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Narragansett Regional School District, District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2012-2013 school year included those classified into Level 3[[1]](#footnote-1) of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance in each of the state’s six regions: Greater Boston, Berkshires, Northeast, Southeast, Central, and Pioneer Valley. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Narragansett Regional School district was conducted from April 22-25, 2013. The site visit included approximately 29 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 44 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, school council members, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted two focus groups with three elementary school teachers and five high school teachers. A third focus group was scheduled with middle school teachers, but none attended. The elementary focus group was attended by three teachers from Phillipston Memorial Elementary school. Teachers from the Baldwinville Elementary School and the Templeton Center Elementary School did not attend.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 46 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

Narragansett is a regional academic school district that serves the students and families in Templeton and Phillipston, Massachusetts. Students from other school districts attend school in Narragansett, a school choice district. There are 7 members of the regional school committee and they meet monthly approximately 10 months a year.

The current superintendent has been in the position since June 1, 2012, and had served as assistant superintendent and business manager since 2009. The superintendent will continue to serve as the business manager. The district leadership team includes an executive director of academics, a K-12 special education director, a K-12 guidance director, and 4 principals. Central office positions have been unstable over the past several years with a number of administrators new to the district or new to the position they hold. The district has four principals leading five schools. There are several other school administrators, including an assistant middle school principal, an assistant high school principal, an assistant principal at one elementary school, and a director of buildings and grounds. In addition, the teachers, the assistant principals, the directors of special education and guidance, clerical, custodial and service, cafeteria, and paraprofessional staff, including ABA aides, are members of a bargaining unit. There are 99 teachers in the district.

As of October 1, 2012, 1,426 students were enrolled in the district’s 5 schools:

**Table 1: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment**

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Templeton Center | Elementary | K-1 | 133 |
| Phillipston Memorial | Elementary | PK-4 | 167 |
| Baldwinville Elementary | Elementary | K-4 | 205 |
| Narragansett Middle | Middle School | 5-8 | 489 |
| Narragansett Regional High | High school | 9-12 | 432 |
| **Totals** | **5 schools** | **PK-12** | **1,426** |
| \*As of October 2012 | | | |

Between 2008 and 2012 overall student enrollment decreased by 13.6 percent, declining steadily from 1,696 in 2008 to 1,643 in 2009, to 1,575 in 2010, to 1,495 in 2011, to 1,426 in 2012. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were similar to the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 48 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students): total in-district per-pupil expenditures were $11,699 in fiscal year 2011 compared with a median of $11,853. Actual net school spending has been above what is required under state law, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district’s level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6) annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for all student groups meeting minimum N-size requirements (20 in the aggregate; 30 for subgroups). Four-and two-year trend data are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. Data on student performance is also available in Appendix B. In both this section and Appendix B, the data reported is the most recent available.

**1. The district is Level 3 because the Baldwinville Elementary School is Level 3.[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**A.** The Baldwinville Elementary School is among the lowest performing 20 percent of elementary schools.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**B.** The district’s four schools place between the 15th percentile and the 54th percentile based on each school’s four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other schools serving the same or similar grades: Baldwinville Elementary (15th percentile of elementary schools); Phillipston Memorial (33rd percentile of elementary schools); Narragansett Middle (35th percentile of middle schools); and Narragansett Regional High (54th percentile of high schools).

**2. The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.**

**A.** The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students is less than 75 for the district. The district is sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps for high needs[[4]](#footnote-4) students because the cumulative PPI for high needs students is 75 or higher for the district. The district’s cumulative PPI [[5]](#footnote-5)[[6]](#footnote-6) is 63 for all students and 75 for high needs students. The district’s cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 60 (low income students), 82 (students with disabilities), and 61 (White students).

**3. The district’s English language arts (ELA) performance is low[[7]](#footnote-7) relative to other districts and its growth[[8]](#footnote-8) is moderate.[[9]](#footnote-9)** **There was variation in performance among grades.**

**A.** The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for high needs students, low income students, and students with disabilities; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students and White students.[[10]](#footnote-10)

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

**C.** The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for all students, students with disabilities, and White students, and it earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for high needs students and students with disabilities.

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

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

**F.** Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful[[11]](#footnote-11) gains in grades 4 and 10 and potentially meaningful decline in grade 7. These gains and declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**G.** The 2012 performance of Phillipston Memorial Elementary School (PK-4) is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 4 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains in grade 4 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**H.** The 2012 performance of Baldwinville Elementary School (K-4) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 4 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI, and SGP. Most of the gains in grade 4 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**I.** The 2012 performance of Narragansett Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 7 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, and CPI. Most of the declines in grade 7 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**J.** The 2012 performance of Narragansett High School (9-12) is moderate relative to other high schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 10 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced, CPI and SGP. Most of the gains in grade 10 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**4. The district’s mathematics performance is low to other districts and its growth is moderate.[[12]](#footnote-12)****There was variation in performance among grades.**

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

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

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

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

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

**F.** Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 7, 8, and 10 and potentially meaningful declines in grades 3, 4, and 5. Most of the gains in grades 7, 8 and 10 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grades 3, 4, and 5 were attributed to its performance over both periods.

**G.** The 2012 performance of Phillipston Memorial Elementary School (PK-4) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is very low. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grades 3, 4, and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher, and CPI. Most of the declines in grades 3, 4, and overall were attributed to its performance over both periods.

**H.** The 2012 performance of Baldwinville Elementary School (K, 1-4) is very low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is low. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 3 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced. Most of the declines in grade 3 and overall were attributed to its performance over both periods.

**I.** The 2012 performance of Narragansett Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 7 and 8 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 5. Most of the gains in grades 7 and 8 were attributable to its performance over both periods, and most of the declines in grade 5 were attributed to its performance between 2011 and 2012.

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

**5. The district’s science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is low relative to other districts.[[13]](#footnote-13)**

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

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

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

**D.** Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 10 in CPI and the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced. Most of the gains in grade 10 were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**E.** The 2012 performance of Narragansett Middle School’s (5-8) is moderate relative to other middle schools.

**F.** The 2012 performance of Narragansett High School (9-12) is high relative to other high schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 10 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced and CPI. Most of the gains in grade 10 and overall were attributable to its performance over both periods.

**6. In 2012, the district met its annual improvement targets for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate, and the five-year cohort graduation rate, and did not meet its target for the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate.[[14]](#footnote-14) Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available[[15]](#footnote-15), the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate increased, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate declined, the five-year cohort graduation rate declined, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined.[[16]](#footnote-16)**

**A.** Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 14.5 percentage points, from 72.8% to 87.3%, an increase of 19.9% percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 2.2 percentage points, from 89.5% to 87.3%, a decrease of 2.5 percent.

**B.** Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate increased 6.8 percentage points, from 82.7% to 89.5%, an increase of 8.2 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it declined 5.2 percentage points, from 94.7% to 89.5%, a decrease of 5.5 percent.

**C.** Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined 1.1 percentage points, from 2.2% to 1.1%, a decrease of 48.6 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 0.7 percentage points, from 1.8% to 1.1%, a decrease of 37.2 percent.

**7.** **Narragansett Public Schools’ rate of in-school suspensions in 2011-2012 was higher than the statewide rate, and the rate of out-of-school suspensions was significantly lower than the state rate[[17]](#footnote-17).**

**A.** The rate of in-school suspensions for Narragansett was 6.6 percent, almost twice the state rate of 3.4 percent. The rate of out-of-school suspensions for Narragansett was 3.0 percent, lower than the state rate of 5.4 percent.

**B.** There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for out-of-school suspensions but not for in-school suspensions[[18]](#footnote-18). The out-of-school-suspension rate was 0.0 percent for African-American/Black students, 4.0 percent for Hispanic/Latino students, 6.1 percent for Multi-race (not Hispanic or Latino) students, 33.3 percent for Native American students, and 2.8 percent for White students.

**C.** There was a significant difference between the in-school suspension rates of high needs students and non high needs students (9.0 percent compared to 4.9 percent), low income students and non low income students (10.3 percent compared to 4.8 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (7.8 percent compared to 6.4 percent).

**D** There was also a significant difference between the rates of out-of-school suspensions for high needs students and non high needs students (4.1 percent compared to 2.3 percent), low income students and non low income students (4.4 percent compared to 2.3 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (4.4 percent compared to 2.7 percent).

**E.** On average students in the Narragansett Public Schools missed 2.1 days per disciplinary action[[19]](#footnote-19), lower than the state average of 3.1.

Narragansett Regional School District, District Review Findings

Strengths

***Leadership***

**1.** **The superintendent is well respected and is establishing a school culture that emphasizes positive lines of communication with all stakeholders.**

**A**. According to interviewees, the superintendent receives high marks for her interactions with stakeholders.

1. In interviews with teachers, administrators, school committee members, and parents, the superintendent is described as pleasant, trusting, honest, approachable, receptive to suggestions, and timely in her responses.

**B**. School leaders said that the superintendent has initiated weekly administrative meetings that follow an agenda.

**C**. School committee members described the superintendent as a good listener, receptive to the options and opinions they present, and willing to compromise when an impasse exists.

**Impact**: By establishing constructive lines of communication with stakeholders and a culture of respect, honesty, and collaboration, the superintendent is developing an academic atmosphere conducive to learning and an organizational environment that will be an asset as the district confronts financial uncertainty. (See the Leadership and Governance Challenge finding below.)

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**2. The district has a culture of conducting administrator and teacher evaluations. The district has begun to implement the new educator evaluation system as required for Race to the Top participants, although some areas of implementation are more fully developed than others.**

**A**. As a participant in the Race to the Top grant program the district was required to begin implementing the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s new educator evaluation system in 2012-2013. The expectation was that half of all educators, including all teachers without professional status, would be evaluated in 2012-2013 using the new district system.

1. District and school leaders and teachers’ association representatives said that the school committee and the teachers’ association negotiated a final agreement on the new educator evaluation system in the fall of 2012 and the teachers ratified it in November, 2012.

2. The district adopted ESE’s model contract language and rubrics without any modifications, according to the agreement dated December, 2012.

a. Teachers’ association representatives said that the former superintendent created an evaluation committee in the fall of 2011 to begin negotiating the structure of the new educator evaluation system; however, implementation was delayed because of prolonged negotiation of arbitration language.

b. Because of the delay in the ratification of the agreement, the district and the teachers’ association agreed that teacher terminations as a result of activities related to the new educator evaluation system would not take place this year (2012-2013).

3. The district and the teachers’ association agreed to jointly review the agreement by June 1st of each school year, according to a review of the agreement and interviews with school leaders and teachers’ association representatives.

**B**. District leaders and principals told the team that primary evaluators had received training during the summer of 2012 as part of weekly administrative team meetings using online guidance documents provided by ESE. An educator evaluation system training schedule is included on the district’s website.

