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Executive Summary

West Bridgewater is a small school district, with 1,320 students enrolled in 2016, in 4 schools, with 3 principals. Macdonald Elementary School is classified at Level 1, and Howard Elementary School and the West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High School are classified at Level 2.[[1]](#footnote-1) The Howard Elementary School is at the 55th percentile of elementary schools, and the junior/senior high school at the 75th percentile of middle/high schools. In 2016, the four-year cohort graduation rate was 97.3 percent, above the 2016 state rate of 87.5 percent. In 2015, the five-year cohort graduation rate was 98.0 percent, above the 2015 state rate of 89.4 percent. In addition, in 2016 the annual drop-out rate was 0.0 percent, below the 2016 state rate of 1.9 percent.

As part of the onsite, the review team observed 46 classes throughout the district: 18 at the high school, 7 at the middle school, and 21 at the 3 elementary schools. The team observed 16 ELA classes, 16 mathematics classes, and 14 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were four science and two career/technical education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

Based on the observations conducted by the review team, it is clear that much progress has been achieved in the district, but effective instructional practices have been implemented unevenly and inconsistently. Review team members found these inconsistencies most pronounced at the high school.

**Strengths**

The superintendent works closely with students, teachers, and principals, through a hands-on, collaborative approach. Teachers, administrators, and school committee members support and pursue the direction the superintendent communicates, a direction arrived at after careful data analysis.

The district has effective systems for curriculum development and implementation, for monitoring students’ progress and using data to make instructional decisions, and for supporting students academically, socially, and emotionally. The district has developed a well-defined and widely understood model of effective lesson design and delivery. Core components of that model include student engagement, technology integration, individualization, high academic expectations, and a safe and supportive learning environment. The district also uses effective supervisory practices, including regular classroom visits supported by instruction-focused dialogue and informal oral and written feedback to teachers.

**Challenges**

The district’s documents do not provide sufficient detail in many cases. For example, the District Improvement and Strategic Plan 2015–2017 and School Improvement Plans include actions and strategies for improving students’ learning and the plans are aligned. Although the district has highlighted four strategic goals and associated objectives, it has not designated staff with primary responsibility for planning and implementing priorities. Also, the district has not established achievement outcomes or timelines for completion of priorities. Curriculum documents do not consistently indicate the assessments that will measure the accomplishment of the objectives or a range of instructional strategies for all learners. Finally, the district’s formal formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations of educators are not sufficiently instructive, evidence based, or growth oriented.

**Recommendations**

The district should use student achievement and other data to inform goals and strategies in its planning documents. The goals should be SMART (specific and strategic; measureable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked).

The district’s documented curriculum should include the following components: standards, objectives, resources, instructional strategies, timelines, and assessments. Particular attention should be paid to fully developing the instructional strategies and assessment components of curriculum documents.

The district should ensure that students are engaged, motivated, and take responsibility for their own learning, and that the taught curriculum develops students’ higher-order thinking and meets the needs of all learners. The district should ensure the use of appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.

The district should closely support and monitor the skills and practices of administrators to ensure that they are providing all staff with high-quality formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations that are instructive, evidence based, actionable, and capable of promoting individual growth and overall effectiveness.

Improvement of the district’s documents would focus its pursuit of improved student achievement and would provide the district with clearer guidance.

By strengthening instruction, especially differentiation, critical thinking, and the use of appropriate formative assessments, the district will be better able to promote and embed its well-developed instructional model and thereby ensure that students in all grade levels and schools receive a high-quality academic experience that provides them with the broad range of knowledge, skills, and understandings needed for success in the 21st century.

West Bridgewater Targeted District Review Overview

Purpose

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

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

This targeted review by the Office of District Reviews and Monitoring focused on the following standards: Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, and Student Support.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to West Bridgewater was conducted from January 9–11, 2017. The site visit included 17 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 38 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 10 elementary-school teachers, 10 middle-school teachers, and 11 high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 46 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

West Bridgewater has an open town meeting form of government, and the chair of the school committee is elected. The five members of the school committee meet monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2006. The district leadership team includes an assistant superintendent, three principals, and a business manager. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number in recent years, with the director of student services becoming the assistant superintendent and one new principal appointed in the 2015–2016 school year. The district has three principals leading four schools, a middle-high school assistant principal, and an English language learner coordinator. In 2015–2016 there were 90 teachers in the district.

In the 2016–2017 school year, 1,287 students were enrolled in the district’s 4 schools:

**Table 1: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2016–2017**

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Spring Street | EES | Pre-K–K | 141 |
| Macdonald | ES | 1–3 | 257 |
| Howard | ES | 4–6 | 270 |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | MSHS | 7–12 | 619 |
| **Totals** | **4 schools** | **Pre-K–12** | **1,287** |
| \*As of October 1, 2016 | | | |

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment increased by 1.9 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for 51 K–12 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2015:  $11,117 as compared with $13,140 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ese/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/)). Actual net school spending has been well above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**West Bridgewater is a Level 2 district because Howard Elementary and West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and high needs students.[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **Group** | **Annual PPI** | | | | **Cumulative PPI** | **School**  **Percentile** | **Accountability**  **Level** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Spring Street | All | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | All | 125 | 100 | -- | 50 | 75 | -- | 1 |
| High Needs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Howard | All | 100 | 60 | -- | 55 | 63 | 55 | 2 |
| High Needs | 81 | 31 | -- | 44 | 46 |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | All | 57 | 68 | -- | 57 | 60 | 75 | 2 |
| High Needs | 33 | 71 | 71 | 71 | 67 |
| District | All | 57 | 68 | -- | 61 | 62 | -- | 2 |
| High Needs | 63 | 42 | -- | 61 | 56 |

**Between 2015 and 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 1 percentage point in ELA and did not improve in math.**

* The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 4 percentage points in ELA and by 6 percentage points in math.
* The percentage of students from economically disadvantaged families meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 1 percentage point in ELA and by 11 percentage points in math.
* The percentage of ELL and former ELL students meeting or exceeding expectations did not improve in ELA and improved by 15 percentage points in math.
* The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 9 percentage points in ELA and declined by 5 percentage points in math.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (Grades 3–8) 2015–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | |
| **2015** | **2016** | **Change** | **2015** | **2016** | **Change** |
| All students | 64% | 65% | 1 | 54% | 54% | 0 |
| High Needs | 32% | 36% | 4 | 27% | 33% | 6 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 45% | 46% | 1 | 31% | 42% | 11 |
| ELL and former ELL students | 31% | 31% | 0 | 23% | 38% | 15 |
| Students with disabilities | 6% | 15% | 9 | 16% | 11% | -5 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science declined by 7 percentage points for all students, by 2 percentage points for high needs students, and by 9 percentage points for students with disabilities. In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 2 percentage points above the state rate for the district as a whole and for students with disabilities and 10 and 19 percentage points above the state rate for high needs students and students from economically disadvantaged families, respectively.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | | |
| **Group** |  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** | **Above/Below**  **State (2016)** |
| All students | District | 63% | 65% | 66% | 56% | -7 | 2 |
| State | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 |
| High Needs | District | 43% | 46% | 44% | 41% | -2 | 10 |
| State | 31% | 33% | 31% | 31% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged | District | -- | -- | 62% | 51% | -- | 19 |
| State | -- | -- | 34% | 32% | -- |
| ELL and former ELL students | District | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | 19% | 18% | 19% | 19% | 0 |
| Students with disabilities | District | 32% | 31% | 6% | 23% | -9 | 2 |
| State | 21% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 0 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **ELA** | | | **Math** | | | **Science** | | |
| **Group** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** | **2016 CPI** | **2016 Target** | **Rating** |
| All students | 91.7 | 95.7 | Improved Below Target | 83.8 | 92.5 | No Change | 82.7 | 91.4 | Declined |
| High Needs | 81.5 | 89.9 | Improved Below Target | 69.1 | 84.5 | No Change | 72.6 | 85.6 | No Change |
| Economically Disadvantaged[[3]](#footnote-3) | 86.9 | 85.3 | Above Target | 75.6 | 79.8 | No Change | 77.7 | 84.9 | Declined |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Students with disabilities | 68.8 | 84.2 | Improved Below Target | 51.4 | 80.5 | Declined | 61.7 | 81.3 | Improved Below Target |

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

**Table 6: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2016 Median ELA SGP** | | | **2016 Median Math SGP** | | |
| **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** | **District** | **CPI Rating** | **Growth Level** |
| All students | 38.0 | Below Target | Low | 29.0 | Below Target | Low |
| High Needs | 34.5 | On Target | Low | 27.5 | Below Target | Low |
| Econ. Disad. | 34.5 | On Target | Low | 29.5 | Below Target | Low |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 32.5 | On Target | Low | 25.0 | Below Target | Low |

**In 2016, the district’s out-of-school suspension rates were lower than state rates and in-school suspension rates were higher than state rates for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 7: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Type of Suspension** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | ISS | 0.0% | 1.8% | 2.5% | 4.8% | 2.9% |
| OSS | 3.4% | 3.9% | 4.7% | 1.7% | 4.9% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | ISS | 0.0% | 2.6% | 2.5% | 5.2% | 3.2% |
| OSS | 4.2% | 2.9% | 4.1% | 1.3% | 5.6% |
| ELLs | ISS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1.9% |
| OSS | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4.0% |
| Students with disabilities | ISS | -- | 0.7% | 3.6% | 4.2% | 3.5% |
| OSS | -- | 5.9% | 8.6% | 2.8% | 5.9% |
| All Students | ISS | 0.0% | 1.0% | 1.7% | 2.8% | 1.9% |
| OSS | 1.3% | 1.5% | 2.0% | 0.5% | 2.9% |

