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Executive Summary

District and city leaders are committed to providing high-quality education to their diverse and growing student population. City leaders told the team that strong and healthy schools benefit the city, a belief demonstrated by the city’s fiscal support of the district. The district and the city have exceeded their net school spending obligation every year since fiscal year 2012, and district and city officials alike reported that they worked collaboratively to approve budgets that meet this goal. Revere is a district marked by stability in key school leadership positions. Many district and school leaders, including the superintendent, have emerged from the ranks of local educators.

District leaders and teachers are reflective about their work with students and use data about student performance to guide their decisions and their instruction. The district has a strong distributed model of leadership with high engagement of teachers in decision-making. The district and its teachers have established an exemplary educator evaluation and growth system, complemented by a rich program of data-informed professional development.

Districtwide student support structures and services are well-established and poised to meet the needs of learners. The alternative high school, Seacoast, needs and is planning a redesign to better meet the learning needs of at-risk students. Similarly, Revere High School is engaged in a redesign process.

**Instruction**

The team observed 85 classes throughout the district: 16 at the 2 high schools, 26 at the 3 middle schools, and 43 at the 6 elementary schools. The team observed 43 ELA classes, 29 mathematics classes, and 13 classes in other subject areas, including 1 special education classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

Districtwide, in observed lessons, classroom teachers more consistently set clear learning objectives and expectations and used a variety of methods to check for understanding at the elementary and middle-school levels than teachers at the high-school level. Similarly, teachers more consistently used appropriate classroom activities well-matched to learning objectives in the elementary and middle schools. In observed classes at the high-school level where instruction was primarily teacher-directed, there were few opportunities for student engagement or opportunities for students to demonstrate their ownership of learning. There was a range across the district of student engagement in higher-order thinking tasks; communication of ideas among students was observed most frequently at the middle-school grades. Inclusive practices and classroom culture conducive to effective learning were present in elementary and middle-school classrooms with well-established routines and high expectations for student behavior; these practices were less consistently used at the high schools.

**Strengths**

* The district has an ongoing collaboration with the Five District Partnership (5DP) to create shared curriculum documents and assessments and to provide opportunities for teachers in the district to collaborate and share expertise.
* The district has established structures, practices, and resources that support the consistent use, alignment, and delivery of the district’s curriculum.
* District leaders facilitate teacher collaboration with administrators in making districtwide decisions, solving problems, and ensuring teacher growth through well-established distributed leadership structures and practices.
* All district schools have structures and processes in place at all levels to collect, analyze, and use data to improve teaching and learning.
* The district has adopted an educator evaluation system that is closely aligned with the Standards for Effective Administrative Leadership and Teaching Practice articulated in the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework. It has made its effective implementation a strategic priority and has made progress in developing a comprehensive, growth-oriented evaluative system.
* The district has developed a comprehensive and collaborative professional development program that is aligned with district and school priorities, supports teachers and administrators, and is informed by student achievement data and the needs and interests of staff.
* The district implements data-based practices to identify and provide academic support for students.
* Schools across the district are continually working to maintain and strengthen partnerships with families, community organizations, and colleges to support students’ academic progress and social-emotional well-being.
* School and city leaders have worked together effectively to meet the state’s net school spending requirement and the building needs of the district.
* The district has leveraged its funding by reallocating funds, seeking government and private grants, and implementing efficiencies in purchasing and maintenance practices.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

* The district does not set measurable goals in its planning documents.
* In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent. There was a consistently lower incidence of characteristics of effective instruction at the high-school level.
* The district has not undertaken formal action on the components of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence.
* The district’s policies and practices are not sufficiently improving a high retention rate in grade 9 and high chronic absence in grades 9–12.
* The high school has overcrowded classrooms and inadequate facilities for science and other programs. The district and the city have submitted statements of interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority for assistance in renovating the high school.

**Recommendations**

* The district should review and revise its planning documents so that they include measurable goals and benchmarks.
* The district should ensure that effective teaching and learning practices are consistently implemented districtwide, with a particular focus on the high school level.
* The district should continue to focus on improving the quality and consistency of all formal staff evaluations and should ensure that all components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework are fully and effectively implemented.
* The district should collect and analyze information from students, families, and teachers to identify the root causes of the high retention and chronic absence rates and develop plans to improve attendance and reduce retention.
* The district should continue its efforts to renovate or rebuild its high school to provide sufficient classroom space for its growing enrollment and adequate facilities for science labs and other programs.