1. School leaders and principals said that training of teachers was an ongoing process and periodically took place during scheduled professional development sessions. The Massachusetts Teachers’ Association held training for teachers just before Christmas; this was not well attended because of scheduling difficulties, according to principals.

**C**. According to teachers’ association representatives, implementation at the high school has been more consistent than at other levels. Association representatives said that they were enthusiastic about the new system.

1. Primary evaluators had completed self-assessments and developed goals generally aligned to the DIP, according to district leaders and principals.

2**.** Teachers in focus groups, as well as administrators, said that implementation training has not been entirely consistent, but, for the most part, self-assessments have been completed and observations were taking place.

3. A review of new teacher evaluation files and documentation from the high school, middle school, and elementary schools showed, for the most part, evidence of self-assessment, goal setting, and observations. School leaders estimated that approximately 45 formative observations have been conducted. At two elementary schools, only documentation of self-assessment was found in files. The superintendent said that the principal responsible for implementing the evaluation system at these two schools was new to Massachusetts and was still learning the requirements of the educator evaluation system.

4. The district uses TeachPoint software to collect educator evaluation information, according to district and school leaders.

**D.** The district’s former administrator and teacher evaluation system complied with regulations.

1. The team reviewed evaluations from the files of 30 teachers with professional or non-professional status. In addition, the team reviewed evaluations in the personnel files of five administrators. These evaluations were all completed before the implementation of the new educator evaluation system. For the most part, evaluations were timely, signed, effective, and instructive.

2. All teacher and administrator files reviewed included documentation of appropriate licensure for the position held or subject taught. Overall, 97 of the 99 teachers in the district were licensed to the initial or professional level.

**Impact:** With the foundation of adherence to the state’s former evaluation system, the district has collaboratively negotiated and successfully introduced new educator evaluations policies and practices, creating a vehicle with the potential to significantly improve the quality of teaching and learning in the district. When the system is fully and properly implemented, it will promote the development and overall effectiveness of professional staff.

***Student Support***

**3. The district has a process for teachers to refer students for academic and non-academic support. The district is responsive to the social and emotional needs of students.**

**A.** Interviews and a review of documents and showed that Child Study Teams (CSTs) at the elementary, middle, and high school collaborated with classroom teachers to identify strategies and target instruction for struggling students.

1. Interviewees said that students were referred to CSTs by classroom teachers based on teacher observations, quality of class work, and assessment results.

2. CST documents provided by the district include sample Individual Curriculum Accommodations Plans (ICAPs) that are developed for students by teachers in consultation with the CSTs.

3. ICAPs list accommodations and interventions for teachers to use in the classroom. ICAPs may also include recommendations for students to receive Title I services, after-school help (middle and high school), a modified school day, tutoring, online credit recovery courses, and access to the learning skills room (high school). Individual student plans are followed-up by teachers and the CSTs after six weeks.

**B.** CSTs, student needs, and student tragedies prompt the district to respond to students’ social and emotional needs, according to interviews and a review of documents.

1. Referral forms provided by the district and reviewed by the team included a checklist of concerns.

2. The CSTs may recommend social skills groups, alternative classrooms (high school), and behavior plans.

3. The review team was told by the superintendent that two behavioral specialists were assigned to the Baldwinville Elementary School staff to address students’ behavioral issues.

4. Administrators told the team that the district partnered with Riverside Community Care to provide training for staff and parents and screening of students for personal injury risks.

5. The district also developed a Freshman Academy, which consists of four days of orientation for incoming 9th graders, and a Peer Pals program, which matches upperclassmen with freshman at the high school.

**Impact:** The district provides teachers a clear and consistent process as well as a network of support to respond to students’ academic and nonacademic needs. The district has also created a culture of responsiveness to student’s social and emotional needs by partnering with Riverside Community Care to train staff and screen students for personal injury risk, and by developing the Freshmen Academy and Peer Pals program.

**4. The district provides support for students and their families to stay engaged in school. The district also supports families in transition.**

**A.** The district supports families and students with extended activities, including enrichment at the high school.

1. Interviewees said that in an effort to engage families, the district hosted quarterly Family Literacy Nights and other support programs for families and students from preschool to grade two. One elementary school has instituted “positive phone calls.” Interviewees also said that the district scheduled parent-teacher conferences twice a year, and individual schools published monthly newsletters. Interviewees told the team that there were Parent Teacher Groups (PTGs), school councils, and that ConnectED was used PK-12 to communicate with families.

2. Administrators said that the district used Title I funds for extended day mathematics support before the start of the school day at the Baldwinville Elementary School and for a summer program for Title I students.

3. Interviewees mentioned a range of practices to keep students from dropping out of school, including online courses, credit recovery, abbreviated day, and an alternative classroom.

4. Administrators said and ESE data confirmed that the high school has increased the number of advanced placement courses as well as the number of students taking classes. A review of district documents by the review team indicated that 73 students had qualifying scores in mathematics, science, and English in 2011-2012, an increase from 62 in 2010-2011.

5. The review team was told that the district partners with outside agencies such as Riverside Community Care, South Bay Mental Health, Cottage Hill, and Haywood Hospital to provide social and emotional support for students.

**B.** The district recognizes and supports families in transition.

1. A review of district documents by the team indicated that the district provided a printed brochure with a list of resources and school contacts for families in transition.

2. The review team found evidence that the superintendent served as the district’s homeless liaison.

3. Interviewees said that the district provided appropriate immediate special education or Title I services for eligible students of families in transition.

4. Interviewees also said that the district had resources available for transportation and clothing for homeless families.

**Impact:** The district promotes a culture of caring that supports families and students thereby helping students to stay engaged in school. ESE data shows that the annual drop-out rate in Narragansett was lower in 2011 than in 2007, fluctuating from 8.1 percent in 2007 to 2.5 in 2008 to 2.2 in 2009 to 1.3 in 2010 to 1.8 percent in 2011.

***Finance and Asset Management***

**5. The district has a well developed and organized plan to maintain buildings and grounds. The district’s capital plan specifically outlines costs and priorities with respect to the short- and long-term needs of district schools.**

**A.** The director of buildings and grounds told the review team that he regularly performs visual audits at the middle and high schools (district-operated buildings), as well as elementary schools (town-owned and -operated buildings), to gather information about both capital and building and grounds maintenance needs. Identified capital needs in both district-operated schools are compiled during these audits and are updated annually with input from principals.

1. A mid-year report that evaluates building systems and features is generated for each school by the director of buildings and grounds. The report template included rating indicators for the condition of each system --- roofs, heating systems, windows and doors, electrical, lighting, security, and technology. It also outlined the condition of the building’s exterior.

2. The report is generated using a free online building evaluation program for use by school districts.

**B**. Routine repair requests are generated by school principals and are generally expedited, according to administrators.

**C**. Most repairs are preventive and predictive and account for approximately 80 percent of the maintenance, according to the superintendent.

**D**. A review of documents showed that the facilities subcommittee has initiated a preliminary feasibility study, which evaluates the opportunity for the middle and high school to use renewable biomass energy including hardwood pellets and wood chips, to offset fuel oil use with a payback period of 10 years.

**E.** Administrators said that the capital plan for the middle and high schools, which is considered a working document, has been approved by the school committee. The plan includes exterior items such as roof replacement, interior items such as lighting upgrades, and access/egress issues, as well as equipment needs such as mower replacement.

**Impact:** Well organized maintenance and capital planning lower the risk of having to allocate resources for unscheduled replacement or repairs and maintenance. Well resourced and maintained schools provide an atmosphere to students and staff that is conducive to teaching and learning.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

Leadership and Governance

**6. At the time of the review the district was in the early stage of creating, revising, and executing the DIP and SIPs, but did not have an aligned strategic planning process with input from all stakeholders.**

**A.** The district improvement planning process began in the fall of 2012 and the DIP was approved by the school committee in January of 2013, according to administrators.

1. School committee members told the team that a committee made up of school committee members, administrators, and teachers was established to develop the DIP. The superintendent confirmed this information and said that school council members were also members of the committee.

2. At the time of the review all schools were in the process of revising SIPs and aligning them with the DIP, according to school and district leaders.

3. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey[[20]](#footnote-20), 72 percent of Narragansett teachers who responded to a question about their role in school improvement planning (n = 68) indicated that they had a small or no role in school improvement planning.

**B**. According to members of the school committee, the district developed a strategic plan in 2007 and updated it in 2010. Members of the committee told the review team that the district needed to review it again soon. According to the superintendent, a strategic plan will be presented to the school committee for review in fall 2013.

**C**. The district has taken steps to meet the benchmarks and strategic objectives in the DIP, including implementing the educator evaluation system; however, the district has not implemented an organized system of formative and summative assessments or a fully aligned curriculum at all levels. (See the first Curriculum and Instruction and Assessment findings below.)

**Impact:** The absence of an aligned and coherent planning process prevents the district from attaining district and school strategic objectives. Without a process of strategic, district, and school planning that includes alignment of administrator and teacher goals, it will be difficult for the district to define a clear vision and expectations for all staff as well as a mandate for continuous improvement.

**7. Many academic district and school-level administrators are new to the district or to their positions in the district.**

**A**. According to 2011-2012 ESE data, the district has a 50 percent principal turnover rate, but a low teacher turnover rate of 9 percent.

**B.** Five of the six district leaders and principals are serving in new positions in school year 2012-2013, according to interviews and a review of documents.

1. According to information provided to the team, the superintendent is in her first year as the district leader. She also serves as the district’s business manager; since 2009 she has served as assistant superintendent and business manager.

2. The principals of the three elementary schools are new to the district this year [2012-2013]. One is the co-principal of two schools and the other fills the dual role of Title I director for the district.

3. The middle school principal is new as the permanent principal this year [2012-2013] and formerly served as the interim principal of the middle school for one year and before that as the high school assistant principal. He replaced a principal who led the school for twelve years.

4. The executive director of academics is responsible for curriculum, instruction, professional development and also has some responsibilities related to assessment and human resources. Last year (2011-2012), she served as the part time principal of one of the elementary schools, was the district Title I director, and also had curriculum and professional development responsibilities.

**C**. The high school principal and district special education and guidance director positions have not turned over in a number of years.

**D**. According to the superintendent and other district and school leaders, the superintendent holds weekly administrative team meetings, with a recent focus on the implementation of the educator evaluation system.

**E**. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey, 43 percent of teachers who responded to a question about shared vision (n = 67) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that the faculty and school leaders had a shared vision; 48 percent of teachers who responded to a question about the atmosphere in schools (n = 71) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that there was an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect in the school.