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

**Between 2013 and 2016, the district’s four-year cohort graduation rate declined by 1.5 percentage points for all students and by 1.1 to 6.5 percentage points for high needs students, students from low-income families, and students with disabilities. The district reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students and high needs students.**[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 8: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2016)** | **Cohort Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 37 | 95.7% | 96.0% | 90.9% | 94.6% | -1.1 | -1.1% | 3.7 | 4.1% | 79.1% |
| Low income | 31 | 100% | 100% | 96.0% | 93.5% | -6.5 | -6.5% | -2.5 | -2.6% | 78.4% |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 64.1% |
| SWD | 8 | 90.0% | 90.0% | 83.3% | 87.5% | -2.5 | -2.8% | 4.2 | 5.0% | 71.8% |
| All students | 112 | 98.8% | 98.1% | 97.0% | 97.3% | -1.5 | -1.5% | 0.3 | 0.3% | 87.5% |

**Between 2012 and 2015, the district’s five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 1.7 percentage points for all students, and by 1.0 and 7.1 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income families, respectively, and declined by 2.4 percentage points for students with disabilities. The district reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students.**[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012–2015** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2015)** | **Cohort Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2012–2015** | | **Change 2014–2015** | | **State (2015)** |
| **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 33 | 92.9% | 95.7% | 96.0% | 93.9% | 1.0 | 1.1% | -2.1 | -2.2% | 82.0% |
| Low income | 25 | 88.9% | 100% | 100% | 96.0% | 7.1 | 8.0% | -4.0 | -4.0% | 81.6% |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70.2% |
| SWD | 12 | 94.1% | 90.0% | 90.0% | 91.7% | -2.4 | -2.6% | 1.7 | 1.9% | 74.5% |
| All students | 101 | 96.3% | 98.8% | 99.0% | 98.0% | 1.7 | 1.8% | -1.0 | -1.0% | 89.4% |

**In 2016, the district did not have any drop-outs.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 10: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| High Needs | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.7% |
| Econ. Disad.[[6]](#footnote-6) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4.1% |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6.6% |
| SWD | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3.1% |
| All students | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.9% |

**Grade and School Results**

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students declined by 1.3 points, from 93.0 in 2013 to 91.7 in 2016, and declined in the 3rd, 4th, and 6th grades.**

* ELA CPI improved by 1.6 points in the 5th grade, by 2.7 points in the 7th grade, and by 0.1 point in the 8th grade.
  + ELA CPI in the 10th grade was 100 in 2016, 3.3 points above the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.
* ELA CPI declined by 4.8 points in the 3rd grade, by 8.5 points in the 4th grade, and by 1.1 points in the 6th grade.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 11: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State**  **(2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 85 | 92.9 | 93.5 | 88.1 | 88.1 | -- | -4.8 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 82 | 90.5 | 88.8 | 86.8 | 82.0 | -- | -8.5 | -4.8 |
| 5 | 88 | 93.3 | 93.4 | 90.4 | 94.9 | -- | 1.6 | 4.5 |
| 6 | 103 | 88.4 | 91.9 | 89.7 | 87.3 | -- | -1.1 | -2.4 |
| 7 | 102 | 92.2 | 90.3 | 87.9 | 94.9 | -- | 2.7 | 7.0 |
| 8 | 106 | 93.8 | 94.7 | 93.8 | 93.9 | -- | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 10 | 97 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 99.3 | 100.0 | 96.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| All | 672 | 93.0 | 93.1 | 91.1 | 91.7 | 87.2 | -1.3 | 0.6 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA was 60 percent in the 3rd grade at Macdonald Elementary; 61 percent, 73 percent, and 53 percent in the 4th, and 5th , and 6th grades, respectively, at Howard Elementary; and 77 percent and 63 percent in the 7th and 8th grades, respectively, at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA was 100 percent in the 10th grade at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 12: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016[[7]](#footnote-7)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | 60% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 60% |
| Howard | -- | 61% | 73% | 53% | -- | -- | -- | 62% |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | -- | -- | -- | -- | 77% | 63% | 100% | -- |
| District | 60% | 62% | 73% | 53% | 77% | 63% | 100% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI declined by 4.8 points at Macdonald Elementary and by 2.6 points at Howard Elementary, and improved by 0.9 point at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.**

* ELA CPI for high needs students declined by 15.8 points at Macdonald Elementary and by 3.6 points at Howard Elementary, and improved by 2.3 points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.
* ELA CPI for students with disabilities declined by 17.0 points at Howard Elementary, and improved by 5.9 points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 13: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | 92.9 | 93.7 | 89.1 | 88.1 | -4.8 |
| High Needs | 85.2 | 87.5 | 80.4 | 69.4 | -15.8 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 87.5 | 86.1 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 77.5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Howard | 90.7 | 91.6 | 89.0 | 88.1 | -2.6 |
| High Needs | 78.2 | 79.9 | 74.3 | 74.6 | -3.6 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 81.4 | 80.0 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 75.0 | 68.5 | 58.6 | 58.0 | -17.0 |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | 95.4 | 94.8 | 93.8 | 96.3 | 0.9 |
| High Needs | 89.0 | 88.7 | 81.2 | 91.3 | 2.3 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 88.5 | 93.1 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 76.7 | 71.7 | 66.1 | 82.6 | 5.9 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI declined by 3.4 points for all students, from 87.2 in 2013 to 83.8 in 2016. Math CPI also declined in the 3rd, 4th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades.**

* Math CPI declined by 2.7 points in the 3rd grade, by 0.5 point in the 4th grade, by 7.0 points in the 6th grade, by 4.0 points in the 7th grade, by 8.3 points in the 8th grade, and by 2.5 points in the 10th grade.
  + Math CPI in the 10th grade was 93.6 in 2016, 3.9 points above the 2016 state math CPI of 89.7.
* Math CPI improved by 0.9 point in the 5th grade.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 14: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 3 | 85 | 97.2 | 98.1 | 90.3 | 94.5 | -- | -2.7 | 4.2 |
| 4 | 82 | 88.0 | 92.3 | 85.6 | 87.5 | -- | -0.5 | 1.9 |
| 5 | 88 | 90.0 | 86.6 | 88.4 | 90.9 | -- | 0.9 | 2.5 |
| 6 | 103 | 89.0 | 86.1 | 80.9 | 82.0 | -- | -7.0 | 1.1 |
| 7 | 102 | 74.1 | 77.1 | 77.0 | 70.1 | -- | -4.0 | -6.9 |
| 8 | 82 | 77.9 | 79.7 | 74.1 | 69.6 | -- | -8.3 | -4.5 |
| 10 | 98 | 96.1 | 97.1 | 94.3 | 93.6 | 89.7 | -2.5 | -0.7 |
| All | 673 | 87.2 | 87.7 | 84.7 | 83.8 | 81.5 | -3.4 | -0.9 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math was 81 percent in the 3rd grade at Macdonald Elementary; 65 percent, 57 percent, and 52 percent in the 4th, and 5th , and 6th grades, respectively, at Howard Elementary; and 37 percent and 32 percent in the 7th and 8th grades, respectively, at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in math was 82 percent in the 10th grade.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 15: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016[[8]](#footnote-8)** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | 81% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 81% |
| Howard | -- | 65% | 57% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | 58% |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | -- | -- | -- | -- | 37% | 32% | 82% | -- |
| District | 80% | 66% | 57% | 52% | 38% | 32% | 83% | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI declined by 2.9 points at Macdonald Elementary, by 2.7 points at Howard Elementary, and by 3.8 points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.**

* Math CPI for high needs students declined by 9.3 points at Macdonald Elementary, by 7.4 points at Howard Elementary, and by 2.0 points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.
* Math CPI for students with disabilities declined by 23.2 points at Howard Elementary and improved by 0.9 point at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 16: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | 97.2 | 98.1 | 91.3 | 94.3 | -2.9 |
| High Needs | 91.7 | 91.1 | 82.6 | 82.4 | -9.3 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 92.9 | 94.4 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 85.0 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Howard | 89.3 | 88.5 | 84.9 | 86.6 | -2.7 |
| High Needs | 77.5 | 74.7 | 71.4 | 70.1 | -7.4 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 76.7 | 75.6 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 72.1 | 58.9 | 56.3 | 48.9 | -23.2 |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | 82.6 | 85.3 | 83.4 | 78.8 | -3.8 |
| High Needs | 66.4 | 72.6 | 68.1 | 64.4 | -2.0 |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 78.8 | 69.4 | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 49.1 | 50.0 | 53.6 | 50.0 | 0.9 |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 7 percentage points in the district as whole, from 63 percent in 2013 to 56 percent in 2016, 2 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.**

* 5th grade science proficiency rates decreased by 5 percentage points from 60 percent in 2013 to 55 percent in 2016, 8 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
* 8th grade science proficiency rates decreased by 8 percentage points from 42 percent in 2013 to 34 percent in 2016, 7 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
* 10th grade science proficiency rates declined by 5 percentage points from 89 percent in 2013 to 84 percent in 2016, 11 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 17: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade** | **Number** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| 5 | 88 | 60% | 69% | 62% | 55% | 47% | -5 | -7 |
| 8 | 108 | 42% | 39% | 54% | 34% | 41% | -8 | -20 |
| 10 | 92 | 89% | 88% | 85% | 84% | 73% | -5 | -1 |
| All | 288 | 63% | 65% | 66% | 56% | 54% | -7 | -10 |

