have equal opportunities to reach high levels of achievement.

Assessment

**15. The middle/high school has not prioritized the development of a comprehensive, coordinated set of structures and processes to collect, analyze, and disseminate student assessment data to inform policy, budget, and decision-making or to identify needed improvements to instruction, assessment, or the program of studies.**

**A.** Although core strategic goals, objectives, and action steps detailed in both the district and elementary school improvement plans emphasize the need to expand the use of student data as key to improving learning, teaching, and decision making, the current middle/high school improvement plan is virtually silent on the subject of using assessment data as an essential tool for school improvement.

**B.** The middle/high school does not have a data team to develop and coordinate an integrated system to continuously compile, analyze, and communicate student assessment results and other pertinent and timely data across all grades and content areas.

**C.** The middle/high school administers common mid-term and final examinations in all content areas, as well as some 21st Century Learning based benchmark assessments, including those in English (writing) and Foreign Language (speaking).

1. Interviewees acknowledged that in the case of mid-term and final examinations there are no clear or uniform expectations, processes, or structures in place to guide the collection or support the analyses and applications of achievement data.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that the school has not started to collect specific academic data, using the 21st Century Learning Expectations rubrics, to assess student achievement.

**D.** Secondary teachers and department heads indicated that they had received little professional development in data analysis practices and procedures and expressed the view that they did not possess the data literacy skills and technical competencies required to collect and use assessment data to inform and guide their work. One department head described data use at the school as “anecdotal, rather than metric.”

**Impact**: The absence of a comprehensive, unified, and reliable system to collect, examine, and communicate multiple sources of student performance data compromises middle/high school leaders’ ability to make well-informed judgments, timely revisions, and needed improvements to academic programs, classroom instruction, professional development programs, assessment practices, and student support services. Without such a system, school leaders are challenged to make sound, data-based decisions about strategic goals, policies, and budget development, to effectively allocate resources, or to initiate, modify, or discontinue programs and services.

Human Resources and Professional Development

**16. The district’s professional development program operates independently of its educator evaluation system.**

**A.** The 31 randomly selected teachers’ evaluations reviewed by the team were generally informative[[3]](#footnote-3), but only 20 percent contained recommendations or suggestions for improved performance.

**B.** All administrators’ evaluations had SMART goals and were both informative and instructive, but did not contain any recommendations for targeted professional development or sources of support. There were no indications of how administrative practice could be enhanced to ensure “exemplary practice” that supports meaningful improvements in both teacher and student performance.

**C.** Although the professional development system is broad and well supported, it operates relatively independently of the educator evaluation system. (See the second Human Resources and Professional Development Strength finding above.)

1. Currently, there is no formal connection between the district’s educator evaluation process and its professional development plan.

2. The team did not find evidence of a system for monitoring teachers’ practice to determine the effectiveness of its professional development. Only Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDPs) are recorded and held as official records of planned and completed professional development.

**Impact:** Without providing all educators with targeted instructive feedback, the district has compromised the overall impact of its educator evaluation system. Also, the absence of tracking, in evaluations, of professional development activities and their impact on teaching and learning weakens the district’s improvement efforts and its understanding of its investment in professional development.Finally, until the district’s educator evaluation system is tightly aligned with its professional development system, it cannot effectively serve as a primary vehicle to improve teaching and learning.

Student Support

**17. In observed general education classrooms, differentiation and accommodation for students with disabilities and English language learners were of low incidence. The district provides differentiation through interventions at the elementary level and different academic levels at the high school.**

**A.** In observed classrooms, review team members noted clear and consistent evidence of teachers using appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities in only 12 percent of elementary classes, in 0 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 36 percent of high school classrooms. (See characteristic #10 in the Instructional Inventory, Appendix C).

1. The review team observed that many classes were characterized by teacher-centered lessons. Pair and group work were rare. The basic presentation model could not easily accommodate students’ learning differences.

2. According to district data, over 60 percent of the district’s students with disabilities receive all of their instruction in full inclusion. According to the latest available ESE data, in 2012–2013 65.2 percent of the district’s enrolled students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) received instruction in full inclusion (in the general education classroom for 80 percent or more of the day).

* 1. Through middle school, one ELA and one math class per grade are co-taught by a general education and special education teacher. A paraprofessional visits other classes.
  2. At the secondary school, there is one paraprofessional to assist at both the middle and the high school levels.
  3. Staff and leaders noted that the district has offered some professional development on differentiated instruction, but said that other priorities such as the new educator evaluation system and NEASC reaccreditation responses have taken significant professional development time.

1. The 2012 NEASC Report noted the absence of personalized instruction and recommended that the district offer training in this area.

**C.** Staff members expressed the view that the district provides differentiation through the intervention model at the elementary school and through the different academic levels offered at the secondary level.