**Impact:** Over the last several years, the district has experienced high levels of academic, district, and school level administrator turnover and mobility. Administrator turnover and mobility within the district inhibits the development of a strong organizational structure and continuous improvement planning. Effective implementation of district and school improvement initiatives is compromised as long as the district continues to experience high rates of administrator turnover, intra-district mobility, and financial uncertainty.

***Curriculum and Instruction***

**8. The district is in the early stages of developing curricula that are aligned to the state curriculum standards and managed through the use of a curriculum management system.**

**A.** Curriculum development is the first objective of the DIP and development and alignment with state standards varies from level to level as well as in content areas.

1. A district administrator said that the status of curriculum development was in flux and that alignment with the common core standards had been ongoing during the year and a half before the site visit.

2. A district administrator said the district contracted with the Teaching and Learning Alliance (TLA) five years ago (2008) to assist with the alignment of curriculum.

3. Teachers said that the ELA curriculum (Reading and Writing Workshop) at the elementary level was in curriculum binders and that revision and alignment to the common core standards was ongoing.

4. According to teachers, the EnVision Math Program purchased for K-6 is not aligned to the state standards and is used as a supplementary program while alignment work continues.

5. An interviewee said that there has not been a curriculum review at the middle school for a long time and expressed the opinion that they were starting from scratch. Further, the district just began to review the common core standards last year (2011-2012). The interviewee also said that district curriculum documents and the mathematics curriculum at the middle school were not complete, but that the middle school was working with DSAC consultants to build units.

6. Another interviewee said that the high school English curriculum was almost completely aligned, while another said that the mathematics curriculum at the high school was in the process of being aligned to the common core, but work was at the beginning stage.

7. Teachers told the team that the district did not have a plan in place for the development of curriculum. A school leader said that the high school did not have a plan with a timeline for alignment of the curriculum. The leader also said they were working with the DSAC who was available to help the high school.

**B.** The district has not implemented a consistent process for the vertical articulation of curriculum.

1. An interviewee said that there has not been mathematics articulation between the elementary and middle schools because time was not allotted for it, even though there was a “need to have the same language.”

2. Another interviewee said that mathematics high school teachers met with middle school mathematics teachers this year (2012-2013) for the first time even though it was very important for the high school to know what mathematics instruction was in place at the middle school.

3. Interviewees said vertical articulation from one grade to another took place at each elementary school and at one elementary school there was “lots of talking” because there was only one class in each grade level. Articulation between elementary schools has not been able to be structured. Vertical articulation at the middle school across grade levels takes place twice each month for 45 minutes. High school departments meet with teachers once monthly for 30 minutes after school.

**C.** The district has purchased the Atlas Rubicon Curriculum Management System to manage the district’s curriculum.

1. The district purchased the system a year and half before the site visit and although most teachers have had one training, they were not fully prepared to use the system, according to a district administrator. Training began at the high school and followed at the middle school and elementary schools. School leaders said that training at the elementary level was only introductory.

2. A district administrator said that during the year and a half before the site visit teachers have been entering curriculum into the system using the common template that includes needed assessments.

3. According to an administrator, the high school English department has almost completed entering their curriculum maps into the system and the mathematics department is making progress. At the time of the review it was anticipated that the middle school would complete maps by the end of the 2012-2013 school year. However, the elementary maps would not be completed and entered into the system by the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

**Impact:** The absence of a complete curriculum that is aligned to the common core standards may prevent teachers from providing students with the instruction that is necessary for academic success.

**9. The district does not have a common articulated model for effective instruction.**

**A**. The second strategic objective in the DIP contains an initiative to develop and expand the district’s and schools’ administrative understanding of curricular expectations and instructional practices essential to achieving expected standards for all students.

**B.** School leaders told the team that they provided instructional expectations in different ways. Some said that they handed out expectations that included asking teachers to think about what they wanted students to know. Another said the district wanted more project based learning, more student engagement, less stand and deliver. Also, interviewees said that instructional strategies were included in the high school handbook. Interviewees said that there had been conversations about lesson design and delivery of curriculum, but that they had been more directive than collaborative.

**C**. Interviewees from the middle and high school levels in a teacher focus group of 10 teachers said that the district wanted less teacher directed instruction and more inquiry and project based experiences for students. However, the interviewees went on to say that there has been a lot of administrative turnover that has resulted in differing and changing expectations. The team was told that with all new principals at the elementary level , too, in 2012-2013 that the expectations for instruction were not yet clear. Other interviewees said that instructional expectations were determined by MCAS results.

**D.** In March of 2013, the district implemented a newlearning walkthrough process,and teams of administrators tested the protocol before receiving learning walkthroughtraining from the DSAC.

1. According to district documentation, the new learning walkthrough process focuses on key aspects of standards-based practices and reflects on the implementation of professional development practices.

2. The learning walkthrough is not designed to evaluate teachers, but to gather classroom data that can benefit the school as a whole.

3. The district plans to align the learning walkthrough process to objectives and initiatives in the DIP and SIPs, according to the documentation.

**E.** In order to assist teachers in improving instruction, the district has used the services of the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) as well as Looney Math and Teaching and Learning Alliance (TLA), according to administrators.

1. TLA had provided coaching in reading and writing to elementary teachers for five years before the site visit and to middle school teachers for one.

2. The DSAC has provided grades 3-6 four days of professional development in mathematics.

3. The DSAC works with teachers in providing a lesson study that involves teachers working together to plan a lesson. One teacher teaches the lesson while others observe. Teachers then meet to debrief and plan a follow-up lesson.

4. The DSAC has provided training for district and school leaders in conducting learning walkthroughs and two took place during the spring. Teachers were told there feedback would not be provided, as administrators were still calibrating the learning walkthrough process.

5. School leaders said that the DSAC was very knowledgeable and important to them.

**F**. Instruction is monitored in various ways at the district’s schools.

1. At the high school department heads observe in classrooms, but the principal and assistant principal are primarily responsible for monitoring instruction. Feedback is provided both written and orally.

2. At the middle school the principal and the assistant principal conduct learning walkthroughs but do not provide feedback. A teacher said that very little supervision was provided at the middle school last year (2011-2012).

3. Elementary teachers said that there were observed periodically by administrators.

**Impact:** Because there is not a well articulated and consistent approach to instructional expectations and practices, students are not reliably provided with instruction that leads to improved student achievement.

**10. In observed classes instruction did not generally involve higher-order thinking.**

The team observed 46 classes throughout the district: 14 at the high school, 18 at the middle school, and 14 at the elementary school. The team observed 16 ELA classes, 19 mathematics classes, 4 social studies classes, and 7 science classes. Special education classes, ELL classes and career/technical classes were not observed. 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. Overall data is presented in Appendix C.

**A.** In observed classrooms, teachers generally were not providing instruction that involved higher order thinking, articulating grade appropriate learning objectives that were aligned to standards, or requiring challenging academic tasks.

**1.** Thirty-five percent of the district’s classrooms showed clear and consistent evidence of the lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations.

**2.** Thirty-seven percent of the classrooms showed clear and consistent evidence of grade appropriate learning objectives aligned to the standards.

**3.** Thirty-three percent of the classes showed clear and consistent evidence of requiring inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, & /or evaluation concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking.

**4.** Thirty-five percent of the classes observed showed clear and consistent evidence of using varied questioning techniques that required thoughtful responses and promoted deeper understanding.

**5.** Clear and consistent evidence that students were engaged in challenging academic tasks was found in 37 percent of the classrooms.

**6.** In four percent of the classrooms the review team observed clear and consistent evidence of student work that demonstrated high quality and could serve as exemplars.

**7**. Clear and consistent evidence of appropriate and varied strategies that meet students’ diverse learning needs was observed in 15 percent of the classrooms visited.

**Impact:** When high-quality instructional practices are not being fully implemented throughout the district’s schools, students are not being provided with the quality of instruction that leads to improved student achievement.

Assessment

**11.The district does not have a formal, comprehensive K-12 assessment system with the capacity to collect, analyze, and disseminate timely and relevant student performance data, make it readily accessible to all staff, and use it to continuously monitor student progress, modify curriculum and classroom instruction, and accurately determine student, school, and district needs to make budget decisions.**

**A.** One of the key strategic objectives of the new DIP is the creation of common formative and summative assessments at all levels.

1.The DIP does not assign or empower any individual or group with direct responsibility for developing a comprehensive assessment system. Instead, it indicates that the “Executive Director of Academics, Building Principals, and Teachers” are all responsible, and that a committee to “research standards based reporting” should be formed in September, 2013.

**B.** Responsibilities for data collection, analysis, and dissemination currently vary widely within the district. At the elementary schools, the reading specialist and Title I director, who is also the Phillipston Memorial School principal, share responsibility for these functions and meet with grade level teachers as need requires and opportunity allows. These responsibilities are assumed at the middle school by the two school administrators and at the high school by the department heads.

**C.** The elementary level (K-4) is making some progress in using student achievement data to measure student performance. It currently uses standardized, primarily summative, assessments, which are generally administered only once or twice each year, rather than common formative and benchmark assessments that can provide more detailed, frequent, and continuous student performance data.

1**.** In addition to the required MCAS testing, the district’s three elementary schools currently use the following ELA assessment programs for all students K-4: Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) twice a year, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) thrice a year, and Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) 1once a year. Administrators said that the district was in the process of replacing DRA with the Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Reading program. In mathematics, Group Math Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GMADE) twice a year and EnVisions thrice a year, used K-6, are the only standardized assessment systems employed. Interviewees said that, with the exception of DIBELS, which is administered bi-weekly or monthly for at risk students, data was used primarily for student placement purposes and to determine Title I eligibility and special education needs rather than serving as a progress monitor or tool for improving classroom practice.

2**.** Assessment training to support the Fountas & Pinnell Reading Program’s introduction, as well as some targeted data analysis training though DSAC, has been provided to elementary teachers this year [2012-2013]. In general, teachers at all levels expressed a need for expanded and sustained training in data collection and analysis methodologies. Among teachers districtwide responding to the 2012 TELL Mass survey, for example, 43 percent expressed the need for more professional development in using data to drive instructional decision making (n = 60).

3**.** The district’s elementary schools have not developed any common grade level or subject area formative or summative benchmark assessments by which to regularly monitor student progress, guide classroom instruction, and make timely modifications to the curriculum. Interviewees acknowledged the need to develop a comprehensive set of district determined student performance measures at all grade levels.

4**.** The collection, analysis, and dissemination of data was described in interviews as done “informally” and the manner by which it is conducted varies considerably across district. At present, the district does not have data teams in its district’s elementary schools or at the central office to oversee and unify the collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance data.

**D.**  The middle and high schools lag substantially behind the elementary schools in developing a comprehensive assessment system characterized by coordinated and articulated common formative and summative performance measures and practices needed to continuously collect, analyze, and communicate student achievement data.