**In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 55 percent in the 5th grade at Howard Elementary, 8 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. At West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High the science proficiency rate was 34 percent in the 8th grade, 7 percentage points below the 2016 state rate, and 84 percent in the 10th grade, 11 percentage points above the 2016 state rate.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 18: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016** | | | | | | | | |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Howard | -- | -- | 55% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 55% |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 34% | 84% | 57% |
| District | -- | -- | 55% | -- | -- | 34% | 84% | 56% |
| State | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 41% | 73% | 54% |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 5 percentage points at Howard Elementary and by 9 percentage points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.**

* Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 19 percentage points at Howard Elementary and by 1 percentage point at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.
* Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 13 percentage points at West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 19: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016** | | | | | |
|  | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-Year Trend** |
| Spring Street | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Macdonald | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Howard | 60% | 70% | 64% | 55% | -5% |
| High Needs | 42% | 54% | 48% | 23% | -19% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 59% | -- | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 27% | 45% | 10% | -- | -- |
| West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High | 66% | 64% | 69% | 57% | -9% |
| High Needs | 47% | 45% | 46% | 46% | -1% |
| Econ. Disad. | -- | -- | 64% | 54% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0% |
| SWD | 40% | 27% | 6% | 27% | -13% |

Curriculum and Instruction

***Contextual Background***

The district has established a thoughtful and collaborative approach to curriculum practices, including technology integration as an important element of the curriculum. At every level, curriculum leaders routinely collaborate with teachers, providing leadership and support to ensure that the curriculum is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. The superintendent plays an active role as the district’s curriculum leader for grades 7–12 while the assistant superintendent is the district’s curriculum leader Pre-K–6. Before 2015–2016, the superintendent’s responsibilities included the district curriculum K–12.

At the elementary level, Pre-K–6, the district adopted the enVisionMATH 2.0 program in 2015–2016 and provides teachers with ongoing support to implement the program. The district uses the Reading Street program Pre-K–5. Teachers follow curriculum maps that are aligned to the standards and have ample resources to support literacy in the district. In an effort to enhance writing at the elementary level, the district is piloting *Empowering Writers.* In grades 7–12, teachers use curriculum maps aligned with the standards, textbooks, and teacher-developed resources to implement the curriculum in their classrooms.

With common planning time at every level and well-developed assessment practices, teachers are continually revising curriculum based on assessments, including PARCC and MCAS. The district has established a five-year curriculum review schedule, and teachers collaborate during the summer to review and revise curriculum. In summer 2017, science teachers in grades 6–12 plan to address revisions based on the 2016 Massachusetts Science Technology/Engineering Framework. In addition, elementary teachers are scheduled to work on curriculum for the math program.

Because of the district’s small size, there is only one curriculum team in each grade at the early elementary school, at the two elementary schools, and at the junior/senior high school. This configuration, which is supported by instructional team leaders and principals, ensures horizontal alignment. Elementary teachers have opportunities to meet vertically at student transition points during the district’s monthly half day of professional development. In grades 7–12, common planning time for departments ensures both horizontal and vertical alignment.

The district was an early adopter of the state Educator Evaluation Framework and has been making a genuine effort to implement practices and procedures designed to improve the quality of classroom instruction across the district. Among those efforts was the collaborative development of a well-defined model of effective classroom instruction. This model represents a shared vision of high-quality teaching and learning and serves as a tool for both teachers and administrators in the design, delivery, and evaluation of instructional practices and students’ learning experiences. During the onsite, teachers and principals in all the district’s schools seemed familiar with and clearly articulated the key components of the model. Through the use of effective supervisory practices such as regular classroom visits supported by instruction-focused dialogue and clear and consistent informal instructional feedback, both oral and written, this instructional model has become embedded within the district’s evaluative system.

However, the district’s formal formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations do not generally contain feedback for improving teaching practice that is specific, measureable, or actionable. Based on the review team’s class observations, work remains to be done for the district to derive the full benefit of the state Educator Evaluation Framework, particularly at the high-school level.

**Strength Findings**

1. **The district has a cohesive approach to curriculum leadership based on communication and collaboration.**
2. The superintendent and the assistant superintendent play active roles as the district’s curriculum leaders.

1. The superintendent oversees the middle- and high-school curriculum including science. In this role, the superintendent meets with the middle-high school principal weekly and collaborates regularly with department coordinators and content teams on curricular issues.

a. Interviewees told the team that the superintendent works with content teams to develop action plans and is currently working with the science committee to align the curriculum with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework.

2. The assistant superintendent provides curricular leadership Pre-K–6 and for behavioral health K–12. She attends elementary grade-level team meetings, meets monthly with elementary principals and reading specialists to review the literacy program, and meets monthly with principals and grade-level instructional team leaders (ITLs).

a. The assistant superintendent also provides professional development to elementary teachers to support implementation of enVisionMATH.

**B**. In grades 7–12, the principal and department content coordinators provide curriculum leadership, and ensure alignment of the curriculum to the standards and fidelity in the implementation of the standards in the classroom.

1. The principal meets monthly on–on–one with coordinators and as a group.

2. Coordinators lead monthly department meetings and bi-weekly teacher common planning time (CPT) meetings focused on curriculum. A review of meeting agendas indicated that teachers use the time for work such as revising curriculum based on assessment results.

3. Coordinators also review lesson plans bi-weekly for inclusion of standards, learning goals, and student-centered activities. They discuss lesson plans with the principal during their monthly individual meetings.

**C**. Elementary principals work closely with the assistant superintendent and ITLs to provide curriculum leadership.

1. Principals took an active role in selecting and piloting the district’s math and writing programs.

2. ITLs serve as liaisons to the principal, running weekly grade-level meetings that cover topics such as curriculum, instruction, and development of action plans.

3. ITLs meet monthly as a vertical group with the principal and the assistant superintendent.

**Impact:** Through this collaborative approach to curriculum leadership, the district ensures oversight for consistent development, alignment, and delivery of its curricula. When teachers have opportunities to collaborate about curriculum, they gain a deeper understanding of the standards and are better equipped to implement them with fidelity in their classrooms.

1. **The district has developed and is implementing a 1:1 technology initiative Pre-K-12 that focuses on the integration of technology into the curriculum.**
2. Long-range, collaborative planning and setting strategic goals led to the district’s technology initiative.

The superintendent told the review team that six to seven years ago the strategic planning committee laid the groundwork for the technology initiative. The result was a five-year district technology plan that called for the integration of technology into instruction.

The District Improvement and Strategic Plan 2015–2017 sets two-year goals for technology that include providing professional development to teachers and developing a Pre-K–12 technology literacy curriculum.

1. The district has made progress in realizing its strategic technology goals.

Pre-K–1 students have 1:1 use of IPads in their classrooms while students in grades 1–6 have 1:1 use of Chromebooks in their classrooms. Students in grades 7–12 have Chromebooks that they may take home.

2. Google classrooms[[9]](#footnote-9) support a high level of student and teacher communication and collaboration.

a. Some teachers reported that they are using blended learning strategies, such as “flipping the classroom.” The district set up study groups to support this strategy throughout the district.

1. For example, focus group participants said that students use their Chromebooks to get their content at home through videos and lectures. When they return to school, the teacher reviews the content at the start of class and then sets up small groups where students can apply what they learn while the teacher works with students who need help.

b. Some teachers stated that Google classroom has improved communication and horizontal and vertical collaboration between teachers.

3. The district has provided ongoing training, embedded personalized support, summer workshops, and year-long professional development to ensure that technology is integrated into the curriculum.

a. The entire 2015–2016 school year was devoted to districtwide technology training using the SAMR model (substitution, augmentation, modification, and redefinition), a continuum of technology use. Teachers in grades 6–12 received additional training from Massachusetts Computer Using Educators (MassCUE) and North River Collaborative.[[10]](#footnote-10)

4. Each school has a technology staff member to support and instruct teachers in small groups or individually.

**C.** The district is part of the Southeast Collaborative Regional Organization (SCRO) Virtual Learning Academy. Since September 2015, students have been taking courses that would not typically be available in a small district. Eight district teachers have been trained to teach online courses.

**Impact:** By integrating technology into teaching and learning, the district is creating a learning environment in which students are active participants in their own learning and are being prepared for the 21st century workplace.

**3. The district has developed a professional culture of collaborative, growth-oriented supervision in which teachers and administrators communicate regularly, constructively, and thoughtfully about lesson design, instructional practice, and student learning.**

**A.** The district’s supervisory policies and practices provide teachers with frequent and timely informal instructional feedback, both oral and written. Supervisors continually monitor and support educators, identifying the strengths of and meeting the needs of classroom teachers to ensure professional growth. This model of collegial supervision is characterized by a high level of professional trust, confidence, and mutual respect.

1. Principals reported that they visit classrooms regularly and that the number of announced and unannounced observations greatly exceeds the minimum requirements of state educator evaluation regulations and contractual requirements. They further stated that teachers are routinely provided with timely and targeted informal feedback, either orally or in writing.

1. Principals stated that uniform procedures and protocols for classroom observations are in place and followed consistently by supervisors in every school in the district. They said that a walkthrough template had been collaboratively developed and is extensively used to provide teachers with clear and consistent feedback on those pedagogical practices that are directly aligned with the district’s model for effective instruction.

i. Walkthrough template forms are submitted and compiled as Google documents and are readily accessible by the teacher and administrators. A document review confirmed the alignment of the walkthrough template forms with district instructional priorities, which include student engagement, technology integration, individualization, high expectations, and a safe and supportive learning environment, and confirmed their extensive and appropriate use by administrators.

2. Principals told reviewers that in addition to school administrators visiting classrooms, the superintendent and the assistant superintendent periodically partner with school administrators in walkthroughs. They reported that these collaborations, which also include a debriefing, help evaluators to calibrate expectations and informal feedback to teachers.