1. With the many singleton offerings at the high school, the district has many high school courses that offer both college prep and honors credit to students sitting in the same classroom. In some cases, staff acknowledged that the difference in levels may be determined primarily by the tests given rather than by the activities students are required to do in and out of class.

**D.** District leadership acknowledged that the core presentation in literacy classes at the elementary school are, by design, more teacher-directed and are followed by intervention groups, also observed to be teacher-centered. The math classes are structured using a workshop model.

**E.** At the elementary school, the small group instruction that follows the core presentation in ELA and math classes is referred to as tiered intervention or route to intervention (RTI). Although student assignment is based on assessment, the RTI process as described to the review team is atypical in several ways.

Interviews and a document review indicated that all elementary students receive intervention services. This means that students who are at benchmark or above also receive intervention services.

District leaders called this a walk-to-read model to support differentiation.

Twelve classrooms and sixteen instruction spaces are used during small-group instruction. Grade-level classrooms are used as well as 10 spaces for literacy interventions and 6 for math.

Classroom teachers, Title I paraprofessionals, four reading specialists, and a special educator provide small-group instruction for literacy.

Progress monitoring does not release students from intervention but may change the nature of the small-group intervention that the student receives.

Students are assigned to literacy groups based on the DIBELS-Next assessment that is given in the fall for placement, in winter, and as a summative assessment in the spring. Curriculum-based assessments in math and literacy are also given with the same frequency. Other data such as benchmark assessments are also used for placement. DIBELS-Next may be administered more frequently to struggling students.

Interviewees said that teachers were uncomfortable when the literacy assignments for intervention are primarily based “on one data point,” the DIBELS-Next. In addition, teachers said that the scheduling and narrow enrollment numbers of small groups do not always adapt to the needs of students who need to move from one group to another. Groups change every 8 to 10 weeks.

For math, the elementary school administers CBM MAZE, unit assessments, and those provided by *Everyday Math*. Small-group math instruction is part of the workshop model used with *Everyday Math*. A coaching coordinator who supervises four math paraprofessionals puts all students into intervention groups based on data analysis.

**F.** In addition to small group classes, a third level of intervention is available to students during or after the school day. These services may last 10 to 45 minutes and are provided by a Title I paraprofessional, or special education teacher, or, in the case of literacy, a reading specialist.

**G.** Although more technology is available at the middle/high school than at the elementary school to track and view progress across a number of indicators, it is not used at a highly skilled level to record, analyze and display assessment data.

**H.** The district has limited common planning time.

1. District leaders and teachers said, and a document review confirmed, that there is some common preparation time at every school level. Teachers at the elementary school and other staff said that the use of prep time for common planning varies by grade level and does not take place regularly within the school for all grade levels.

a. The Professional Learning Community (PLC) time that takes place monthly at the elementary level for one hour after school is used exclusively for examination of data.

b. At the secondary level, the common planning time offered by the Crusader Period is focused on curriculum development and alignment and the creation of common assessments.

2. Interviews and a document review indicated that general and special educators do not have designated time in which to discuss accommodations for students.

**I.** The schoolwide intervention schedule at the elementary school limits the classroom teacher’s time with his/her specific classroom of students. Teachers may have most of their contact with their home group in core presentations of literacy and math lessons. Those students are often sent to intervention classes with other staff. The grade-level teachers reported feeling unable to adequately describe to parents their child’s performance and challenges because of the limited time they spend with many of the students in their home group.

**Impact**: When teachers do not have adequate time to discuss instructional strategies for students’ learning needs and when differentiation and accommodations find a home in the second tier of intervention rather than in the general classroom, many students who receive instruction in full inclusion are not ensured access to the full educational program.

Carver Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Curriculum and Instruction

**1. The district is encouraged to identify a district instructional model, communicate it to the full educational community, and support educators in its implementation.**

**A.** Curricular and Instructional leaders and teachers should collaborate to identify common best instructional practices that will constitute the expectations for good teaching in Carver. These components of practice should be incorporated into all teachers’ teaching repertoires and used when relevant and needed.

1. The director of curriculum and instruction, literacy director, principals, coaches, grade-level lead teachers and department heads along with a representative group of teachers should define the district’s expectations for good teaching. These expectations could build upon practices that are already in place.

2. Key instructional practices should be the district’s non-negotiable teaching components.

3. The district’s instructional expectations should include the effective use of differentiation and accommodation strategies to create classrooms where all students have equal access to high-quality instruction. (See Student Support Challenge finding.)

4. ESE offers several potential resources to support this, including the Educator Evaluation Classroom Teacher Rubric: Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice, and the instructional inventory observation tool in Appendix C.

**B.** Once a model of instructional practice is identified, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.

Equitable opportunities should be provided for teachers to share best practices reflective of the instructional model.

**C.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.

1. Professional development should focus on elements of the instructional model.

2. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district’s expectations for instruction.