1**.** At present, neither school has developed either formative or summative common assessments by which to benchmark student growth, guide instruction, and inform curriculum modifications. The high school does administer midterm and final examinations but according to interviewees, only the English department uses common assessments. Consequently, little formal collection or analysis of comparable student performance data is possible.

2.With the exception of MCAS results, which are reviewed at the departmental level, team members found limited evidence of systematic data collection or analyses to inform instructional program improvements, professional development, or assessment practices at either the middle school or high school.

3**.** In interviews with review team members, high school teachers said that what little student achievement data there was (for example, MCAS and PSAT/SAT) got to them slowly and that analysis of the data often took place as “informal conversations.” As in the elementary schools, data teams have not been created at the middle or high school to coordinate, facilitate, and improve data collection and dissemination policies and practices.

4**.** Secondary teachers said that training in data collection and analysis methodologies has not been provided to them, and to their knowledge the district was not currently planning any.

**Impact:** Although the elementary schools appear to be making more and better use of student achievement data than the middle and high schools, the district as a whole is not making effective or appropriate use of data to improve student achievement and inform all aspects of its policy and decision making. As a consequence, the district’s ability to make appropriate decisions and timely enhancements to its curriculum, assessment practices, professional development programming, classroom instruction, and goal and policy development is substantially compromised.

Human Resources and Professional Development

**12. The district’s professional development plans are generally aligned to the** **strategic objective initiatives in the January 2013 DIP; however, the professional development plans have not been planned collaboratively by teachers and are not aligned to the SIPs, which were being revised at the time of the review.**

**A.** Each school level has a professional development plan generally aligned to the DIP approved in January 2013, according to the executive director for academics.

1. A document review by the team indicated that the district had elementary school level, middle school level, and high school level 2012-2013 professional development plans that were generally aligned with the DIP approved in January 2013. The plans include professional development initiatives, and the dates and venues for professional development meetings.

2. The three professional development plans include training on the new educator evaluation system, as well as curriculum articulation, instructional practices and bullying. A new education training schedule is included on the district website.

**B**.Teachers told the review team thatprofessional development planning in the district did not involve a collaborative process that was data driven and fully engaged all teachers.

1. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey, of district teachers who responded to a question about their role in developing professional development programs (n = 69), 51 percent said that they had a small role in determining the content of in-service professional development programs and 28 percent said that they had no role at all.

2. Of district teachers who responded to a question about professional development resources (n = 69), 68 percent disagreed with the statement that enough professional development resources were available at their school; 60 percent of the teachers who responded to a question about the amount of time spent on professional development (n = 62) said that they spent less than an hour a week on professional development and 19 percent said that they did not spend any time each week on professional development.

**C**. According to district leaders, the district has nine early-release professional development days (half days) as well as one full professional development day. The full day consists of professional development collaboration between Narragansett, Ashburnham-Westminster, Winchendon, and Gardner (NAWWG Day).

1. Other professional development may take place during common planning time, staff meetings, vertical team meetings, department head meetings, outside conferences, during the summer, or be job embedded, according to district leaders.

2. The superintendent said that she believed in embedding professional development in the teacher’s day. Job embedded professional development is provided through the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC). Examples of DSAC job embedded professional development includelesson study andlearning walkthroughtraining. Lesson study is a form of professional development that relies on teacher inquiry to improve instructional practice, according to a lesson study description provided to the team. The superintendent told the team that all elementary teachers had been trained in Reader and Writers Workshop through a partnership with the Teaching and Learning Alliance (TLA).

3. Professional development is differentiated by school level and content during professional development days, according to district leaders and a review of agendas. For example, on October 1, 2012, elementary teachers received professional development from a TLA consultant in reading assessments; middle school teachers received curriculum alignment professional development through the DSAC; and high school teachers focused on NEASC activities. Nurses, physical education teachers, special educators, and guidance personnel received targeted training on the same day.

**D**. The district relies on grants to fund most professional development; professional development from the DSAC is provided free of charge. From 2009 to 2011, the professional development per pupil expenditure fluctuated in Narragansett from $244 in 2009 to $133 in 2010 to $173 in 2011, ending up lower, while the state rate increased steadily from $224 in 2009 to $226 in 2010 to $238 in 2011. Interviewees confirmed that there was a budget for professional development, but that it had been reduced.

**Impact:** The absence of a collaboratively developed system of professional development aligned to both the DIP and the SIPs compromises professional growth, competency, and accountability of staff and hinders the district’s ability to meet strategic objectives.

**13. Solid systems of teacher collaboration are not in place at all school levels to ensure that all teachers meet regularly to discuss student work and achievement.**

**A.** Because of scheduling conflicts, teachers at one elementary school are prevented from collaborating with grade level teachers in the other elementary schools, according to teachers.

1. Elementary teachers have grade-level common planning time twice a week for 30 minutes.

**B**. Middle school grade level teams have one common period a day for planning and vertical teams meet twice a month for 45 minutes, according to school leaders. Teams determine their own agenda, according to the school leaders.

**C**. High school teachers have one planning period per day, but it is not common. They also have 30 minute department meetings, 60 minute faculty meetings, and monthly principal advisory meetings. Department heads meet with the principal for 60 minutes once per month.

**D.** In the 2012 TELL Mass Survey, 59 percent of the district teachers who responded to a question about time with colleagues (n = 70) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they had time available to collaborate with colleagues.

**Impact:** The absence of organized professional learning communities prevents targeted discussions among teachers that could lead to improved student achievement.

Student Support

**14. The district’s tiered system of support is missing critical elements to identify and support student academic needs.**

**A**. The district provided the review team with a color-coded chart of its tiered system of support. The chart lists general core curriculum with modifications and accommodations as Tier I; CST (Child Study Team) referrals, additional support, and other services as Tier II; and screening and evaluating for special education and increased support as Tier III.

**B**. Interviews and a document review showed that the district did not have common formative assessments in reading and mathematics K-12 that were uniformly administered and results analyzed to provide ongoing feedback on student performance.

**C**. There is limitedrigor and differentiation in core classroom instruction.

1. Interviewees said that they were always asking for models of differentiation and that some teachers had a handle on differentiation while others might not.

2. Classroom observations showed little differentiation in the core classroom instruction. Team members saw clear and consistent evidence of multiple resources available to meet student’s diverse learning needs in only 12 out of 46 classrooms observed.

3. Team members saw clear and consistent evidence of varied strategies that meet students’ diverse learning needs in only 7 out of 46 classrooms observed.

4. In observed classrooms team members saw clear and consistent evidence of lessons reflecting rigor and high expectations in only 16 out of 46 classrooms visited.

**D**. Support for students who are performing below grade level in reading and mathematics is limited.

1. Title I, which provides pull-out support during the school day, extended day mathematics support, and a summer program, is limited to students K-4 who are Title I eligible.

2. A review by the team of documents provided by the district indicated that 134 students were supported with Title I funds.

3. Interviewees said that Title I was the primary Tier II intervention and a special education referral was the primary Tier III intervention.

4. When interviewees were asked what supports were available for non-Title I students, they noted CSTs, accommodations, and 504s; however, they did not mention any of the programs listed on the color-coded chart of tiered system of support provided to the team.

5. Interviewees said that while they referred students who were struggling to the CSTs, formal academic support programs or summer school programs were not available for these students because of limited resources. Teachers do stay after school to provide students with support including homework help.

**Impact:** The absence of a comprehensive tiered system of academic support is leaving many students without the interventions they need to ensure proficiency on MCAS tests. According to ESE data, between 2008 and 2012 there was only a three percentage point increase in the ELA proficiency rate for all students (61 percent in 2008 and 2009, 63 percent in 2010, 63 percent in 2011, and 64 percent in 2012). In addition, between 2008 to 2012, there was a decrease of one percentage point in the MCAS mathematics proficiency rate (49 percent in 2008, 48 percent in 2009, 54 percent in 2010, 53 percent in 2011, and 48 percent in 2012).

Finance and Asset Management

15. The district has not developed an underlying formal structure to make budget decisions based on an analysis of student achievement data and input from teachers.

**A.** The district does not have a formal, comprehensive K-12 assessment system with the capacity to collect, analyze, and disseminate timely and relevant student performance data.

1. Interviewees said that the district did not have any “formal” data teams. Administrators and teachers said that the district did not have data teams but that they were being developed at the elementary and middle schools.

**B**. A school committee member noted that data assessment did not drive district policy.

1.A school committee member noted that the budget is not developed around student achievement data but that the committee does discuss class size. Another school committee member noted that the district needs systemic change and that there is not enough student assessment to drive district policy.

**C**. Administration invites department chairs, principals, and the maintenance director to present requests.

1. Principals said that they were asked to level fund but to also request what they believe is necessary to operate their schools.

2. At school committee budget subcommittee meetings, department heads and principals are invited to present budget information.

**D**. A review of budget information presented at public forums showed that subtotaled instructional and other subsidiary accounts were not included in the presentation nor were the figures analyzed against prior years for analysis by stakeholders.

**E**. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey, of district teachers who responded to a question about involvement in their school’s budget (n = 70), 93 percent said that they had a small role or no role at all in providing input into the school’s budget.

**Impact:** In the absence of a systemic plan to analyze and apply student achievement data to allocate financial resources, the district will have difficulty maximizing the impact of the funding it receives to improve student achievement. The limited analysis of student achievement data to build the budget will have an impact on the district’s ability to provide an educationally appropriate budget.

Narragansett Regional School District, District Review Recommendations

Leadership and Governance

**1. The** **superintendent and the administrative team should together develop methods to monitor the implementation of the new DIP and the revised SIPs. Approaches should be developed to measure progress toward meeting DIP and SIP goals. Continuing to update the Strategic Plan should also be a priority.**

**A.** DIP andSIP teams should be created and should meet frequently to monitor district and school improvement progress.

1.The school committee and the superintendent should make it a priority to continue updating the Strategic Plan in alignment with the DIP and SIP goals.

1. ESE’s *District Self-Assessment Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/review/district/district-self-assessment.pdf>) is a resource designed to support districts in assessing their systems and processes as part of an ongoing cycle of inquiry for continuous improvement.

2. Principals should develop and train school improvement teams, and encourage teachers to provide input into the development of SIPs.

a. ESE's *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CSESelf-Assesment.pdf>) is a tool to help schools to conduct a scan of current practice, identify areas of strength, and highlight areas requiring greater focus.

3. The process of revising the DIP and SIPs should be aligned with the district’s budget development cycle to ensure that the resources needed to meet DIP and SIP goals and objectives are allocated and funded.

4.The superintendent should require updates by principals on the status of the revision of SIPs. All revised SIPS should be presented to the school committee when they have been completed.

5. The district should develop a communication plan so that all staff and stakeholders understand the DIP and SIPs and their roles in meeting goals.