3. Principals stated that they believe walkthroughs are “embedded” as a “key component” within each school’s professional culture. Additionally, principals’ increased visibility in classrooms enables them to construct a “more complete picture” of teacher competencies, to engage in an ongoing professional dialogue with teachers, develop a more constructive and supportive relationship with staff, and have a more direct impact on the quality of instruction.

4. In separate focus groups, teachers at the elementary-, middle-, and high- school levels concurred with principals’ descriptions of supervisory policies and procedures.

a. Interviewees stated that administrators’ visits to classrooms are much more “frequent” and “collaborative” than in the past and that informal feedback from principals is provided consistently and promptly.

b. Further, teachers agreed that informal feedback is constructive and “very helpful,” and that it focuses on pedagogical practice, generates “more productive conversations about instruction,” and has done much to build a culture of trust and mutual respect.

**Impact**: Through a collaborative model of supervision characterized by a high level of trust and mutual respect, enhanced professional dialogue between teachers and administrators, and an increased focus on classroom practice and student learning, administrators are able to identify the strengths of and meet the needs of individual teachers as well as the larger faculty, assess the application of skills and practices learned from professional development, and provide staff with timely, targeted informal feedback focused on continuous professional growth and increased student achievement.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

**4. The district’s elementary curriculum documents provide an incomplete guide for the implementation of the curriculum.**

**A.** A review of elementary ELA, mathematics, and science curriculum documents indicated that all the components of a documented curriculum are not fully developed.

1. The district’s curriculum maps use a single template that includes these elements: month/term; current topic; standard focus/skills; MA 2011 code; instructional strategies/activities; key vocabulary; and assessments.

2. In most curriculum maps, assessments and instructional strategies were not fully addressed.

a. Assessments were often not specific to the unit and were repeated word for word from one unit to the next. In a number of curriculum maps, specific assessments were not listed.

b. Instructional strategies were sometimes not included or were lists of activities or worksheets.

c. The team did not find evidence of a range of instructional strategies to reach all learners.

**Impact:** Without linking a full range of assessments to the curriculum, the district does not have a means of measuring its effectiveness in implementing the specified curriculum. By not including a range of instructional strategies, the district is not providing all learners with entry points into the curriculum.

**5. The district’s formal formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations are not sufficiently instructive, evidence based, or growth oriented.**

* 1. The review team reviewed the folders of 31 teachers randomly selected from all the district’s schools. Although supporting documentation (e, g., self-assessments, goal setting, educator plans, etc.) was timely and complete, the written formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations were generally not instructive[[11]](#footnote-11) and contained little concrete supporting evidence. Formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations seldom provided feedback for improved classroom practice that was specific, measurable, or actionable. Nor did they generally contain recommendations capable of significantly improving instruction or contributing to substantive professional growth.

1. Principals acknowledged that, because of numerous competing demands on their time and attention, including the PARCC testing at the end of the school year, they find meeting the procedural demands and timelines of the educator evaluation system to be “very challenging.”
2. Principals reported that the district was an early adopter of the state Educator Evaluation Framework, noting that formal training was provided to them at that time and subsequent training in evaluative practices and processes has been addressed primarily within the district, for example, at administrative cabinet meetings and summer retreats.

**B**. The team conducted a similar review of the evaluation folders of the district’s principals. As was the case with teachers’ assessments and evaluations, formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations typically were not sufficiently evidence based or instructive. Feedback was not specific and concrete and actionable recommendations were few.

**Impact**: Without ensuring that formal assessments and evaluations are of uniformly high quality, the district is challenged to enhance and extend the impact of its effective supervisory practices and to advance the fundamental goal of educator evaluation, the implementation of an evidence-based, student-centered process that fully supports and promotes the continuous professional growth and development of teachers and administrators.

**6. In observed classrooms across the district the quality of instruction was uneven. There was a consistently lower incidence of characteristics of high-quality instruction at the high school.**

As part of the onsite, the review team observed 46 classes throughout the district: 18 at the high school, 7 at the middle school, and 21 at the 3 elementary schools. The team observed 16 ELA classes, 16 mathematics classes, and 14 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were four science and two career/technical education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

* 1. **Focus Area #1-Learning Objectives and Instruction** Overall, the instructional practices observed in this focus area were consistently the strongest of all the characteristics of effective instruction. In most observed classrooms, teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content, provided and referred to clear learning objectives, implemented lessons with high expectations aligned with the learning objective, and used appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective.

For example in observed classrooms team members saw moderate and strong evidence that teachers:

* demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content (characteristic #1) in 93 percent of classes (in 100 percent of elementary- and middle-school classes, and in 83 percent of high-school classes);
* provided and referred to clear learning objectives (characteristic #2) in 96 percent of classrooms (in 95 percent of elementary-school lessons, in 100 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 94 percent of high-school lessons);
* implemented a lesson that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objective (characteristic #3) in 85 percent of classes (in 95 percent of elementary-school lessons, in 100 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 67 percent of high-school lessons); and
* used appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objectives (characteristic #4) in 93 percent of classrooms (in 100 percent of elementary- and middle-school classes and in 84 percent of high-school lessons).

**B. Focus Area #2-Student Engagement and Critical Thinking**. In observed classrooms there was variation in the extent to which teachers facilitated tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking and to assume responsibility for their own learning.

1. Team members found moderate and strong evidence of student motivation and engagement (characteristic #5) in 80 percent of all observed classes (in 95 percent of elementary-school classes, in 100 percent of middle-school classes, and in 55 percent of observed high-school lessons).

a. In a “very engaging” grade 7 math class, students described what they saw on their iPhones using mathematical terms, including “dilation,” “scale factor,” and “rotation.”

b. Observers noted that in some high-school classes some students were inattentive and needed redirection.

2. Observers saw moderate and strong evidence that the teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking (characteristic #6) in 72 percent of observed classes (in 71 percent of the elementary-school classes, in 100 percent of middle-school classes, and in 62 percent of high-school lessons).

a. Observers gave as an example of strong engagement in critical thinking a grade 5 ELA class in which there was “a big emphasis on explaining.”

b. In contrast, team members noted that students in a science class at the high school were completing lab exercises but “were not drawing conclusions while doing this.”

3. Team members noted moderate and strong evidence that students assumed responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups (characteristic #7) in 81 percent of all observed lessons (in 85 percent of elementary-school classes, in 100 percent of middle-school classes, and in 67 percent of high-school classes).

**C. Focus Area #3-Differentiated Instruction and Classroom Structure** In almost every observed classroom the climate was characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse. In most observed classrooms, teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content, provided and referred to clear learning objectives, implemented lessons with high expectations aligned with the learning objective, and used appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective. Team members made particular note of extensive technology integration in many classrooms across the district. Review team members noted that in observed classrooms differentiated instruction was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction.

* + 1. Observers saw moderate and strong evidence that the teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so that the lesson content is accessible for all learners (characteristic #8) in 52 percent of all classrooms (in 62 percent of elementary-school classes, in 71 percent of middle-school classes, but in only 34 percent of high-school classrooms).

a. In a grade 3 math class, all students were “purposefully engaged in differentiated activities while waiting for class to formally begin.” First, they completed activities on a list provided by the teacher, “then went to other programs aligned to diverse needs.”

b. Conversely, lessons that were not sufficiently differentiated were mostly lecture and question and answer. For example, in a small science class at the high school, it appeared that some students needed more help, but were not given additional support.

* + 1. Review team members noted moderate and strong evidence that the teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students’ diverse learning needs (characteristic #9) in 81 percent of all classes (in 81 percent of elementary-school classrooms, in 100 percent of middle-school classes, and in 73 percent of classes at the high school).
    2. Observers noted moderate and strong evidence of a classroom climate characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse (characteristic #10) in 97 percent of all classes (in 100 percent of elementary- and middle-school classes, and in 94 percent off high-school classes).
    3. Team members saw moderate and strong evidence that the teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students (characteristic #11) in 79 percent of all lessons observed (in 95 percent of elementary-school lessons, compared with 58 percent of middle-school lessons, and 67 percent of high-school lessons).

a. In a grade 7 math class, the teacher did not systematically check for understanding; all responses were voluntary.

b. In contrast, in a grade 10 geometry class about quadrilaterals, the teacher moved about the classroom probing and asking students: “What’s the operation?”

**Impact**: Without engaging and motivating instruction in which students take responsibility for their own learning, without sufficient opportunities for higher-order thinking and analysis, and without lessons structured to be accessible by all learners in every classroom, the district is not providing all students with the knowledge, skills, and understandings needed for success in the 21st century.

**Recommendations**

**The district should take steps to ensure that it has fully developed curriculum in all subject areas. The curriculum should include standards, objectives, resources, instructional strategies, timelines, and assessments.**

**A.** The district should ensure the quality and completeness of the required components in each unit. Particular attention should be given to including a full range of instructional strategies that reach all learners as well as assessments that are specific to the unit.

**Benefit:**  By implementing this recommendation, the district will ensure that student learning is standards based, richly diversified, and effective.

**Recommended resources:**

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

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

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

**The district should closely support and monitor the skills and practices of administrators to ensure that they are providing all staff with high-quality formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations that are instructive, evidence based, actionable, and capable of promoting individual growth and overall effectiveness.**

**A.** Evaluators should receive ongoing training, coaching, and other support to enhance their ability to analyze instruction and to write high-quality formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations.

**B.** Evaluators should continue to strengthen the feedback that helps teachers implement effective instruction, especially at the high school.

**C.** To develop additional ability to evaluate teachers, the district should review the caseload of educators assigned to each evaluator and consider ways of increasing the pool of evaluators, as appropriate.