3. Teachers should receive frequent feedback that helps them to continually improve their instruction (see the Human Resources and Professional Development recommendation below).

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

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
* *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 full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units. The series 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.
* ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.
  + Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.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.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation and the MA Curriculum Frameworks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/EdEvalandCF.pdf>) provides an overview of how the Educator Evaluation System supports implementation of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, including ways to embed the Frameworks within the 5-Step Cycle for Educator Evaluation and to incorporate them into evidence collection.
* The March 2014 *ESE Educator Evaluation e-Newsletter* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/communications/newsletter/2014-03.pdf>) includes a section called Implementation Spotlight: Strategies for Focusing Observations and Providing Consistent, Constructive Feedback.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation include clear and articulated expectations for educators of what constitutes high-quality instruction. This will provide a common language that can facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that prioritizes excellent instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth and increased achievement.

Assessment

**2. The district should prioritize the development of a unified, comprehensive, and coordinated assessment system.**

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

1. Building on the practices in place at the elementary school, the middle/high school is encouraged to create a data team to oversee the development and implementation of a comprehensive and integrated assessment system. This team should be a representative group of administrators, department heads, and teachers.
2. Ongoing, embedded professional development in the collection, analysis, and use of student performance data should be provided for staff at each grade level and subject area.

a. District leaders and teachers should review how PLCs and grade-level meetings are used; these could provide opportunities for more frequent data analysis to improve response time to student performance data.

**B.** School and district leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data (e.g., PBIS) into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision-making, including budget development, district and school improvement plans, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

**C.** District leaders should analyze student performance data from multiple sources over time to better target student support and to plan improvements in programs and service delivery.

1. The current tiered system of support should be closely reviewed and modified so that the goal of teachers as Tier 1 providers and specialists as Tier 2 providers is more clearly defined and integrated. (See Student Support challenge finding.)

**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.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/lg.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.
* The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.
* *District-Determined Measures* <http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquEalxpfpzD6qG9zxvPWl0c>) is a series of videos featuring different aspects of the development and use of District-Determined Measures (DDMs).
* 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.
* The *Early Warning Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/2014ImplementationGuide.pdf>) provides information on how to use early warning data, including the Massachusetts Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), to identify, diagnose, support and monitor students in grades 1-12. It offers educators an overview of EWIS and how to effectively use these data in conjunction with local data by following a six-step implementation cycle.
* The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.
  + The MTSS Self-Assessment Overview can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/mtss/sa/default.html> (this link includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*).

**Benefits** **from implementing this recommendation** will include improved classroom instruction and student support services, enhanced curriculum, and accurately informed educational policy, programs, and decision-making. Ultimately, by promoting a culture of inquiry and systematic data use, the district will provide every student with significantly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

Human Resources and Professional Development

**3. The district should align professional development with its educator evaluation system.**

**A.** Professional development (PD) should be aligned with the district’s educator evaluation system. The PD program should be informed by evaluators’ specific recommendations for PD that is linked to educators’ growth and development.

**B.** The district should develop a system for following up on participation in PD to determine its impact on the effectiveness of educators’ practice.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
* *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncg&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqt9EmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.
* ESE’s *Professional Development Self- Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/dsac/pd/PDProviderGuide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings’ alignment with the Massachusetts High-Quality Professional Development Standards, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.

**Benefit**: Ongoing, targeted professional development that is aligned with the educator evaluation system will likely help to improve the professional skills and the overall effectiveness of teachers and administrators and will further strengthen the district’s collaborative culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 28–May 1, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Owen Conway, Ph. D., leadership and governance and financial and asset management
2. Linda L. Greyser, Ed.D., curriculum and instruction and *review team coordinator*
3. Frank Sambuceti, Ed.D., assessment
4. Tom Johnson, Ed. D., human resources and professional development
5. Katherine Lopez Natale, Ph. D., student support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: assistant superintendent for business and finance and administrative assistants for accounts payable and payroll.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chairman, vice-chairman, and three members of the committee.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: president, vice-president, elementary school building representative, and middle/high school building representative.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent; assistant superintendent for business and finance; director of curriculum, instruction and technology; director of special education, and K–12 director of literacy.

The team visited the following schools: Carver Elementary School (PK–5), Carver Middle/High School (grades 6–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with two principals and focus groups with 17 elementary school teachers and 5 middle/high school teachers.

The team observed 52 classes in the district: 15 at the high school, 11 at the middle school, and 26 at the elementary school.