6. District and school leaders, including school improvement teams, should develop a plan to collect and analyze the data needed to measure success in meeting DIP and SIP goals as part of an ongoing continuous cycle of improvement.

a. ESE’s *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/level4/AIP-GuidingPrinciples.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.

7. The administrative team should provide the school committee with progress toward meeting DIP and SIP goals and objectives at school committee meetings.

**B.** Principals should lead the school improvement process, prioritize the review of SIP goals and measures at school improvement and leadership team meetings, and be accountable for successful SIP implementation.

1. Principals should align their educator goals, developed as part of the new educator evaluation system, with goals in the revised SIPs.

2. The superintendent should provide principals with useful feedback about SIP implementation, including supporting principals in making midcourse corrections based on data.

3. Professional development plans should be periodically reviewed to ensure that they are aligned with and focused on DIP and SIP goals and objectives.

**Benefits**: Developing a structured process to review, monitor, and revise improvement plans, and to continue updating the Strategic Plan, has several associated benefits. First, it creates a culture of collaboration and a focus on continuous school improvement across the district. Second, it requires that professional development and other resources are focused and aligned. Third, it helps the district to make decisions and allocate resources based on the collection and analysis of data in light of shared, widely understood goals.

**2.** **The school committee and the superintendent should conduct a survey of stakeholders to assess the reasons for high administrator turnover and examine methods to retain and support administrators.**

**A**. The school committee and superintendent should collaborate with administrators to explore what factors may have caused past administrators to move on from the district and what factors might cause current administrators to leave.

1. The school committee and superintendent should conduct a survey of administrative salaries and benefits in nearby districts to determine whether salaries are competitive. If it is determined that salaries and benefits are not competitive the school committee and superintendent should develop a strategy to address the disparity.

2. The school committee and superintendent, in addition to surveying the salaries of local school districts, should consider developing a creative and strategic benefit and compensation package to attract talented administrators.

3. The superintendent and school committee should support administrators by establishing a formal mentoring/coaching program and aligning its goals with those established in the DIP and SIPs and the educator evaluation system.

4. The district should allocate resources for sustained professional development to encourage career development for administrators.

5. The superintendent should establish a structured exit interview process to obtain immediate feedback about why an administrator is leaving.

6. The district should consider ways to provide opportunities for teachers to become leaders while remaining in the classroom as well as possible pathways to support them in transitioning from teaching to administrator roles.

**Benefits:** The benefits of stable district and school leadership are many, including the potential for improved staff morale, consistent implementation of district and school initiatives, and reduced hiring and training costs. Providing resources and programs to support district and school leaders can instill a culture of support and value that will enable the district to retain and attract district and school leaders.

Curriculum and Instruction

**3**. **The district should continue to pursue the DIP goal of developing and implementing a rigorous curriculum PK- 12. Leaders should ensure that there is a plan in place that will guide the district in its development, implementation, and monitoring of curricula that are aligned to state standards.**

**A**. The plan for development of curriculum should include specific timelines as well as individuals responsible for the development and implementation of curriculum. The plan should also include monitoring for goal completion and should be communicated to all staff in the district.

**B**. The district and its schools should explore ways to provide adequate time for teachers to develop and align curricula. The elementary level should continue to align its mathematics curriculum and any other unaligned curricula to state standards and the middle school should work to align its curricula to state standards. This work should also continue at the high school where only ELA is aligned to state standards. The high school needs to provide time for curriculum development. At the present time, only one hour and 30 minutes per month is available for this work. The challenge of finding adequate time at the high school is complicated by the fact that the school is preparing for a NEASC visit in 2014. Currently, students are not being taught a vertically aligned mathematics curriculum that incorporates common core state standards.

**C.** The district should provide additional Atlas Rubicon curriculum management system training for all its teachers to ensure that they can enter curriculum documents into the system using a common template and can access curriculum easily.

**D.** District and school leaders should monitor the content of the Atlas Rubicon curriculum management system in order to ensure the quality and consistency of the written curriculum.

**E.**  Principals at all levels should develop methods to ensure that the curriculum is being delivered with fidelity in all classrooms.

**F.** The district should also provide teachers with sufficient opportunities for curriculum revision. This should include the analysis of relevant data to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum, as well as teachers’ collaborative reflection and discussions about curriculum implementation and revision.

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

**Benefits:** Developing a rigorous, aligned curriculum in all content areas and grades enables the district to provide a cohesive and usable set of curriculum materials and helps students attain higher levels of achievement. Providing time for revision of curriculum can also ensure that there is vertical alignment across all grade levels. The full use of the curriculum management system will not only provide all teachers with access to all curriculum documents but will facilitate the articulation of curriculum across all levels.

**4**. **In order to improve instruction and the achievement of all students, the district should continue to pursue the DIP goal of defining good instruction and find opportunities to systematically communicate these agreed-upon definitions to all staff in a timely manner.**

**A**. The district should develop an instructional plan that contains specific goals and expectations related to excellent instruction. The plan should include professional development that will lead to a common understanding of what excellent instruction looks like. This information should be communicated to all in the district along with expectations for implementation.

**B**. The district should provide time for school leaders and teachers to discuss what constitutes good instruction and how effective instructional strategies can be implemented at all levels.

1. School leaders and teachers should be provided with professional development focused on effective instructional practices.

2. Teachers should be provided opportunities to discuss current instructional practices and how they might be enhanced.

3. All teachers should be provided with examples of good instructional practices. This can be accomplished through the use of videos as well as through peer observations.

4. Teachers should be provided with specific information relating to such aspects of good classroom instruction as the communication of lesson objectives, the pacing of lessons, and the use of strategies that encourage the use of higher order thinking skills.

a. *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning. It is part of ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>).

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

5. Teachers who are having difficulty implementing high-quality instruction should be provided with extra support through frequent feedback from administrators, peer coaching, and other professional development.

**C.** District and school leaders should continue to conduct learning walkthroughs at all levels. The walkthrough protocol should include ways to provide feedback about instructional trends. School leaders at all levels should prioritize regularly visiting classrooms to observe instruction, and should ensure that their schedules allow for this.

1. Learning walkthroughs should take place regularly at all levels. Feedback should include instructional trends and areas for improvement.

2. School leaders should establish routines for observing instruction and providing timely feedback to teachers.

3. Administrators should be made aware of instructional expectations and provided with professional development and support in giving useful feedback to teachers about attainment of these instructional goals.

**Benefits:** Establishing and communicating instructional expectations will help to ensure that students receive consistent, high-quality instruction at all levels. A shared definition of effective instruction will help administrators to provide focused, coherent feedback and will help teachers to use a shared language to collaboratively reflect on and plan their teaching.

Assessment

**5. The district should prioritize the creation of a comprehensive and fully coordinated K-12 assessment system. This integrated system should have clearly identified leadership, well-defined responsibilities, and widely communicated goals and objectives.**

**A.** Policies and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance data should be developed; they should be consistent and effective and include specific strategies, timelines, and expectations for all schools, grade levels, and subject areas across the district.

1.Every school in the district should employ a comprehensive and balanced system of common formative, summative, and benchmark assessments, both standardized and locally developed. Assessments should be developed and selected based on the data that teachers, schools, and the district need in order to accurately monitor and continually support the academic progress of every student.

2.Structures should be created (for example, data teams) that enable school administrators and faculty to work together and communicate regularly, systematically, and efficiently about data analysis. Their work should enable staff to make appropriate adjustments to classroom instruction and timely decisions about support services, interventions, and needed improvements to the curriculum.

a. *ESE’s District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.

3**.** Targeted and sustained professional development should be provided for all professional staff in the analysis and applications of student performance data, so that these competencies are embedded in all schools, grade levels, and content areas.

4.All staff should be provided convenient access to the results of all student testing, as well as to other relevant academic data. All members of the school community, including the school committee and parents, should be routinely provided with appropriate and timely information generated through expanded and improved assessment programs and practices.

5.District and school leaders should incorporate student assessment data and other pertinent information into all aspects of decision making, including developing the annual budget and the DIP and SIPs and evaluating educational programs and services.

6.The district should prioritize the selection of reliable, high-quality, district-determined measures that can be used to accurately assess student growth and achievement and also be used, in conjunction with the state’s new educator evaluation system, to help determine educator effectiveness.

**Benefits:** The systematic analysis of student achievement data can:

* help teachers and administrators identify ways to improve classroom instruction;
* help to provide targeted student support services;
* enhance curriculum revision;
* support educational policy and decision making; and
* strengthen student progress monitoring throughout all of the district’s schools.

In addition, data analyses can directly inform both professional development and the supervision and evaluation of staff. Ultimately, implementing this recommendation can contribute to substantially enhanced learning opportunities and outcomes for all students.

Human Resources and Professional Development

**6. District and school leaders should ensure that school professional development plans are aligned with the DIP and SIPs and that the plans reflect teacher input. A district professional development plan should be created.**

**A**. The district should allocate funds for professional development with consideration for the competencies needed by staff to attain the goals and objectives included in the DIP and SIPs.

**B**. All staff should be surveyed annually to determine professional development needs and priorities and those needs should be considered in an annual review and revision of professional development plans.

**C**.The district should consider staff needs identified as part of the educator evaluation system while making decisions about professional development.

D. The district should create a professional development committee consisting of administrators and teachers to implement a collaborative process for planning professional development and to research additional methods of funding and delivering professional development to staff.

E. The district should continue to implement and enhance the learning walkthrough process, which focuses on standards-based practices and reflects on the ways in which strategies learned through professional development are implemented in the classroom.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation in Narragansett will increase the likelihood of attaining DIP and SIP goals and objectives and contribute to improved staff performance and higher student achievement.

**7. To improve instruction and embed a culture of professional learning in each school to foster continuous improvement, school leaders should develop common planning time structures along with expectations for teachers to collaborate in a meaningful way to improve student achievement.**

**A.** School leaders should make the development of professional learning communities in Narragansett a priority.

1. School leaders should develop professional learning communities with goals aligned to district and school goals as well as teacher goals developed as part of the new educator evaluation system.

a. Resources that might be useful include ESE’s *Professional Learning Community Guidance* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/PLCguidance.pdf>) and *Professional Learning Community Stages at a Glance* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/PLCstages.pdf>), which are reference tools to frame the work of developing and strengthening instructional teams at the school level.

b. ESE’s District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) is another resource to provide support in developing new professional learning community strategies.

**B**. To support professional learning communities, the district should take the steps necessary to add common planning time to teachers’ schedules.

1.Principals should take the lead in developing a climate of professional learning and should conduct an evaluation of current common planning time structure and effectiveness at their schools.

a. The *Common Planning Time Self-Assessment Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/CPTtoolkit.pdf>) is a guide to help districts raise student achievement by building capacity to support effective teacher instructional teams.