**D.** The district’s walkthrough template and its related procedures and protocols can support this work.

**Benefits**: Implementing this recommendation will significantly and systematically promote the professional growth and development of teachers and administrators and ensure that student learning is the focus of the district’s educator evaluation system.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Online Calibration Training Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/tool/>) uses videos of classroom instruction from ESE’s Calibration Video Library to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as a district leadership team, watch a video together and then individually assess the educator’s practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric and provide the educator with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare to each other, as well educators throughout the state.
* ESE’s Educator Evaluation Training Materials webpage ([www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/training/)) suggests resources for improving the technical competencies of evaluators.
* ESE’s On Track with Evaluator Capacity interactive tool (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/pln/OnTrack-EvaluatorCapacity.pdf>) presents how several districts and schools in Massachusetts tackled evaluator capacity.
* ESE’s *Educator Effectiveness Quick Reference Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Streamline.pdf>) suggests ways to streamline the evaluation process.

Assessment

***Contextual Background***

All staff, including the superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, instructional team leaders, reading specialists, coordinators, grade-level and content teams, and teachers, are focused on the collection and analysis of data as well as the subsequent development of action plans to address students’ learning needs. In interviews, staff at all levels discussed their responsibilities about data collection, analysis, and decision-making, and noted that instruction addresses the needs indicated by the data.

There are consistent practices at each school with clear expectations about how data is collected, disseminated, and used to guide instruction and decision making. The district has a balanced system of assessments, including: Reading Street (K–5); enVisionMATH (grades 1–3); Diagnostic Reading Assessment (K–3); IReady (grades 4–6); IXL math (grades 1–8); locally developed common assessments (grades 7–12); and MCAS, PARCC, mid-year, and final exams (grades 7–12). At the time of the onsite in January 2017, the district was planning to use IReady in grades 1–3.

**Strength Finding**

**1. The district systematically analyzes and uses data to measure student growth and to drive decision making.**

**A.** Coordinators, reading teachers, instructional team leaders (ITLs), teachers, principals, the assistant superintendent, and the superintendent reported extensive time spent in meetings reviewing summative and benchmark assessment results to make decisions about instructional areas that require focused attention to improve students’ learning. They said that data analysis always concludes with the development of an action plan to address the learning needs indicated by the assessments.

1. Interviewees reported that in fall 2016 a review of MCAS and PARCC summative results led to action plans for curriculum changes, adoption of a writing program to supplement literacy instruction, expansion of the diagnostic assessments in use, and specific interventions for individual students or groups of students.

**B.** Coordinators, elementary reading teachers, and ITLs facilitate the development of grade-level and department action plans and submit the plans to the principal who works with teachers to oversee their implementation.

1. Grade-level and content teams review the implementation of each action plan and adjust action plans as necessary.

2. Every five to six weeks K–5 staff analyze reading and math benchmark assessments (Reading Street benchmark assessments and enVisionMATH topic tests).

a. Reading teachers and grade-level teams review Reading Street benchmark assessments to monitor individual students’ progress and to identify students to be referred to the Response to Intervention (RtI) Team.

b. The principal and the reading teacher review benchmark results to make decisions about the allocation of resources.

c. The RtI team writes action plans for individual students; these may involve interventions led by the reading teacher, tutoring, or additional support from the classroom teacher. The RtI team monitors students’ progress on plan objectives and adjusts the plans as appropriate.

3. ITLs work with grade-level teams to analyze enVisionMATH benchmark assessments and IXL results to develop individual student action plans involving interventions by Title I, math tutors, and classroom teachers.

a. The principal meets with the ITLs and grade-level teams to monitor the implementation of the action plans.

**C.** The district is using data to measure students’ growth.

1. The superintendent told the team that all teachers are using common assessments to measure students’ growth.

a. In an interview with reading teachers, ITLs, and coordinators, all indicated with a show of hands that they administer common assessments.

2. A review of sample common assessments indicated that common assessments in place measure growth for a range of learning objectives: for example, for reading teacher interventions with grade 2 students; for all grade 8 and 9 algebra students; for unit-based concept maps in biology; for phonological processing; and for Diagnostic Reading Assessments (DRAs) for all students in grades 1–3.

3. The superintendent receives all action plans for common assessments, and principals follow up on the implementation of each action plan.

4. The superintendent receives the final report on students’ growth on each common assessment. Each final report determines whether students have attained low, moderate, or high growth in their learning. Reports also indicate the median student growth rate for the assessment.

a. As necessary, the superintendent follows up on the reports of students’ growth with regular meetings with the appropriate team.

**D.** The superintendent, principals, department heads, instructional team leaders, reading teachers, and classroom teachers use data analysis to make decisions.

1. For example, the superintendent told the review team that after a comparison of students’ readiness for first grade after half-day kindergarten and after full-day kindergarten, the superintendent recommended and the school committee agreed to assume the cost of full-day kindergarten for all students.

2. After analysis of middle-school level 2016 PARCC results, a team led by the superintendent reviewed math at the middle-school level. The superintendent then recommended and the school committee agreed to hire math tutors to increase middle-school math support.

3. When the high-school math department determined that their students had scored lower than the state on MCAS questions about the Pythagorean Theorem, teachers restructured the geometry course.

4. When the grade 3 team saw in their 2016 results a need for improved writing instruction, it held vertical team meetings and grades 1, 2, and 3 agreed to implement more writing instruction. This eventually resulted in the adoption of a writing program at the elementary level.

**Impact**: With regular data analysis, the development of action plans to address students’ learning needs indicated by the analysis, and monitoring of the implementation of action plans, the district prioritizes goals; maximizes effectiveness in allocating resources; and makes needed adjustments to policies, services, and instruction.

Student Support

***Contextual Background***

During the onsite review in January 2017, administrators, staff, school committee members, parents, and students acknowledged the district’s collegial environment in which administrators, teachers, and town officials and employees work together for the benefit of students. In addition to providing a pleasant working environment, this provides a supportive structure for students who reported that teachers are always there to help them with their studies and to lend an ear when they are troubled. The district maintains an excellent attendance record,[[12]](#footnote-12) discipline referrals are few,[[13]](#footnote-13) graduation rates are high,[[14]](#footnote-14) and dropouts are practically nonexistent.[[15]](#footnote-15) Through a strong partnership with parents the district works diligently to ensure that students come to school on time and that the district supports them.

The district is proactive in anticipating and providing support for students and has systems in place to identify and provide support for struggling students. These include team meetings, Response to Intervention (RtI) teams, Student Success Teams, the Behavioral Health Task Force, and the many informal conversations that take place throughout the day in a small district.

In addition, the district has invested in resources to support students’ academic needs. These include: online software programs such as Lexia, IREADY, and IXL; RtI tutors, and Title I tutors. Students in grades 6–12 receive 30 minutes of designated support time during daily Power Block periods.

Students with disabilities and English language learners are served in the classroom through the collaborative efforts of general and special education teachers, para-professionals, and the ELL coordinator. General and special education staff and the ELL coordinator have designated times to discuss and plan instructional strategies for students.

The district is also attentive to the social-emotional needs of students. There are several programs in place for students Pre-K–12, including Calm Classroom, Social Thinking, Responsive Classroom, and Break Free from Depression. In addition, the district has behavior specialists and school psychologists on staff and social work interns from community agencies who provide counseling, lunch groups, and social groups.

**Strength Findings**

**1. The district has a comprehensive and uniformly implemented process in place to identify and to provide additional academic support for struggling students.**

**A.** Interviews and a review of district and school documents indicated that the district’s four schools have similar systems in place to identify and provide additional support for students.

1. Response to Intervention (RtI) teams meet regularly across the district to develop action plans that identify interventions to support struggling students.

a. Elementary teachers reported that the RtI process is followed across grades in all three elementary schools.

b. Middle- and high-school teachers reported that the RtI process is well established and leads to interventions for struggling students.

2. RtI teams composed of referring teachers, a school psychologist, a reading specialist, tutors, a case manager, and the principal meet to discuss teachers’ concerns about an individual student’s needs. The team creates an action plan for the student and after four to six weeks of implementation reviews the student’s progress.

3. Teachers at the Howard School (grades 4–6) and the junior/senior high school (grades 7–12) meet in teams to develop Student Success Plans for students who have not achieved proficiency on MCAS or PARCC.

4. Interventions at the elementary schools include Title I tutors, reading specialists, and a range of online programming including Lexia, IREADY, and IXL for ELA and mathematics.

5. The junior/senior high school and the Howard School provide interventions during Power Block sessions, which are scheduled daily for 30 minutes. RtI tutors and core subject teachers provide tutoring during Power Block and after school.

* + - 1. Students who require more support may be scheduled for academic seminars that are in place for grades 7, 8, 9/10, and 11/12.

**B.** General education teachers and specialists, including special education teachers and the ESL coordinator, provide support for students with disabilities, English language learners (ELLs) and other students who need additional support.

1. The team was told that at the elementary level general and special education teachers meet once to twice a month to check on students’ progress and make necessary adjustments to support. While a formal “co-teaching” model is not in place, teachers work together to provide special education services in the classroom with limited pull-out.

2. Interviewees reported and a document review confirmed that students with disabilities receive services through an inclusionary model K–12. Special education teachers and para-professionals support students in classrooms. In addition, directed studies classes are scheduled for students with disabilities at the junior/senior high school.

3. At the time of the review in January 2017, the district had only 10 ELLs and all were in Levels 3-5 of ACCESS.[[16]](#footnote-16) The ELL coordinator manages the program, conducts home surveys, and travels from school to school to meet with teachers about instructional strategies. In the junior/ senior high school, the coordinator provides direct support to some students. The team was told that most teachers in the district have obtained the Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) endorsement.