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**  4/28/2015 | **Tuesday**  4/29/2015 | **Wednesday**  4/30/2015 | **Thursday**  5/1/2015 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; and interview with teachers’ association. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; interview with town officials, teacher focus groups; high school student focus group, parent focus group. | Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to the elementary school and the middle/high school for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to the elementary and middle/high school for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Carver Public Schools**

**2014–2015 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 20 | 1.2% | 83,556 | 8.7% |
| Asian | 2 | 0.1% | 60,050 | 6.3% |
| Hispanic | 17 | 1.0% | 171,036 | 17.9% |
| Native American | 1 | 0.1% | 2,238 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,588 | 96.8% | 608,453 | 63.7% |
| Native Hawaiian | 3 | 0.2% | 930 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 10 | 0.6% | 29,581 | 3.1% |
| **All Students** | 1,641 | 100.0% | 955,844 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2014 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Carver Public Schools**

**2014–2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations[[4]](#footnote-4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Groups** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 310 | -- | 18.7% | 165,060 | -- | 17.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 3 | -- | 0.2% | 81,146 | -- | 8.5% |
| All high needs students | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2014. 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 1660; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391. | | | | | | |

**Table B2a: Carver Public Schools**

**English Language Arts Performance, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 3 | CPI | 136 | 83.6 | 84.9 | 86 | 84.2 | 82.6 | 0.6 | -1.8 |
| P+ | 136 | 57.0% | 63.0% | 57.0% | 53.0% | 57.0% | -4.0% | -4.0% |
| 4 | CPI | 119 | 80.2 | 78.2 | 71.2 | 74.4 | 79.1 | -5.8 | 3.2 |
| P+ | 119 | 45.0% | 54.0% | 37.0% | 35.0% | 54.0% | -10.0% | -2.0% |
| SGP | 113 | 32 | 46 | 34 | 37 | 49 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | CPI | 161 | 83.3 | 86.6 | 80.6 | 82 | 84.5 | -1.3 | 1.4 |
| P+ | 161 | 61.0% | 69.0% | 59.0% | 61.0% | 64.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| SGP | 153 | 41 | 49 | 43 | 46 | 50 | 5 | 3 |
| 6 | CPI | 130 | 85.6 | 81.5 | 88.7 | 85.4 | 85.8 | -0.2 | -3.3 |
| P+ | 130 | 66.0% | 59.0% | 70.0% | 67.0% | 68.0% | 1.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 125 | 37 | 45 | 46 | 54 | 50 | 17 | 8 |
| 7 | CPI | 128 | 91.8 | 88.1 | 87.5 | 90 | 88.3 | -1.8 | 2.5 |
| P+ | 128 | 75.0% | 71.0% | 69.0% | 72.0% | 72.0% | -3.0% | 3.0% |
| SGP | 126 | 46 | 55 | 56 | 39 | 50 | -7 | -17 |
| 8 | CPI | 151 | 88.9 | 93.2 | 90.7 | 90.4 | 90.2 | 1.5 | -0.3 |
| P+ | 151 | 73.0% | 80.0% | 81.0% | 81.0% | 79.0% | 8.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 147 | 42.5 | 39 | 50 | 58 | 50 | 15.5 | 8 |
| 10 | CPI | 110 | 95.6 | 98.5 | 97.7 | 97.5 | 96 | 1.9 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 110 | 85.0% | 96.0% | 94.0% | 91.0% | 90.0% | 6.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 98 | 61 | 66.5 | 69 | 67.5 | 50 | 6.5 | -1.5 |
| All | CPI | 935 | 87 | 87 | 85.5 | 86.1 | 86.7 | -0.9 | 0.6 |
| P+ | 935 | 66.0% | 69.0% | 65.0% | 66.0% | 69.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 762 | 42 | 50 | 47 | 49 | 50 | 7 | 2 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP 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: Carver Public Schools**