2. School leaders should consider visiting other schools and districts that have implemented collaborative common planning time models, such as expanded learning time schools.

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will enhance and systematize effective communication about teaching and learning. An organized, efficient, focused, and collaborative planning and reflection process can contribute to increased student achievement.

Student Support

**8**. **The district should strengthen its tiered system of interventions so that all students can more readily be supported and challenged.**

**A.** The district should support teachers in identifying students’ academic needs using results from formative assessments in consistent and unified ways that will provide ongoing indicators of student learning needs. The results of the analysis should drive instruction, interventions, and differentiated groupings.

1. A resource that might be helpful is the Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) *Self-Assessment Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/>), which is designed to help schools and districts establish priorities and develop a coherent action plan to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

**B.** The district should identify and communicate to all staff the specific interventions and modifications that will be provided both in class and outside of class to students who need additional support.

**C.** Teachers should be expected to identify students who are ready for accelerated work and to provide rigorous in-class extension activities or projects; this will ensure that all students are appropriately challenged and have the opportunity to grow.

**D.** A common understanding of what differentiation looks like and how students at all levels will benefit should be communicated to all instructional staff. The district should provide professional development for teachers in differentiation strategies. Differentiation strategies should be incorporated into the districtwide instructional model and should be monitored through walkthroughs and other mechanisms.

**Benefits:**  Implementing this recommendation will provide opportunities for all students to be challenged and supported and will help to develop a climate conducive to learning for all students. Using data and agreed-upon criteria to assign students to available interventions will make the district’s color-coded chart an active and living document. Finally, common understanding of differentiated instruction and support and accountability for the use of differentiation strategies will contribute to a culture of student-centered classroom instruction.

***Finance and Asset Management***

**9. In order to build an adaptable, cost-effective and equitable budget that focuses on improving achievement for all students, the district should embed in the budget development process the review and analysis of student data as a basis for budget decisions.**

**A**. The district should align the budget development process with the DIP and SIP development cycle and consider the goals and objectives of the plans when funding and allocating resources.

1. As recommended above under Assessment, district and school leaders should incorporate student assessment data and other pertinent information into all aspects of decision making, including developing the annual budget and the DIP and SIPs and evaluating educational programs and services.

2. To ensure equity of resources, district and school leaders should consider the educational needs of all student subgroups, including students with disabilities and all at-risk students when developing school and district budgets.

3. In budget presentations to the public and school committee, the district should include enough detail so that appropriations and expenditures related to instruction and academic programs are clearly communicated.

4.School committee members should be provided periodic academic reports by the superintendent or principals, including student assessment results and progress toward DIP and SIP goals.

**Benefits:** Reviewing student data will help to identify

* effective programs and personnel and
* successful teaching and academic support models

to be supported with resources and perhaps expanded or replicated. It will also provide confidence to stakeholders that the budget is not static or historical, but adaptable and transparent.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from April 22-25, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. John Moretti, leadership and governance
2. Dolores Fitzgerald, curriculum and instruction
3. Frank Sambuceti, assessment
4. James L. Hearns, human resources and professional development, review team coordinator
5. Lenora Jennings, student support
6. Richard Scortino, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: superintendent and the assistant business manager.

The team conducted interviews with the seven members of the regional school committee.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators (administrative team): superintendent, executive director of academics, special education director, director of guidance, high school principal, middle school principal, and two elementary school principals. The superintendent also serves as the business manager.

The team visited the following schools: Baldwinville Elementary School (grades 2-4), Templeton Center Elementary School (K-1), Phillipston Memorial Elementary School (PK-4), Narragansett Regional Middle School (grades 5-8), and Narragansett Regional High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and focus groups with three elementary school teachers and five high school teachers. A third focus group was scheduled with middle school teachers, but none attended.

The team observed 46 classes in the district: 14 at the high school18 at the middle school, and 14 at the elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**  04/22/2013 | **Tuesday**  04/23/2013 | **Wednesday**  04/24/2013 | **Thursday**  04/25/2013 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; and an interview with teachers’ association. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; an interview with the teachers association; Interviews with town or city personnel; and visits to the middle and high schools for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to the Phillipston, Baldwinville, and Templeton Center elementary schools for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

**Table B1a: Narragansett Regional School District**

**2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Student Group** | 1. **District** | 1. **Percent of Total** | 1. **State** | 1. **Percent of Total** |
| Asian | 4 | 0.3% | 56,517 | 5.9% |
| Afr. Amer./Black | 14 | 1.0% | 81,806 | 8.6% |
| Hispanic/ Latino | 27 | 1.9% | 156,976 | 16.4% |
| Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat. | 38 | 2.7% | 26,012 | 2.7% |
| Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl. | 4 | 0.3% | 1,020 | 0.1% |
| White | 1,335 | 93.6% | 630,150 | 66.0% |
| **All students** | **1,426** | **100.0%** | **954,773** | **100.0%** |
| Note: As of October 1, 2012 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Narragansett Regional School District**

2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 173 | 36.3% | 12.1% | 163,921 | 35.5% | 17.0% |
| Low income | 363 | 76.1% | 25.5% | 353,420 | 76.5% | 37.0% |
| ELL and Former ELL | 0 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 95,865 | 20.7% | 10.0% |
| **All high needs students** | **477** | **--** | **33.5%** | **462,272** | **--%** | **47.9%** |

Note: District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

**Table B2: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending**

**Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY11** | | **FY12** | | **FY13** |
|  | Estimated | Actual | Estimated | Actual | Estimated |
| Expenditures | | | | | |
| From school committee budget | 19,233,858 | 19,018,119 | 19,236,914 | 21,189,005 | 18,165,788 |
| From revolving funds and grants | --- | 2,615,154 | --- | 1,763,780 | --- |
| Total expenditures | --- | 21,633,273 | --- | 22,952,785 | --- |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | --- | 9,556,093 | --- | 9,607,394 | 9,664,194 |
| Required local contribution | --- | 4,548,674 | --- | 4,564,055 | 4,721,311 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | --- | 14,104,767 | --- | 14,171,449 | 14,385,505 |
| Actual net school spending | --- | 16,410,877 | --- | 15,843,250 | 15,215,020 |
| Over/under required ($) | --- | 2,306,110 | --- | 1,671,801 | 829,515 |
| Over/under required (%) | --- | 16.3 | --- | 11.8 | 5.8 |
| \*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.  \*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.  Sources: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports; Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website.  Data retrieved Feb. 7, 2013 for expenditures, April 26, 2013 for c. 70. | | | | | |

Table B3: Narragansett Regional School District

Expenditures Per In-District Pupil

Fiscal Years 2010–2012

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| Administration | $526.39 | $544.22 | $553.80 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $638.40 | $731.71 | $707.31 |
| Teachers | $4,386.07 | $4,894.73 | $4,685.27 |
| Other teaching services | $717.28 | $764.43 | $753.07 |
| Professional development | $133.01 | $172.66 | $173.49 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $257.58 | $151.83 | $149.70 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $324.78 | $339.29 | $357.39 |
| Pupil services | $1,153.58 | $1,105.90 | $1,127.06 |
| Operations and maintenance | $886.52 | $948.78 | $994.32 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $1,741.94 | $2,045.60 | $2,151.87 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $10,765.55 | $11,699.15 | $11,738.11 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/) | | | |