4. Interviewees reported and documents confirmed that Individual Curriculum Accommodation Plans (ICAPs) are developed for students who need some support but do not qualify for Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) or plans for special education services (Section 504 Plans).

a. Parents, teachers, and leaders develop ICAPs to target instructional strategies outlined in the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan (DCAP) to particular students.

b. Administrators reported that teachers use ICAPs in addition to IEPs when planning instruction.

**Impact**: Leaders have embedded common practices across all levels to identify and provide support for struggling students. Students who need additional support are primarily served in the classroom by teachers and specialists who plan and modify instruction to best meet their needs. This strong culture of support likely contributes to improved achievement.

**2. The district is proactive and responsive to students’ social-emotional health. Program effectiveness and students’ needs are closely monitored.**

1. The district promotes programs that support students’ social and emotional health.

1. One of the primary focus areas in the District Improvement and Strategic Plan 2015–2017 is school and community well-being, with a goal of ensuring social and emotional support for students.

2. Administrators reported that the district has piloted Responsive Classroom and students in pre-kindergarten through grade 6 start the day with Calm Classroom, a daily three-minute relaxation exercise conducted over the intercom.

a. The superintendent said that the discipline data shows the positive effect of these interventions.

3. Interviewees said that Break Free from Depression, a program from Boston Children’s Hospital, is being used in grades 6–12.

4. High-school staff have been trained in the curriculum for the Social Thinking program to support at-risk students.

5. Interviewees reported that Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) are in place across the district. The program provides monthly themes and students earn rewards for improved behavior.

1. The district responds to students’ social and emotional needs by providing interventions through the Response to Intervention (RtI) process.

1. Behavioral specialists and school psychologists provide targeted support for students identified through the RtI process.

a. Interviewees reported that behavioral specialists conduct play groups or lunch groups at the elementary level.

2. The team was told that school psychologists, social work interns, and the school nurse school address the social and emotional needs of junior/senior high school students.

**C.** The district monitors the need for and the effectiveness of social-emotional programs.

1. A documents review indicated that all students in grades 9–12 complete the Youth at Risk Behavior Survey, and health teachers receive the results of the survey.

* + 1. Administrators reported that they use pre-and post-data on behavioral growth, including the results of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, to determine the effectiveness of social-emotional support programs such as Social Thinking, Calm Classroom, Responsive Classroom, and Break Free from Depression.

**Impact**: Districts that are proactive and responsive to the social and emotional needs of students likely experience stronger student engagement, fewer disciplinary referrals, classrooms with instruction focused on teaching and learning, and improved student achievement.

**3. The district is characterized by a collegial environment where teachers, administrators, and town personnel work together for the benefit of the students.**

**A.** Parents and students praised administrators and staff for providing instructional and emotional support to students. More than one student said that “they [teachers and staff] really care.”

1. Interviews with students, parents, teachers, and administrators indicated teachers’ willingness to provide extra help to students before or after school, even to students for whom they were not currently responsible.

a. For example, a senior spoke about a middle-school English teacher who reviews his writing assignments long after his year in her classroom.

b. An Advanced Placement teacher, out for over six weeks on jury duty, provided classroom instruction on video to help keep his students on track.

2. Because students know that teachers and staff care about them, students feel comfortable talking to them about personal as well as academic matters.

3. With open lines of communication and trust, a tip line established by the superintendent has helped students let the school know of their concerns about friends in regard to drinking, depression, or other matters.

* 1. Parents spoke well of administrators who reached out to parents and students. They cited the high-school principal’s monthly coffee for parents and the elementary principal who introduced a new student to a few potential friends.
  2. Parents also attested to the availability of administrators, noting, for example, that the superintendent returns calls and emails promptly.
  3. Teachers at every level reported that the collegiality of the staff was one of the most important sources of job satisfaction in the district.

1. At the time of the onsite in January 2017, teachers’ association officers reported that they could not remember when the last grievance was filed and said that collective bargaining agreement negotiations between the superintendent and the association had been recently settled within a few weeks without benefit of lawyers. With a sense of pride, one association leader said, “West Bridgewater is the district we would all like to be.”

2. Teachers mentioned the collegial exchange that takes place with administrators after walkthroughs, and they credited this with stimulating more productive conversations about classroom instruction.

* 1. The police and fire departments are frequent visitors and provide support to the schools.

1. Administrators and students reported that, in the absence of a school resource officer, police visit every school every day. This practice contributes to the safety of the school and is an informal way for police and students to get to know each other.
2. Students reported feeling comfortable with the police.
   1. School committee members said that municipal officials have supported a number of school requests for improvements and additional funds.
3. The town supported the construction of the junior/senior high school. In the spirit of collaboration with the town, the school was designed so that members of the community can use the learning commons, auditorium, and gym.
4. Town officials agreed to provide additional funds to expand the kindergarten program to a free full-day program for all students.

**Impact**: This high level of collaboration and share responsibility for improvement benefits the students and the community in many ways. The new junior/senior high school is a beautiful space that is used respectfully by students and community members. Teachers and administrators go beyond their academic responsibilities to provide emotional support for students. Fire and police departments work closely with the schools to ensure a safe school environment and to maximize the effectiveness of community policing efforts.

**4. The district collaborates with neighboring districts and reaches out to a variety of community partners to provide resources.**

**A.** North River Collaborative[[17]](#footnote-17) has provided several resources for the district.

After identifying anxiety and depression issues among students, the district formed a Behavioral Health Task force in which North River Collaborative participated to provide services to students with social-emotional challenges.

Social work interns from local colleges see students at the Cozy Corner at the high school during Power Block.

Some district students attend afternoon classes at Independence Academy in Brockton, which provides services for students with substance abuse or dependence issues.

**B.** Brockton Area Multi-Services, Inc. (BAMSI) provides a psychiatrist and a psychologist to address students’ social-emotional challenges.

1. West Bridgewater is a member of a group of eighty-eight districts that make up Southeast Collaborative Regional Organization (SCRO).[[18]](#footnote-18) SCRO is collaborating on a virtual high school for electives. Eight West Bridgewater teachers have been trained to deliver online courses.
2. The district benefits from its relationship with several four-year and community colleges.

Bridgewater State College and Stonehill College send student teachers to the district.

The district offers a dual-enrollment program to students who wish to take a course at Bridgewater State College or Massasoit Community College while still in high school.

Some students participate in the Project Contemporary Competitiveness summer program at Stonehill College.

**E.** The ELL program partners with Catholic Charities and Quincy Asian Resources. Both organizations help the district and parents in the district to access information, programs, and ESL classes.

**F.** Representatives of community businesses visit the school to talk to students about career options and a private foundation provides financial gifts to students.

**Impact**: Collaboration with regional districts and partnerships with local agencies and community colleges enables the district to offer a wide range of services to its students and families at a lower cost than would otherwise be possible.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 9–11, 2017, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Suzanne Kelly, Curriculum and Instruction
2. Dr. Frank Sambuceti, Curriculum and Instruction
3. Patricia Williams, Assessment, *review team coordinator*
4. Lenora Jennings, Student Support
5. Dr. Katherine Lopez-Natale, Student Support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: chair and four members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: president and vice-president.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent and assistant superintendent.

The team visited the following schools: Spring Street (Pre-K–K), Macdonald (grades 1–3), Howard (grades 4–6), and West Bridgewater Junior/Senior High (grades 7–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 3 principals and 3 focus groups with 10 elementary-school teachers, 10 middle-school teachers, and 11 high-school teachers.

The team observed 46 classes in the district: 18 at the high-school level, 7 at the middle-school level, and 21 at the 3 elementary schools.

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

* + Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.
  + Data on the district’s staffing and finances.
  + 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, and school schedules.
  + All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**  January 9, 2017 | **Tuesday**  January 10, 2017 | **Wednesday**  January 11, 2017 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; standards interviews with district staff and principals; review of documents; review of personnel files; interview with teachers’ association; teacher focus groups; and a visit to the junior/senior high school for classroom observations. | Standards interviews with teachers, school-based specialists, and principals; teacher focus group; parent focus group; interviews with school committee members, and visits to the junior/senior high school and the Spring Street and Howard elementary schools for classroom observations. | Student focus group and visits to the Macdonald and Howard elementary schools for classroom observations. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| African-American | 39 | 3.0% | 84,996 | 8.9% |
| Asian | 16 | 1.2% | 63,690 | 6.7% |
| Hispanic | 44 | 3.4% | 184,782 | 19.4% |
| Native American | 2 | 0.2% | 2,125 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,148 | 89.2% | 584,665 | 61.3% |
| Native Hawaiian | 2 | 0.2% | 855 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 36 | 2.8% | 32,635 | 3.4% |
| **All Students** | 1,287 | 100.0% | 953,748 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2016 | | | | |

**Table B1b: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**2016–2017 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Groups** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 129 | 41.1% | 9.9% | 167,530 | 38.4% | 17.4% |
| Econ. Disad. | 203 | 64.6% | 15.8% | 288,465 | 66.1% | 30.2% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 10 | 3.2% | 0.8% | 90,204 | 20.7% | 9.5% |
| All high needs students | 314 | 100.0% | 24.1% | 436,416 | 100.0% | 45.2% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2016. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,302; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,514. | | | | | | |