**Mathematics Performance, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 3 | CPI | 136 | 85.4 | 77.4 | 85 | 85.8 | 85.1 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| P+ | 136 | 66.0% | 55.0% | 58.0% | 69.0% | 68.0% | 3.0% | 11.0% |
| 4 | CPI | 119 | 79.4 | 77.6 | 73.9 | 80.7 | 79.6 | 1.3 | 6.8 |
| P+ | 119 | 45.0% | 46.0% | 39.0% | 44.0% | 52.0% | -1.0% | 5.0% |
| SGP | 113 | 45 | 43 | 41.5 | 49 | 50 | 4 | 7.5 |
| 5 | CPI | 161 | 75 | 84.8 | 81.4 | 74.8 | 80.4 | -0.2 | -6.6 |
| P+ | 161 | 51.0% | 69.0% | 60.0% | 56.0% | 61.0% | 5.0% | -4.0% |
| SGP | 154 | 54 | 64 | 52 | 41 | 50 | -13 | -11 |
| 6 | CPI | 130 | 79.7 | 76.6 | 82.4 | 78.7 | 80.2 | -1 | -3.7 |
| P+ | 130 | 59.0% | 53.0% | 62.0% | 55.0% | 60.0% | -4.0% | -7.0% |
| SGP | 125 | 54 | 48 | 35 | 45 | 50 | -9 | 10 |
| 7 | CPI | 128 | 79.6 | 77.4 | 76.8 | 77.3 | 72.5 | -2.3 | 0.5 |
| P+ | 128 | 54.0% | 55.0% | 51.0% | 53.0% | 50.0% | -1.0% | 2.0% |
| SGP | 126 | 70 | 71 | 60 | 60 | 50 | -10 | 0 |
| 8 | CPI | 154 | 68.9 | 80.7 | 74.3 | 72.2 | 74.7 | 3.3 | -2.1 |
| P+ | 154 | 39.0% | 56.0% | 46.0% | 43.0% | 52.0% | 4.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 149 | 47.5 | 55 | 35 | 46 | 50 | -1.5 | 11 |
| 10 | CPI | 110 | 91 | 94.8 | 95 | 93.6 | 90 | 2.6 | -1.4 |
| P+ | 110 | 78.0% | 87.0% | 89.0% | 81.0% | 79.0% | 3.0% | -8.0% |
| SGP | 97 | 31 | 52.5 | 57.5 | 50 | 50 | 19 | -7.5 |
| All | CPI | 938 | 79.7 | 80.8 | 80.4 | 79.8 | 80.3 | 0.1 | -0.6 |
| P+ | 938 | 56.0% | 59.0% | 56.0% | 57.0% | 60.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 764 | 50 | 55 | 46 | 47 | 50 | -3 | 1 |
| 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: Carver Public Schools**

**Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 5 | CPI | 161 | 74.7 | 85.4 | 78.6 | 76.2 | 79 | 1.5 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 161 | 43.0% | 60.0% | 49.0% | 45.0% | 53.0% | 2.0% | -4.0% |
| 8 | CPI | 152 | 65.9 | 72.3 | 66.8 | 66.9 | 72.4 | 1 | 0.1 |
| P+ | 152 | 28.0% | 39.0% | 28.0% | 31.0% | 42.0% | 3.0% | 3.0% |
| 10 | CPI | 101 | 83.9 | 90.4 | 90.9 | 84.4 | 87.9 | 0.5 | -6.5 |
| P+ | 101 | 57.0% | 72.0% | 71.0% | 60.0% | 71.0% | 3.0% | -11.0% |
| All | CPI | 414 | 74.6 | 82 | 77.2 | 74.8 | 79.6 | 0.2 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 414 | 42.0% | 56.0% | 46.0% | 43.0% | 55.0% | 1.0% | -3.0% |
| Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B3a: Carver Public Schools**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 346 | 73.9 | 73.1 | 73.4 | 74.4 | 0.5 | 1 |
| P+ | 346 | 42.0% | 42.0% | 44.0% | 41.0% | -1.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 271 | 39.5 | 46 | 39.5 | 44 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| State | CPI | 241,069 | 77 | 76.5 | 76.8 | 77.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 241,069 | 48.0% | 48.0% | 48.0% | 50.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| SGP | 183,766 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 47 | 1 | 0 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 219 | 78 | 77.8 | 77.9 | 80.3 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| P+ | 219 | 52.0% | 53.0% | 53.0% | 50.0% | -2.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 171 | 40 | 44 | 38.5 | 46 | 6 | 7.5 |
| State | CPI | 189,662 | 77.1 | 76.7 | 77.2 | 77.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 189,662 | 49.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 51.0% | 2.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 145,621 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 47 | 1 | 0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 197 | 63.8 | 60.5 | 61.8 | 64.7 | 0.9 | 2.9 |
| P+ | 197 | 23.0% | 20.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 1.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 153 | 37 | 46 | 39 | 45 | 8 | 6 |
| State | CPI | 90,777 | 68.3 | 67.3 | 66.8 | 66.6 | -1.7 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 90,777 | 30.0% | 31.0% | 30.0% | 31.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 66,688 | 42 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 1 | 0 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 47,477 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 67.4 | 67.8 | 1.6 | 0.4 |
| P+ | 47,477 | 33.0% | 34.0% | 35.0% | 36.0% | 3.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 32,239 | 50 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 4 | 1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 935 | 87 | 87 | 85.5 | 86.1 | -0.9 | 0.6 |
| P+ | 935 | 66.0% | 69.0% | 65.0% | 66.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 762 | 42 | 50 | 47 | 49 | 7 | 2 |
| State | CPI | 488,744 | 87.2 | 86.7 | 86.8 | 86.7 | -0.5 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 488,744 | 69.0% | 69.0% | 69.0% | 69.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 390,904 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 0 | -1 |
| 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: Carver Public Schools**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 347 | 62.1 | 62.2 | 65.7 | 64.4 | 2.3 | -1.3 |
| P+ | 347 | 29.0% | 30.0% | 33.0% | 31.0% | 2.0% | -2.0% |
| SGP | 272 | 47 | 55.5 | 45 | 43 | -4 | -2 |
| State | CPI | 241,896 | 67.1 | 67 | 68.6 | 68.4 | 1.3 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 241,896 | 37.0% | 37.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 184,937 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 1 | 1 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 220 | 66.5 | 68.2 | 70.2 | 69.1 | 2.6 | -1.1 |
| P+ | 220 | 37.0% | 39.0% | 39.0% | 40.0% | 3.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 172 | 44.5 | 53.5 | 44.5 | 47 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| State | CPI | 190,183 | 67.3 | 67.3 | 69 | 68.8 | 1.5 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 190,183 | 38.0% | 38.0% | 41.0% | 41.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 146,536 | 46 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 1 | 1 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 197 | 49.6 | 47.6 | 53.5 | 50.3 | 0.7 | -3.2 |
| P+ | 197 | 11.0% | 12.0% | 18.0% | 12.0% | 1.0% | -6.0% |
| SGP | 154 | 51 | 56.5 | 46 | 38 | -13 | -8 |
| State | CPI | 91,181 | 57.7 | 56.9 | 57.4 | 57.1 | -0.6 | -0.3 |
| P+ | 91,181 | 22.0% | 21.0% | 22.0% | 22.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 67,155 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 43 | 0 | 1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 47,847 | 62 | 61.6 | 63.9 | 63.8 | 1.8 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 47,847 | 32.0% | 32.0% | 35.0% | 36.0% | 4.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 32,607 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 52 | 0 | -1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 938 | 79.7 | 80.8 | 80.4 | 79.8 | 0.1 | -0.6 |
| P+ | 938 | 56.0% | 59.0% | 56.0% | 57.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 764 | 50 | 55 | 46 | 47 | -3 | 1 |
| State | CPI | 490,288 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 80.8 | 80.3 | 0.4 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 490,288 | 58.0% | 59.0% | 61.0% | 60.0% | 2.0% | -1.0% |
| SGP | 392,953 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 0 | -1 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B3c: Carver Public Schools**

**Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 141 | 58.1 | 66.4 | 66.4 | 59.9 | 1.8 | -6.5 |
| P+ | 141 | 15.0% | 26.0% | 24.0% | 19.0% | 4.0% | -5.0% |
| State | CPI | 100,582 | 63.8 | 65 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 3.5 | 0.9 |
| P+ | 100,582 | 28.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 33.0% | 5.0% | 2.0% |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 83 | 61 | 71.8 | 70.4 | 66.3 | 5.3 | -4.1 |
| P+ | 83 | 20.0% | 34.0% | 31.0% | 27.0% | 7.0% | -4.0% |
| State | CPI | 79,199 | 62.8 | 64.5 | 66.1 | 66.8 | 4 | 0.7 |
| P+ | 79,199 | 28.0% | 31.0% | 32.0% | 33.0% | 5.0% | 1.0% |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 88 | 49.7 | 55.2 | 57.6 | 50.3 | 0.6 | -7.3 |
| P+ | 88 | 6.0% | 9.0% | 13.0% | 7.0% | 1.0% | -6.0% |
| State | CPI | 38,628 | 59.2 | 58.7 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 38,628 | 20.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 22.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 0 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 16,871 | 50.3 | 51.4 | 54 | 54 | 3.7 | 0 |
| P+ | 16,871 | 15.0% | 17.0% | 19.0% | 18.0% | 3.0% | -1.0% |
| All students | District | CPI | 414 | 74.6 | 82 | 77.2 | 74.8 | 0.2 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 414 | 42.0% | 56.0% | 46.0% | 43.0% | 1.0% | -3.0% |
| State | CPI | 211,440 | 77.6 | 78.6 | 79 | 79.6 | 2 | 0.6 |
| P+ | 211,440 | 52.0% | 54.0% | 53.0% | 55.0% | 3.0% | 2.0% |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: Carver Public Schools**

**Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2011-2014** | | **Change 2013-2014** | | **State (2014)** |
|  | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| All students | 2.4% | 1.8% | 3.2% | 1.1% | -1.3 | -52.4% | -2.1 | -65.6% | 2.0 |
| Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5a: Carver Public Schools**

**Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2014)** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2011-2014** | | **Change 2013-2014** | | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 37 | 76.2% | 68.0% | 70.8% | 83.8% | 7.6 | 10.0% | 13.0 | 18.4% | 76.5% |
| Econ.  Disad. | 28 | 74.2% | 64.1% | 70.2% | 85.7% | 11.5 | 15.5% | 15.5 | 22.1% | 75.5% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 17 | 60.0% | 52.2% | 68.8% | 76.5% | 16.5 | 27.5% | 7.7 | 11.2% | 69.1% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63.9% |
| All students | 119 | 86.2% | 83.2% | 83.9% | 95.0% | 8.8 | 10.2% | 11.1 | 13.2% | 86.1% |
| Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5b: Carver Public Schools**

**Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010–2013**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** |  | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2010-2013** | | **Change 2012-2013** | | **State (2013)** |
| **Number Included (2013)** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 65 | 66.7% | 76.2% | 68.0% | 70.8% | 4.1 | 6.1% | 2.8 | 4.1% | 79.2% |
| Econ.  Disad. | 47 | 66.7% | 74.2% | 64.1% | 70.2% | 3.5 | 5.2% | 6.1 | 9.5% | 78.3% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 32 | 55.2% | 60.0% | 52.2% | 68.8% | 13.6 | 24.6% | 16.6 | 31.8% | 72.9% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70.9% |
| All students | 149 | 85.8% | 86.2% | 84.0% | 83.9% | -1.9 | -2.2% | -0.1 | -0.1% | 87.7% |
| Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B6: Carver Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2011-2014** | | **Change 2013-2014** | | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| All students | 95.7% | 95.9% | 95.9% | 95.8% | 0.1 | 0.1% | -0.1 | -0.1% | 94.9% |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B7: Carver Public Schools**

**Suspension Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2011-2014** | | **Change 2013-2014** | | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| In-School Suspension Rate | 6.7% | 6.0% | 1.8% | 3.7% | -3.0 | -44.8% | 1.9 | 105.6% | 2.1% |
| Out-of-School Suspension Rate | 6.0% | 6.3% | 2.3% | 3.4% | -2.6 | -43.3% | 1.1 | 47.8% | 3.9% |
| Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B8: Carver 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 | $20,922,339 | $20,935,759 | $21,324,392 | $21,324,263 | $21,368,292 | | $21,656,946 |
| By municipality | $890,593 | $1,050,342 | $897,679 | $981,425 | $1,185,281 | | $993,448 |
| Total from local appropriations | $21,812,932 | $21,986,101 | $22,222,071 | $22,305,688 | $22,553,573 | | $22,650,394 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $2,269,139 | -- | $2,325,229 | -- | | $2,180,987 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $24,255,240 | -- | $24,630,917 | -- | | $24,831,381 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | |  |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $9,573,059 | -- | $9,644,539 | -- | | $9,688,439 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $8,021,055 | -- | $8,171,863 | -- | | $8,403,720 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $17,594,114 | -- | $17,816,402 | -- | | $18,092,159 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $20,206,796 | -- | $20,487,836 | -- | | $20,347,554 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $2,612,682 | -- | $2,671,434 | -- | | $2,555,395 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 14.8 | -- | 15.0 | -- | | 12.5 |
| \*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, FY123. FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved April 22, 2015 | | | | | | | |