**Table B4a: Narragansett Regional School District**

**English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | | | **2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** | **Potentially Meaningful?** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| 3 | CPI | 92 | 80.4 | 84.2 | 86.3 | 86.4 | 6 | 0.1 | -- | Low |
| P+ | 92 | 51% | 59% | 64% | 58% | 7 | -6 | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 106 | 74.2 | 71.6 | 74.6 | 80.4 | 6.2 | 5.8 | Yes | Low |
| P+ | 106 | 40% | 30% | 41% | 56% | 16 | 15 | -- |
| SGP | 98 | 37.0 | 28.0 | 40.0 | 47.0 | 10.0 | 7.0 | Moderate |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 83.7 | 80.6 | 80.3 | 79.0 | -4.7 | -1.3 | -- | Very Low |
| P+ | 132 | 56% | 52% | 46% | 55% | -1 | 9 | -- |
| SGP | 123 | 37.5 | 59.0 | 39.0 | 43.0 | 5.5 | 4.0 | Moderate |
| 6 | CPI | 128 | 83.5 | 87.2 | 81.0 | 79.1 | -4.4 | -1.9 | -- | Very Low |
| P+ | 128 | 55% | 70% | 57% | 51% | -4 | -6 | -- |
| SGP | 120 | 28.5 | 55.0 | 45.0 | 42.0 | 13.5 | -3.0 | Moderate |
| 7 | CPI | 123 | 88.5 | 88.0 | 88.0 | 83.5 | -5.0 | -4.5 | Yes | Very Low |
| P+ | 123 | 67% | 67% | 69% | 59% | -8 | -10 | -- |
| SGP | 116 | 40.0 | 58.0 | 35.0 | 29.5 | -10.5 | -5.5 | Low |
| 8 | CPI | 143 | 89.3 | 94.2 | 92.5 | 90.4 | 1.1 | -2.1 | -- | Low |
| P+ | 143 | 75% | 86% | 80% | 76% | 1 | -4 | -- |
| SGP | 133 | 33.0 | 67.0 | 56.0 | 46.0 | 13.0 | -10.0 | Moderate |
| 10 | CPI | 99 | 96.2 | 90.7 | 94.4 | 98.0 | 1.8 | 3.6 | Yes | Moderate |
| P+ | 99 | 87% | 77% | 86% | 95% | 8 | 9 | -- |
| SGP | 88 | 56.0 | 62.0 | 58.0 | 72.0 | 16.0 | 14.0 | High |
| **All** | **CPI** | **823** | **85.2** | **85.6** | **85.3** | **85.0** | **-0.2** | **-0.3** | **--** | **Low** |
| **P+** | **823** | **62%** | **64%** | **63%** | **64%** | **2** | **1** | **--** |
| **SGP** | **678** | **38.0** | **55.0** | **44.5** | **45.0** | **7.0** | **0.5** | **Moderate** |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4b: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Mathematics Performance, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | | | **2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** | **Potentially Meaningful?** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| 3 | CPI | 92 | 86.0 | 85.7 | 87.5 | 77.2 | -8.8 | -10.3 | Yes | Low |
| P+ | 92 | 63% | 66% | 66% | 49% | -14 | -17 | -- |
| 4 | CPI | 107 | 74.4 | 74.8 | 72.9 | 66.4 | -8 | -6.5 | Yes | Very Low |
| P+ | 107 | 34% | 36% | 33% | 24% | -10 | -9 | -- |
| SGP | 98 | 40.5 | 26.0 | 30.0 | 21.0 | -19.5 | -9.0 | Low |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 68.1 | 74.4 | 79.0 | 66.5 | -1.6 | -12.5 | Yes | Very Low |
| P+ | 132 | 37% | 49% | 55% | 36% | -1 | -19 | -- |
| SGP | 122 | 39.0 | 57.0 | 44.0 | 28.0 | -11.0 | -16.0 | Low |
| 6 | CPI | 128 | 76.3 | 77.3 | 75.4 | 78.7 | 2.4 | 3.3 | -- | Low |
| P+ | 128 | 52% | 54% | 51% | 52% | 0 | 1 | -- |
| SGP | 118 | 58.5 | 63.0 | 44.0 | 47.5 | -11.0 | 3.5 | Moderate |
| 7 | CPI | 124 | 74.3 | 73.1 | 75.4 | 79.0 | 4.7 | 3.6 | Yes | Moderate |
| P+ | 124 | 44% | 47% | 50% | 52% | 8 | 2 | -- |
| SGP | 116 | 55.0 | 59.5 | 65.0 | 71.0 | 16.0 | 6.0 | High |
| 8 | CPI | 140 | 70.0 | 75.8 | 69.2 | 72.5 | 2.5 | 3.3 | Yes | Low |
| P+ | 140 | 42% | 49% | 41% | 45% | 3 | 4 | -- |
| SGP | 133 | 38.5 | 55.5 | 42.0 | 48.0 | 9.5 | 6.0 | Moderate |
| 10 | CPI | 96 | 90.8 | 89.0 | 90.6 | 93.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | Yes | Moderate |
| P+ | 96 | 74% | 74% | 77% | 84% | 10 | 7 | -- |
| SGP | 87 | 39.0 | 47.0 | 42.0 | 48.0 | 9.0 | 6.0 | Moderate |
| **All** | **CPI** | **819** | **76.4** | **78.5** | **78.2** | **75.7** | **-0.7** | **-2.5** | **--** | **Low** |
| **P+** | **819** | **48%** | **54%** | **53%** | **48%** | **0** | **-5** | **--** |
| **SGP** | **674** | **45.0** | **51.0** | **45.0** | **41.5** | **-3.5** | **-3.5** | **Moderate** |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. The “2012 Performance” column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4c: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | | | **2012 Performance(CPI)** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** | **Potentially Meaningful?** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 83.7 | 80.5 | 82.9 | 81.4 | -2.3 | -1.5 | -- | Low |
| P+ | 132 | 57% | 51% | 56% | 55% | -2 | -1 | -- |
| 8 | CPI | 140 | 74.5 | 77.0 | 71.6 | 72.9 | -1.6 | 1.3 | -- | Low |
| P+ | 140 | 44% | 42% | 37% | 42% | -2 | 5 | -- |
| 10 | CPI | 92 | 87.7 | 91.0 | 89.9 | 94.0 | 6.3 | 4.1 | Yes | High |
| P+ | 92 | 67% | 79% | 71% | 85% | 18 | 14 | -- |
| **All** | **CPI** | **364** | **81.1** | **82.1** | **81.1** | **81.3** | **0.2** | **0.2** | **--** | **Low** |
| **P+** | **364** | **54%** | **55%** | **54%** | **58%** | **4** | **4** | **--** |
| Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. The “2012 Performance” column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts’ CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 7 in the Student Performance section above. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5a: Narragansett Regional School District**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| High needs | District | CPI | 356 | 73.7 | 76.3 | 76.6 | 79.6 | 5.9 | 3 |
| P+ | 356 | 40% | 44% | 46% | 52% | 12 | 6 |
| SGP | 284 | 32.0 | 47.0 | 40.0 | 46.5 | 14.5 | 6.5 |
| State | CPI | 235,216 | 75.3 | 76.1 | 77.0 | 76.5 | 1.2 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 235, 216 | 44% | 45% | 48% | 48% | 4 | 0 |
| SGP | 177,719 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 1 | 0 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 270 | 77.0 | 79.0 | 79.2 | 81.2 | 4.2 | 2 |
| P+ | 270 | 46% | 52% | 53% | 57% | 11 | 4 |
| SGP | 221 | 32.0 | 44.0 | 40.0 | 46.0 | 14.0 | 6.0 |
| State | CPI | 180,261 | 75.5 | 76.5 | 77.1 | 76.7 | 1.2 | -0.4 |
| P+ | 180,261 | 45% | 47% | 49% | 50% | 5 | 1 |
| SGP | 137,185 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 148 | 64.6 | 65.7 | 66.5 | 70.8 | 6.2 | 4.3 |
| P+ | 148 | 25% | 23% | 26% | 33% | 8 | 7 |
| SGP | 111 | 27.0 | 39.0 | 36.0 | 48.0 | 21.0 | 12.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,757 | 67.8 | 67.3 | 68.3 | 67.3 | -0.5 | -1.0 |
| P+ | 91,757 | 28% | 28% | 30% | 31% | 3 | 1 |
| SGP | 66,785 | 40.0 | 41.0 | 42.0 | 43.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| English language learners or Former ELL | District | CPI | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 45,367 | 64.8 | 66.1 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| P+ | 45,367 | 30% | 32% | 33% | 34% | 4 | 1 |
| SGP | 29,933 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 51.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| **All students** | **District** | **CPI** | **823** | **85.2** | **85.6** | **85.3** | **85.0** | **-0.2** | **-0.3** |
| **P+** | **823** | **62%** | **64%** | **63%** | **64%** | **2** | **1** |
| **SGP** | **678** | **38.0** | **55.0** | **44.5** | **45.0** | **7.0** | **0.5** |
| **State** | **CPI** | **497,549** | **86.5** | **86.9** | **87.2** | **86.7** | **0.2** | **-0.5** |
| **P+** | **497,549** | **67%** | **68%** | **69%** | **69%** | **2** | **0** |
| **SGP** | **395,772** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **0.0** | **0.0** |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5b: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| High needs | District | CPI | 355 | 64.2 | 68.4 | 71.6 | 69.2 | 5 | -2.4 |
| P+ | 355 | 29% | 36% | 40% | 36% | 7 | -4 |
| SGP | 281 | 43.0 | 46.0 | 45.5 | 35.0 | -8.0 | -10.5 |
| State | CPI | 235,552 | 64.5 | 66.7 | 67.1 | 67.0 | 2.5 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 235, 552 | 32% | 36% | 37% | 37% | 5 | 0 |
| SGP | 178,144 | 45.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 46.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 269 | 67.0 | 71.2 | 73.6 | 69.5 | 2.5 | -4.1 |
| P+ | 269 | 34% | 39% | 43% | 37% | 3 | -6 |
| SGP | 217 | 40.0 | 48.5 | 46.0 | 34.0 | -6.0 | -12.0 |
| State | CPI | 180,433 | 64.5 | 67.1 | 67.3 | 67.3 | 2.8 | 0.0 |
| P+ | 180,433 | 33% | 37% | 38% | 38% | 5 | 0 |
| SGP | 137,529 | 44.0 | 47.0 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 1.0 | -1.0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 148 | 57.5 | 60.0 | 62.9 | 62.2 | 4.7 | -0.7 |
| P+ | 148 | 19% | 23% | 26% | 26% | 7 | 0 |
| SGP | 109 | 46.5 | 37.5 | 44.0 | 40.0 | -6.5 | -4.0 |
| State | CPI | 91,876 | 56.9 | 57.5 | 57.7 | 56.9 | 0.0 | -0.8 |
| P+ | 91,876 | 20% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 1 | -1 |
| SGP | 66,876 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| English language learners or Former ELL | District | CPI | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SGP | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 45,695 | 59.2 | 61.5 | 62.0 | 61.6 | 2.4 | -0.4 |
| P+ | 45,695 | 29% | 31% | 32% | 32% | 3 | 0 |
| SGP | 30,189 | 49.0 | 54.0 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| **All students** | **District** | **CPI** | **819** | **76.4** | **78.5** | **78.2** | **75.7** | **-0.7** | **-2.5** |
| **P+** | **819** | **48%** | **54%** | **53%** | **48%** | **0** | **-5** |
| **SGP** | **674** | **45.0** | **51.0** | **45.0** | **41.5** | **-3.5** | **-3.5** |
| **State** | **CPI** | **497,984** | **78.5** | **79.9** | **79.9** | **79.9** | **1.4** | **0.0** |
| **P+** | **497,984** | **56%** | **58%** | **58%** | **59%** | **3** | **1** |
| **SGP** | **396,357** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **50.0** | **0.0** | **0.0** |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B5c: Narragansett Regional School District**

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

**Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and**  **Measure** | | | **Number Included (2012)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | | | | **Gains and Declines** | |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** |
| High needs | District | CPI | 148 | 67.8 | 72.1 | 73.0 | 73.8 | 6 | 0.8 |
| P+ | 148 | 33% | 36% | 36% | 47% | 14 | 11 |
| State | CPI | 96,996 | 62.1 | 64.3 | 63.8 | 65.0 | 2.9 | 1.2 |
| P+ | 96,996 | 25% | 28% | 28% | 31% | 6 | 3 |
| Low income | District | CPI | 111 | 71.9 | 79.3 | 75.0 | 76.8 | 4.9 | 1.8 |
| P+ | 111 | 40% | 47% | 41% | 50% | 10 | 9 |
| State | CPI | 74,300 | 61.1 | 63.6 | 62.8 | 64.5 | 3.4 | 1.7 |
| P+ | 74,300 | 25% | 28% | 28% | 31% | 6 | 3 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 63 | 59.6 | 59.4 | 67.2 | 59.9 | 0.3 | -7.3 |
| P+ | 63 | 22% | 16% | 23% | 29% | 7 | 6 |
| State | CPI | 38,590 | 58.1 | 59.0 | 59.2 | 58.7 | 0.6 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 38,590 | 18% | 19% | 20% | 20% | 2 | 0 |
| English language learners or Former ELL | District | CPI | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| P+ | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 15,271 | 50.8 | 51.8 | 50.3 | 51.4 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| P+ | 15,271 | 15% | 16% | 15% | 17% | 2 | 2 |
| **All students** | **District** | **CPI** | **364** | **81.1** | **82.1** | **81.1** | **81.3** | **0.2** | **0.2** |
| **P+** | **364** | **54%** | **55%** | **54%** | **58%** | **4** | **4** |
| **State** | **CPI** | **211,464** | **76.8** | **78.3** | **77.6** | **78.6** | **1.8** | **1.0** |
| **P+** | **211,464** | **50%** | **52%** | **52%** | **54%** | **4** | **2** |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B6: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2009-2012** | | **Change 2011-2012** | | **State**  **(2012)** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| **All students** | **2.2%** | **1.3%** | **1.8%** | **1.1%** | **-1.1** | **-48.6%** | **-0.7** | **-37.2%** | **2.5%** |
| Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B7a: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2012)** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2009-2012** | | **Change 2011-2012** | | **State**  **(2012)** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| High needs | 46 | 46.2% | 91.2% | 76.5% | 84.8% | 38.6 | 83.5% | 8.3 | 10.8% | 74.1% |
| Low income | 37 | 44.8% | 89.3% | 79.2% | 89.2% | 44.4 | 99.1% | 10.0 | 12.6% | 72.4% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 17 | 40.0% | 91.7% | 73.3% | 70.6% | 30.6 | 76.5% | -2.7 | -3.7% | 68.6% |
| English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 61.1% |
| **All students** | **118** | **72.8%** | **93.9%** | **89.5%** | **87.3%** | **14.5** | **19.9%** | **-2.2** | **-2.5%** | **84.7%** |
| Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B7b: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2011)** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2008-2011** | | **Change 2010-2011** | | **State**  **(2011)** |
| **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| High needs | 34 | 78.4% | 53.8% | 94.1% | 76.5% | -1.9 | -2.4% | -17.6 | -18.7% | 76.5% |
| Low income | 24 | 79.4% | 51.7% | 92.9% | 79.2% | -0.2 | -0.3% | -13.7 | -14.7% | 75.0% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 15 | 68.0% | 46.7% | 91.7% | 73.3% | 5.3 | 7.8% | -18.4 | -20.1% | 70.8% |
| English language learners (ELL) or Former ELL | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 64.2% |
| **All students** | **105** | **82.7%** | **77.2%** | **94.7%** | **89.5%** | **6.8** | **8.2%** | **-5.2** | **-5.5%** | **86.3%** |
| Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B8: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Attendance Rates, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2009-2012** | | **Change 2011-2012** | | **State**  **(2012)** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| **All Students** | **95.5%** | **95.2%** | **95.3%** | **95.3%** | **-0.2** | **-0.2%** | **0.0** | **0.0%** | **94.9%** |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B9: Narragansett Regional School District**