**Table B2a: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | |  | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 85 | 92.9 | 93.5 | CPI | 88.1 | 88.1 | 0.0 |
| P+ | 85 | 74% | 78% | Lv 4&5 | 62% | 60% | -2 |
| 4 | CPI | 82 | 90.5 | 88.8 | CPI | 86.8 | 82.0 | -4.8 |
| P+ | 82 | 70% | 70% | Lv 4&5 | 73% | 62% | -11 |
| SGP | 80 | 49.0 | 49.0 | SGP | 38.0 | 29.0 | -9.0 |
| 5 | CPI | 88 | 93.3 | 93.4 | CPI | 90.4 | 94.9 | 4.5 |
| P+ | 88 | 78% | 82% | Lv 4&5 | 63% | 73% | 10 |
| SGP | 87 | 68.0 | 56.0 | SGP | 38.0 | 43.0 | 5.0 |
| 6 | CPI | 103 | 88.4 | 91.9 | CPI | 89.7 | 87.3 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 103 | 74% | 76% | Lv 4&5 | 60% | 53% | -7 |
| SGP | 102 | 54.5 | 47.0 | SGP | 30.0 | 28.0 | -2.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 102 | 92.2 | 90.3 | CPI | 87.9 | 94.9 | 7.0 |
| P+ | 102 | 78% | 76% | Lv 4&5 | 65% | 77% | 12 |
| SGP | 99 | 39.0 | 31.0 | SGP | 38.5 | 64.0 | 25.5 |
| 8 | CPI | 106 | 93.8 | 94.7 | CPI | 93.8 | 93.9 | 0.1 |
| P+ | 106 | 83% | 84% | Lv 4&5 | 59% | 63% | 4 |
| SGP | 103 | 41.5 | 33.0 | SGP | 38.5 | 38.0 | -0.5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2b: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016[[19]](#footnote-19)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 97 | 100 | 98.9 | 99.3 | 100 | 96.7 | 0 | 0.7 |
| P+ | 97 | 99% | 97% | 95% | 100% | 91% | 1% | 5% |
| SGP | 92 | 71.0 | 63.0 | 43.0 | 49.0 | 50.0 | -22.0 | 6.0 |
| All | CPI | 672 | 93.0 | 93.1 | 91.1 | 91.7 | 87.2 | -1.3 | 0.6 |
| P+ | -- | 80% | 81% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 566 | 54.0 | 47.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 50.0 | -16.0 | 0.0 |

**Table B2c: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS Year** | |  | **PARCC** | | **Gains and Declines** |
| **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| 3 | CPI | 85 | 97.2 | 98.1 | CPI | 90.3 | 94.5 | 4.2 |
| P+ | 85 | 91% | 95% | Lv 4&5 | 61% | 80% | 19 |
| 4 | CPI | 82 | 88 | 92.3 | CPI | 85.6 | 87.5 | 1.9 |
| P+ | 82 | 61% | 71% | Lv 4&5 | 61% | 66% | 5 |
| SGP | 78 | 54.0 | 49.0 | SGP | 30.0 | 39.5 | 9.5 |
| 5 | CPI | 88 | 90 | 86.6 | CPI | 88.4 | 90.9 | 2.5 |
| P+ | 88 | 73% | 68% | Lv 4&5 | 56% | 57% | 1 |
| SGP | 87 | 52.0 | 33.5 | SGP | 25.5 | 48.0 | 22.5 |
| 6 | CPI | 103 | 89 | 86.1 | CPI | 80.9 | 82.0 | 1.1 |
| P+ | 103 | 74% | 71% | Lv 4&5 | 42% | 52% | 10 |
| SGP | 102 | 57.5 | 29.5 | SGP | 30.5 | 26.5 | -4.0 |
| 7 | CPI | 102 | 74.1 | 77.1 | CPI | 77.0 | 70.1 | -6.9 |
| P+ | 102 | 51% | 59% | Lv 4&5 | 48% | 38% | -10 |
| SGP | 99 | 25.0 | 25.0 | SGP | 26.0 | 23.0 | -3.0 |
| 8 | CPI | 82 | 77.9 | 79.7 | CPI | 74.1 | 69.6 | -4.5 |
| P+ | 82 | 52% | 62% | Lv 4&5 | 45% | 32% | -13 |
| SGP | 79 | 34.0 | 64.0 | SGP | 20.0 | 21.0 | 1.0 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table B2d: West Bridgewater Public Schools**  **Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016[[20]](#footnote-20)** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **MCAS/Accountability Year** | | | |  | **Gains and Declines** | |
|  | **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 10 | CPI | 98 | 96.1 | 97.1 | 94.3 | 93.6 | 89.7 | -2.5 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 98 | 87% | 94% | 85% | 83% | 78% | -4 | -2 |
| SGP | 92 | 63.0 | 39.0 | 33.0 | 29.0 | 50.0 | -34.0 | -4.0 |
| All | CPI | 673 | 87.2 | 87.7 | 84.7 | 83.8 | 81.5 | -3.4 | -0.9 |
| P+ | -- | 70% | 74% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 563 | 47.0 | 41.0 | 27.0 | 29.0 | 50.0 | -18.0 | 2.0 |

**Table B2e: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **State (2016)** |
| 5 | CPI | 88 | 86.5 | 85.9 | 85.3 | 84.1 | 76.4 | -2.4 | -1.2 |
| P+ | 88 | 60% | 69% | 62% | 55% | 47% | -5% | -7% |
| 8 | CPI | 108 | 74.8 | 71.9 | 80 | 71.5 | 71.3 | -3.3 | -8.5 |
| P+ | 108 | 42% | 39% | 54% | 34% | 41% | -8% | -20% |
| 10 | CPI | 92 | 96.2 | 95.5 | 94.1 | 94.6 | 88.9 | -1.6 | 0.5 |
| P+ | 92 | 89% | 88% | 85% | 84% | 73% | -5% | -1% |
| All | CPI | 288 | 85.5 | 84.4 | 86.1 | 82.7 | 78.7 | -2.8 | -3.4 |
| P+ | 288 | 63% | 65% | 66% | 56% | 54% | -7% | -10% |
| Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE) MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B3a: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[21]](#footnote-21)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | |  | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 185 | 84.5 | 84.4 | CPI | 78.4 | 81.5 | 3.1 | -3.0 |
| P+ | -- | 57% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 150 | 41.0 | 34.0 | SGP | 30.0 | 34.5 | 4.5 | -6.5 |
| State | CPI | 222,707 | 76.8 | 77.1 | CPI | 76.3 | 77.1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| P+ | -- | 48% | 50% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,487 | 47.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 47.0 | 47.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 120 | -- | -- | CPI | 84.0 | 86.9 | 2.9 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 100 | -- | -- | SGP | 34.0 | 34.5 | 0.5 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,877 | -- | -- | CPI | 77.6 | 78.2 | 0.6 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,361 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 73 | 77.4 | 70.5 | CPI | 66.1 | 68.8 | 2.7 | -8.6 |
| P+ | -- | 38% | 31% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 58 | -- | -- | SGP | 19.0 | 32.5 | 13.5 | #-- |
| State | CPI | 91,177 | 66.8 | 66.6 | CPI | 67.4 | 68.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| P+ | -- | 30% | 31% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,633 | 43.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 13 | 0.0 | 0.0 | CPI | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | -- | 0% | 0% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 12 | -- | -- | SGP | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 52,960 | 67.4 | 67.8 | CPI | 68.9 | 70.7 | 1.8 | 3.3 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,109 | 53.0 | 54.0 | SGP | 53.0 | 54.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 672 | 93.0 | 93.1 | CPI | 91.1 | 91.7 | 0.6 | -1.3 |
| P+ | -- | 80% | 81% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 566 | 54.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 38.0 | 38.0 | 0.0 | -16.0 |
| State | CPI | 491,267 | 86.8 | 86.7 | CPI | 86.8 | 87.2 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| P+ | -- | 69% | 69% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,999 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3b: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016[[22]](#footnote-22)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Accountability** | | | | | **2-Year Trend** | **4-Year Trend** |
| **MCAS** | |  | **PARCC** | |
| **2013** | **2014** |  | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 185 | 75.0 | 73.9 | CPI | 71.6 | 69.1 | -2.5 | -5.9 |
| P+ | -- | 46% | 49% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 150 | 40.0 | 36.0 | SGP | 31.0 | 27.5 | -3.5 | -12.5 |
| State | CPI | 222,349 | 68.6 | 68.4 | CPI | 67.9 | 68.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| P+ | -- | 40% | 40% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 165,191 | 46.0 | 47.0 | SGP | 46.0 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Econ.  Disad. | District | CPI | 120 | -- | -- | CPI | 78.0 | 75.6 | -2.4 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 100 | -- | -- | SGP | 27.5 | 29.5 | 2.0 | -- |
| State | CPI | 152,560 | -- | -- | CPI | 69.2 | 70.0 | 0.8 | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 114,091 | -- | -- | SGP | 46.0 | 45.0 | -1.0 | -- |
| SWD | District | CPI | 73 | 66.8 | 55.9 | CPI | 58.0 | 51.4 | -6.6 | -15.4 |
| P+ | -- | 30% | 19% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 58 | -- | -- | SGP | 28.5 | 25.0 | -3.5 | -- |
| State | CPI | 91,049 | 57.4 | 57.1 | CPI | 57.3 | 58.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 22% | 22% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 66,511 | 42.0 | 43.0 | SGP | 43.0 | 44.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 13 | -- | -- | CPI | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | -- | -- | -- | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 12 | -- | -- | SGP | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 53,048 | 63.9 | 63.8 | CPI | 64.5 | 65.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| P+ | -- | 35% | 36% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 35,290 | 53.0 | 52.0 | SGP | 51.0 | 50.0 | -1.0 | -3.0 |
| All students | District | CPI | 673 | 87.2 | 87.7 | CPI | 84.7 | 83.8 | -0.9 | -3.4 |
| P+ | -- | 70% | 74% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 563 | 47.0 | 41.0 | SGP | 27.0 | 29.0 | 2.0 | -18.0 |
| State | CPI | 490,612 | 80.8 | 80.3 | CPI | 80.7 | 81.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 |
| P+ | -- | 61% | 60% | Lv 4&5 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 388,423 | 51.0 | 50.0 | SGP | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |

**Table B3c: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

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

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2016)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 73 | 79.1 | 74.5 | 74.7 | 72.6 | -6.5 | -2.1 |
| P+ | 73 | 43% | 46% | 44% | 41% | -2% | -3% |
| State | CPI | 89,857 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 66.3 | 65.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 |
| P+ | 89,857 | 31% | 33% | 32% | 31% | 0 | -1 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 47 | 0 | 0 | 83.5 | 77.7 | 77.7 | -5.8 |
| P+ | 47 | 0% | 0% | 62% | 51% | 51% | -11% |
| State | CPI | 61,476 | -- | -- | 67.1 | 65.8 | -- | -1.3 |
| P+ | 61,476 | -- | -- | 33.0% | 29% | -- | -4 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 30 | 76.6 | 65.5 | 55.6 | 61.7 | -14.9 | 6.1 |
| P+ | 30 | 32% | 31% | 6% | 23% | -9% | 17% |
| State | CPI | 38,109 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 60.2 | 59.7 | -0.1 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 38,109 | 20% | 22% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 18,594 | 54 | 54 | 53.9 | 54.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| P+ | 18,594 | 19% | 18% | 18% | 19% | 0 | 1 |
| All students | District | CPI | 288 | 85.5 | 84.4 | 86.1 | 82.7 | -2.8 | -3.4 |
| P+ | 288 | 63% | 65% | 66% | 56% | -7% | -10% |
| State | CPI | 208,262 | 79 | 79.6 | 79.4 | 78.7 | -0.3 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 208,262 | 53% | 55% | 54% | 54% | 1 | 0 |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE). State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2012–2015** | | **Change 2014–2015** | | **State (2015)** |
| **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High Needs | 2.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -2.2 | -100% | 0 | -- | 3.4 |
| Econ. Disad.[[23]](#footnote-23) | 1.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | -1.6 | -100% | 0 | -- | 3.3 |
| Students w/ disabilities | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 3.5 |
| ELL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5.7 |
| All students | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | -0.5 | -100% | -0.2 | -100% | 1.9 |
| Notes: The annual drop-out rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Drop outs are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2013–2016** | | **Change 2015–2016** | | **State (2016)** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| All students | 96.0% | 95.9% | 95.4% | 95.7% | -0.3 | -0.3% | 0.3 | 0.3% | 94.9% |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B6: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY14** | | | **FY15** | | | **FY16** | | | |
|  | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  | | | | | | | | | |
| By school committee | $9,675,025 | $10,255,650 | | $10,638,872 | | $10,638,872 | | $11,122,692 | | $11,122, 692 |
| By municipality | $2,683,283 | $14,908,136 | | $4,347,328 | | $17,151,095 | | $4,999,661 | | $10,522,131 |
| Total from local appropriations | $12,358,308 | $25,163,786 | | $14,986,200 | | $27,789,967 | | $16,122,353 | | $21,644,823 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $2,825,300 | | -- | | $3,248,252 | | -- | | $3,262,477 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $27,989,086 | | -- | | $31,038,219 | | -- | | $24,907,300 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $2,817,296 | | -- | | $3,006,077 | | -- | | $3,031,677 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $7,107,926 | | -- | | $6,918,340 | | -- | | $6,849,766 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $9,925,222 | | -- | | $9,924,417 | | -- | | $9,881,443 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $11,783,866 | | -- | | $12,081,001 | | -- | | $12,760,356 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $1,858,644 | | -- | | $2,156,584 | | -- | | $2,878,913 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 18.7% | | -- | | 21.7% | | -- | | 29.1% |
| \*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.  \*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.  Sources: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved 4/11/17 | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B7: West Bridgewater Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2013–2015**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** |
| Administration | $413 | $391 | $414 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $618 | $682 | $685 |
| Teachers | $4,240 | $4,385 | $4,668 |
| Other teaching services | $837 | $876 | $987 |
| Professional development | $78 | $74 | $75 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $406 | $347 | $561 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $339 | $323 | $343 |
| Pupil services | $994 | $1,248 | $1,139 |
| Operations and maintenance | $751 | $818 | $822 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $1,442 | $1,493 | $1,424 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $10,118 | $10,637 | $11,117 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/ppx.html)  Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 86% | 14% | 2.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 0% | 17% | 72% | 11% | 1.9 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 3 | 36 | 7 | 2.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 7% | 78% | 15% |  |
| 2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson. | **ES** | 0% | 5% | 90% | 5% | 2.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 57% | 43% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 0% | 6% | 83% | 11% | 2.1 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 2 | 38 | 6 | 2.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 4% | 83% | 13% |  |
| 3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s). | **ES** | 0% | 5% | 67% | 29% | 2.2 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 86% | 14% | 2.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 33% | 50% | 17% | 1.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 7 | 29 | 10 | 2.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 15% | 63% | 22% |  |
| 4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 90% | 10% | 2.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 86% | 14% | 2.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 17% | 67% | 17% | 2.0 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 3 | 37 | 6 | 2.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 7% | 80% | 13% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 8.5 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 9.0 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 7.8 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 0% | 5% | 71% | 24% | 2.2 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 86% | 14% | 2.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 44% | 44% | 11% | 1.7 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 9 | 29 | 8 | 2.0 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 20% | 63% | 17% |  |
| 6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking. | **ES** | 0% | 29% | 71% | 0% | 1.7 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 6% | 33% | 56% | 6% | 1.6 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 12 | 30 | 3 | 1.8 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 26% | 65% | 7% |  |
| 7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | **ES** | 0% | 14% | 71% | 14% | 2.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 2.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 33% | 56% | 11% | 1.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 9 | 32 | 5 | 1.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 20% | 70% | 11% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 5.9 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 6.4 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 5.1 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 5.7 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture** |  | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|  | (0) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (0 to 3) |
| 8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners. | **ES** | 10% | 29% | 52% | 10% | 1.6 |
| **MS** | 0% | 29% | 57% | 14% | 1.9 |
| **HS** | 22% | 44% | 28% | 6% | 1.2 |
| **Total #** | 6 | 16 | 20 | 4 | 1.5 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 35% | 43% | 9% |  |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel). | **ES** | 0% | 19% | 71% | 10% | 1.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 71% | 29% | 2.3 |
| **HS** | 6% | 22% | 67% | 6% | 1.7 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 8 | 32 | 5 | 1.9 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 17 | 70% | 11% |  |
| 10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 62% | 38% | 2.4 |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 57% | 43% | 2.4 |
| **HS** | 0% | 6% | 78% | 17% | 2.1 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 1 | 31 | 14 | 2.3 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 2% | 67% | 30% |  |
| 11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students. | **ES** | 5% | 0% | 90% | 5% | 2.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 43% | 43% | 14% | 1.7 |
| **HS** | 0% | 335 | 56% | 11% | 1.8 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 9 | 32 | 4 | 1.8 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 20% | 70% | 9% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 7.9 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 7.5 |

1. Spring Street School does not have reportable accountability data because it is an early elementary school serving pre-kindergarten and kindergarten and does not serve any grades that take part in the statewide assessments (MCAS and PARCC). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Spring Street School does not have reportable accountability data because it is an early elementary school serving pre-kindergarten and kindergarten and does not serve any grades that take part in the statewide assessments (MCAS and PARCC). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years’ CPI targets. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Students from low-income familiesdid not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Students from low-income families did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Drop-out rates for students from low-income families used for 2013 and 2014 drop-out rates for students from economically disadvantaged families. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Google classroom is a blended-learning platform that helps teachers organize assignments, provide feedback, and communicate with their classes. It helps students organize their work, complete and turn it in, and communicate directly with teachers and peers. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The member districts of North River Collaborative (Abington, Avon, Bridgewater-Raynham, East Bridgewater, Hanover, Rockland, West-Bridgewater, and Whitman Hanson) work together “to provide high-quality, cost-effective educational programs and services.” [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. An informative evaluation is factual and cites instructional details such as methodology, pedagogy, Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice or instruction of subject-based knowledge that is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. It does not commit to improvement strategies. An instructive evaluation includes comments intended to improve instruction. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. According to ESE data, the district attendance rate was 95.9 percent in 2014, 94.9 percent in 2015, and 95.7 percent in 2016, compared with state rates of 95.4 percent, 94.7 percent, and 94.9 percent, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. According to ESE data, in 2016 the district’s in-school suspension and out-of-school suspension rates were 2.8 and 0.5 respectively, compared with 2016 state rates of 1.9 and 2.9, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. According to ESE data, in 2016 the four-year graduation rate in the district was 97.3 percent, compared with the 2016 state rate of 87.5 percent. In 2015, the five-year graduation rate was 98 percent, compared with the 2015 state rate of 89.4 percent. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. According to ESE data, the district’s drop-out rate was 0.2 percent in 2014, 0.0 percent in 2015, and 0.0 percent in 2016. In 2014, 1 student (of 423 students in grades 9–12) dropped out. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. ACCESS stands for Assessing Comprehension and Communications in English State-to-State for English Language Learners. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The member districts of North River Collaborative (Abington, Avon, Bridgewater-Raynham, East Bridgewater, Hanover, Rockland, West-Bridgewater, and Whitman Hanson) work together “to provide high-quality, cost-effective educational programs and services.” [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. SCRO is a consortium of nine educational collaboratives in southeastern Massachusetts. North River Collaborative is one of the members. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Rates for students from low-income families used for rates for students from economically disadvantaged families for 2012, 2013, and 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)