**Table B9: Carver Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** |
| Administration | $341 | $358 | $488 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $705 | $740 | $769 |
| Teachers | $4,746 | $4,807 | $4,665 |
| Other teaching services | $712 | $748 | $882 |
| Professional development | $185 | $134 | $205 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $226 | $267 | $279 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $415 | $428 | $460 |
| Pupil services | $964 | $988 | $1,038 |
| Operations and maintenance | $959 | $912 | $931 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,073 | $2,262 | $2,405 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $11,325 | $11,644 | $12,122 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/) | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Environment & Teaching** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| **MS** | 0% | 9% | 91% |
| **HS** | 0% | 13% | 87% |
| **Total #** | 0 | 3 | 49 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 6% | 94% |
| 2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably. | **ES** | 29% | 8% | 65% |
| **MS** | 9% | 9% | 82% |
| **HS** | 20% | 13% | 67% |
| **Total #** | 11 | 5 | 36 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 10% | 69% |
| 3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities. | **ES** | 4% | 8% | 88% |
| **MS** | 9% | 27% | 64% |
| **HS** | 0% | 27% | 73% |
| **Total #** | 7 | 9 | 41 |
| **Total %** | 4% | 17% | 79% |
| 4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time. | **ES** | 4% | 4% | 92% |
| **MS** | 0% | 18% | 82% |
| **HS** | 27% | 0% | 73% |
| **Total #** | 5 | 3 | 44 |
| **Total %** | 10% | 6% | 85% |
| 5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students’ diverse learning needs. | **ES** | 19% | 19% | 62% |
| **MS** | 0% | 45% | 55% |
| **HS** | 13% | 53% | 33% |
| **Total #** | 7 | 18 | 27 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 35% | 52% |
| 6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content. | **ES** | 0% | 8% | 92% |
| **MS** | 0% | 9% | 91% |
| **HS** | 0% | 13% | 87% |
| **Total #** | 0 | 5 | 47 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 10% | 90% |
| 7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations. | **ES** | 23% | 46% | 31% |
| **MS** | 0% | 27% | 73% |
| **HS** | 20% | 20% | 60% |
| **Total #** | 9 | 18 | 25 |
| **Total %** | 17% | 35% | 48% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*. | **ES** | 54% | 19% | 27% |
| **MS** | 36% | 36% | 27% |
| **HS** | 53% | 13% | 33% |
| **Total #** | 26 | 11 | 15 |
| **Total %** | 50% | 21% | 29% |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content. | **ES** | 23% | 27% | 50% |
| **MS** | 9% | 27% | 54% |
| **HS** | 33% | 33% | 33% |
| **Total #** | 12 | 15 | 25 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 29% | 48% |
| 10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products. | **ES** | 54% | 35% | 12% |
| **MS** | 36% | 27% | 36% |
| **HS** | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| **Total #** | 28 | 17 | 7 |
| **Total %** | 54% | 33% | 13% |
| 11. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy). | **ES** | 35% | 35% | 31% |
| **MS** | 9% | 36% | 55% |
| **HS** | 27% | 27% | 47% |
| **Total #** | 14 | 17 | 21 |
| **Total %** | 27% | 33% | 40% |
| 12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding. | **ES** | 8% | 38% | 54% |
| **MS** | 27% | 27% | 45% |
| **HS** | 27% | 13% | 60% |
| **Total #** | 9 | 15 | 28 |
| **Total %** | 17% | 29% | 54% |
| 13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas. | **ES** | 8% | 15% | 77% |
| **MS** | 9% | 9% | 82% |
| **HS** | 20% | 7% | 73% |
| **Total #** | 6 | 6 | 40 |
| **Total %** | 12% | 12% | 77% |
| 14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students’ learning needs. | **ES** | 0% | 35% | 65% |
| **MS** | 0% | 27% | 73% |
| **HS** | 20% | 13% | 67% |
| **Total #** | 3 | 14 | 35 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 27% | 67% |
| 15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction. | **ES** | 15% | 19% | 65% |
| **MS** | 18% | 9% | 73% |
| **HS** | 33% | 20% | 47% |
| **Total #** | 11 | 9 | 32 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 17% | 62% |
| 16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning. | **ES** | 77% | 12% | 12% |
| **MS** | 1% | 1% | 98% |
| **HS** | 47% | 13% | 40% |
| **Total #** | 28 | 6 | 18 |
| **Total %** | 54% | 12% | 35% |
| **Learning** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks. | **ES** | 12% | 54% | 35% |
| **MS** | 0% | 9% | 91% |
| **HS** | 20% | 27% | 53% |
| **Total #** | 6 | 19 | 27 |
| **Total %** | 12% | 37% | 52% |
| 18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing. | **ES** | 27% | 23% | 50% |
| **MS** | 18% | 9% | 73% |
| **HS** | 33% | 20% | 47% |
| **Total #** | 14 | 10 | 28 |
| **Total %** | 27% | 19% | 54% |
| 19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy). | **ES** | 58% | 12% | 31% |
| **MS** | 9% | 0% | 91% |
| **HS** | 33% | 20% | 47% |
| **Total #** | 21 | 6 | 25 |
| **Total %** | 40% | 12% | 48% |
| 20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions. | **ES** | 58% | 15% | 27% |
| **MS** | 27% | 9% | 64% |
| **HS** | 47% | 27% | 27% |
| **Total #** | 25 | 9 | 18 |
| **Total %** | 48% | 17% | 35% |
| 21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects. | **ES** | 35% | 31% | 35% |
| **MS** | 0% | 18% | 82% |
| **HS** | 20% | 27% | 53% |
| **Total #** | 12 | 14 | 26 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 27% | 50% |
| 22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding. | **ES** | 88% | 8% | 4% |
| **MS** | 55% | 0% | 45% |
| **HS** | 80% | 0% | 20% |
| **Total #** | 41 | 2 | 9 |
| **Total %** | 79% | 4% | 17% |
| 23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | **ES** | 23% | 19% | 58% |
| **MS** | 9% | 18% | 73% |
| **HS** | 20% | 27% | 53% |
| **Total #** | 10 | 11 | 31 |
| **Total %** | 19% | 21% | 60% |
| 24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars. | **ES** | 54% | 27% | 19% |
| **MS** | 36% | 27% | 36% |
| **HS** | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| **Total #** | 27 | 13 | 12 |
| **Total %** | 52% | 25% | 23% |

1. 2014 graduation targets are 80 percent for the four year and 85 percent for the five year cohort graduation rates and refer to the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rates. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ECRI is the Enhanced Core Reading Instruction model from the University of Oregon using DIBELS-Next as formative assessments three times a year to monitor progress. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. An informative evaluation is factual and cites instructional details such as methodology, pedagogy, Principles of Effective Teaching or instruction of subject-based knowledge that is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. It does not commit to improvement strategies. An instructive evaluation includes comments intended to improve instruction. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Because of changes in free-lunch policies in some districts the population of economically disadvantaged students and high-needs students has not yet been calculated for the 2014–2015 school year. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)