**Suspension Rates, 2009-2012**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | | | | **Change 2009-2012** | | **Change 2011-2012** | | **State**  **(2012)** |
| **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| In-School Suspension Rate | 2.7% | 6.7% | 5.5% | 6.6% | 3.9 | 144.4% | 1.1 | 20.0% | 3.4% |
| Out-of-School Suspension Rate | 3.0% | 4.6% | 3.4% | 3.0% | 0.0 | 0.0% | -0.4 | -11.8% | 5.4% |
| Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Environment** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | | | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** | **Overall** | | |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |  | **#** | **%** |
| 1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful. | **ES** | 0 | 7% | 93% | **(0)** | 0 | 0% |
| **MS** | 0 | 18% | 82% | **(1)** | 8 | 17% |
| **HS** | 0 | 27% | 73% | **(2)** | 38 | 83% |
| 1. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably. | **ES** | 0 | 7% | 93% | **(0)** | 0 | 0% |
| **MS** | 0 | 18% | 82% | **(1)** | 8 | 17% |
| **HS** | 0 | 27% | 73% | **(2)** | 38 | 83% |
| 1. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities. | **ES** | 0 | 0% | 100% | **(0)** | 0 | 0% |
| **MS** | 0 | 12% | 88% | **(1)** | 5 | 11% |
| **HS** | 0 | 20% | 80% | **(2)** | 41 | 89% |
| 1. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations. | **ES** | 7% | 50% | 43% | **(0)** | 9 | 20% |
| **MS** | 41% | 24% | 35% | **(1)** | 21 | 46% |
| **HS** | 7% | 67% | 27% | **(2)** | 16 | 35% |
| 1. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented. | **ES** | 14% | 14% | 71% | **(0)** | 4 | 9% |
| **MS** | 12% | 35% | 53% | **(1)** | 13 | 28% |
| **HS** | 0% | 33% | 67% | **(2)** | 29 | 63% |
| 1. Multiple resources are available to meet students’ diverse learning needs. | **ES** | *36%* | *29%* | *36%* | ***(0)*** | *16* | *35%* |
| **MS** | *29%* | *29%* | *41%* | ***(1)*** | *18* | *39%* |
| **HS** | *40%* | *60%* | *0%* | ***(2)*** | *12* | *26%* |
| 1. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities. | **ES** | 0% | 7% | 93% | **(0)** | 6 | 13% |
| **MS** | 18% | 12% | 71% | **(1)** | 11 | 24% |
| **HS** | 20% | 53% | 27% | **(2)** | 29 | 63% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | | | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** | **Overall** | | |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |  | **#** | **%** |
| 1. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content. | **ES** | 29% | 29% | 43% | **(0)** | 6 | 13% |
| **MS** | 6% | 24% | 71% | **(1)** | 9 | 20% |
| **HS** | 7% | 7% | 87% | **(2)** | 31 | 67% |
| 1. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident. | **ES** | 36% | 21% | 43% | **(0)** | 14 | 30% |
| **MS** | 35% | 18% | 47% | **(1)** | 15 | 33% |
| **HS** | 20% | 60% | 20% | **(2)** | 17 | 37% |
| 1. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content. | **ES** | 36% | 43% | 21% | **(0)** | 16 | 35% |
| **MS** | 47% | 24% | 29% | **(1)** | 21 | 46% |
| **HS** | 20% | 73% | 7% | **(2)** | 9 | 20% |
| 1. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills) | **ES** | 36% | 14% | 50% | **(0)** | 19 | 41% |
| **MS** | 53% | 18% | 29% | **(1)** | 12 | 26% |
| **HS** | 33% | 47% | 20% | **(2)** | 15 | 33% |
| 1. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding. | **ES** | 14% | 36% | 50% | **(0)** | 18 | 39% |
| **MS** | 59% | 0% | 41% | **(1)** | 12 | 26% |
| **HS** | 40% | 47% | 13% | **(2)** | 16 | 35% |
| 1. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students’ diverse learning needs. | **ES** | 57% | 21% | 21% | **(0)** | 24 | 52% |
| **MS** | 65% | 24% | 12% | **(1)** | 15 | 33% |
| **HS** | 33% | 53% | 13% | **(2)** | 7 | 15% |
| 1. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding. | **ES** | 7% | 14% | 79% | **(0)** | 7 | 15% |
| **MS** | 18% | 29% | 53% | **(1)** | 14 | 30% |
| **HS** | 20% | 47% | 33% | **(2)** | 25 | 55% |
| 1. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction. | **ES** | 29% | 7% | 64% | **(0)** | 18 | 39% |
| **MS** | 59% | 18% | 24% | **(1)** | 12 | 26% |
| **HS** | 27% | 53% | 20% | **(2)** | 16 | 35% |
| 1. Makes use of technology to enhance learning. | **ES** | 79% | 0% | 21% | **(0)** | 28 | 61% |
| **MS** | 35% | 12% | 53% | **(1)** | 3 | 7% |
| **HS** | 73% | 7% | 20% | **(2)** | 15 | 33% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** | | | | | |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** | **Overall** | | |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |  | **#** | **%** |
| 1. Students are engaged in productive learning routines. | **ES** | 0% | 29% | 71% | **(0)** | 6 | 13% |
| **MS** | 24% | 24% | 53% | **(1)** | 16 | 35% |
| **HS** | 13% | 53% | 33% | **(2)** | 24 | 52% |
| 1. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks. | **ES** | 29% | 36% | 36% | **(0)** | 13 | 28% |
| **MS** | 41% | 18% | 41% | **(1)** | 16 | 35% |
| **HS** | 13% | 53% | 33% | **(2)** | 17 | 37% |
| 1. *Students assume responsibility for their own learning.* | **ES** | 29% | 7% | 64% | **(0)** | 9 | 20% |
| **MS** | 6% | 29% | 65% | **(1)** | 13 | 28% |
| **HS** | 27% | 47% | 27% | **(2)** | 24 | 52% |
| 1. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups. | **ES** | 21% | 29% | 50% | **(0)** | 15 | 33% |
| **MS** | 41% | 18% | 41% | **(1)** | 15 | 33% |
| **HS** | 33% | 53% | 13% | **(2)** | 16 | 35% |
| 1. Students’ responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses). | **ES** | 43% | 36% | 21% | **(0)** | 23 | 50% |
| **MS** | 53% | 24% | 24% | **(1)** | 13 | 28% |
| **HS** | 53% | 27% | 20% | **(2)** | 10 | 22% |
| 1. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter. | **ES** | 43% | 21% | 36% | **(0)** | 15 | 33% |
| **MS** | 41% | 12% | 47% | **(1)** | 13 | 28% |
| **HS** | 13% | 53% | 33% | **(2)** | 18 | 39% |
| 1. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding. | ***ES*** | *86%* | *0%* | *14%* | ***(0)*** | ***38*** | *82%* |
| ***MS*** | *82%* | *6%* | *12%* | ***(1)*** | ***3*** | *7%* |
| ***HS*** | *80%* | *13%* | *7%* | ***(2)*** | ***5*** | *11%* |
| 1. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars. | ***ES*** | *86%* | *7%* | *7%* | ***(0)*** | ***33*** | *72%* |
| ***MS*** | *88%* | *12%* | *0%* | ***(1)*** | ***11*** | *24%* |
| ***HS*** | *40%* | *53%* | *7%* | ***(2)*** | ***2*** | *4%* |

1. Districts selected were in Level 3 in school year 2012-2013; all served one or more schools among the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving common grade levels pursuant to 603 CMR 2.05(2)(a). The districts with the lowest aggregate performance and least movement in Composite Performance Index (CPI) in their respective regions were selected for review from among those districts not exempt under Chapter 15, Section 55A. A district was exempt if another comprehensive review was completed or scheduled within nine months of the review window. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Due to the district’s Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of “Needs Technical Assistance (NTA).” This serves as an indication that while areas of the district’s performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A district is classified into the level of its lowest-performing school unless it has been placed in Level 4 or 5 by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education independent of the level of its schools. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district’s, school’s or subgroup’s cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group’s annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school’s performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state’s measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: “very high”, “high”, “moderate”, “low” or “very low”. In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts’ CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools’ CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department's School and District Profiles website: <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student’s or group of students’ achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student’s MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles (“academic peers”). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group’s progress toward proficiency based on the group’s current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group’s progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates “moderate” or “typical” growth if the group’s median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. For mathematics trends in the aggregate see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For STE trends in the aggregate see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state’s federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For annual dropout rate trends from 2009 to 2012 see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available, see Tables B7a and B7b. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Statistical significance based on one sample T test. P≤ .05 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square. P≤ .05 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Available at <http://2012.tellmass.org/reports/detailed.php?orgID=M0720> [↑](#footnote-ref-20)