Revere Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Revere Public Schools was conducted from January 8–11, 2018. The site visit included 36 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 103 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups with three elementary-school teachers, one middle-school teacher, and six high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, attendance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 85 classrooms in 11 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

Revere has a mayor-council form of government and the mayor chairs the school committee. Members elect the vice-chair. The seven members of the school committee conduct a monthly regular meeting and meet between two and four additional times each month for committee of the whole and/or subcommittee meetings.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2015.The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and the assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services. Central office positions have been stable in number over the past several years. The district has 11 principals leading 11 schools and a deputy principal at the high school. There are 27 other school administrators, including assistant principals and program and assistant program directors. In the 2017–2018 school year, there were 539 teachers in the district.

In the 2017–2018 school year, 7,552 students were enrolled in the district’s 11 schools:

**Table 1: Revere Public Schools**

**Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2017–2018**

| **School** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Beachmont | ES | Pre-K–5 | 374 |
| Garfield | ES | Pre-K–5 | 768 |
| Hill | ES | K–5 | 712 |
| Lincoln | ES | Pre-K–5 | 695 |
| Paul Revere | ES | K–5 | 472 |
| Whelan | ES | K–5 | 753 |
| Susan B. Anthony | MS | 6–8 | 570 |
| Garfield | MS | 6–8 | 538 |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | MS | 6–8 | 597 |
| Revere High School | HS | 9–12 | 1,991 |
| Seacoast High School | HS | 9–12 | 82 |
| **Totals** | **11 schools** | **Pre-K–12** | **7,552** |
| \*As of October 1, 2017 | | | |

Between 2013 and 2017 overall student enrollment increased by 12.1 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were higher than the median in-district per-pupil expenditures for 32 K–12 districts of similar size (5,000–7,999 students) in fiscal year 2016: $13,394, compared with $13,280 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing and Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/)). Actual net school spending has been slightly above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B3 in Appendix B.[[1]](#footnote-1)

Student Performance

**Note:** The Next-Generation MCAS assessment is administered to grades 3–8 in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics; it was administered for the first time in 2017. (For more information, see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/parents/results-faq.html>.) The MCAS assessment is administered to grades 5 and 8 in science and to grades 10 in ELA, math, and science. Data from the two assessments are presented separately because the tests are different and cannot be compared.

**The average scaled score on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment for all students was below the state rate by 1.0 point in ELA and below the state rate by 1.9 points in math.**

| **Table 2: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Average Scaled Score (SS) Grades 3– by Subgroup, 2017** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA SS** | **State SS** | **N** | **Math SS** | **State SS** |
| High Needs | 2,256 | 492.9 | 488.5 | 2,256 | 492.1 | 488.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,794 | 494.4 | 489.2 | 1,793 | 493.4 | 488.1 |
| SWD | 597 | 478.0 | 480.0 | 596 | 474.9 | 479.8 |
| ELLs | 829 | 486.4 | 484.9 | 831 | 488.7 | 486.8 |
| All | 3,491 | 498.1 | 499.1 | 3,491 | 496.9 | 498.8 |
| Next Generation MCAS Achievement Levels: 440–470 Not Meeting Expectations; 470–500 Partially Meeting Expectations; 500–530 Meeting Expectations; 530–560 Exceeding Expectations | | | | | | |

**The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in grades 3–8 was below the state rate by 2 percentage points in ELA (47 percent vs. 49 percent) and below the state rate by 3 percentage points in math (45 percent vs. 48 percent).**

* The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was below the state rate in ELA and math for students with disabilities by 4 and 5 percentage points, respectively.
* The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA and math was above the state rate for high needs students by 9 percentage points, for economically disadvantaged students by 11 and 12 percentage points, respectively, and for English language learners by 2 and 4 percentage points, respectively.

| **Table 3: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (M/E) Grades 3–8 by Subgroup, 2017** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA M/E** | **State M/E** | **Above/Below State** | **N** | **Math M/E** | **State M/E** | **Above/Below State** |
| High Needs | 2,256 | 36% | 27% | 9 | 2,256 | 36% | 27% | 9 |
| Econ. Dis. | 1,794 | 40% | 29% | 11 | 1,793 | 39% | 27% | 12 |
| SWD | 597 | 9% | 13% | -4 | 596 | 9% | 14% | -5 |
| ELLs | 829 | 25% | 23% | 2 | 831 | 30% | 26% | 4 |
| All | 3,491 | 47% | 49% | -2 | 3,491 | 45% | 48% | -3 |

**The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA and math on the MCAS assessment in 10th grade was 7 and 9 percentage points, respectively, below the state rate.**

* In ELA the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was below the state rate by 1 and 4 percentage points for high needs students and economically disadvantaged students, respectively,by 9 percentage points for students with disabilities, and by 28 percentage points for English language learners.
* In math the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was below the state rate by 22 and 15 percentage points for students with disabilities and English language learners, respectively.

| **Table 4: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10 by Subgroup, 2017** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N** | **ELA** | **State** | **Above/Below State** | **N** | **Math** | **State** | **Above/Below State** |
| High Needs | 289 | 75% | 79% | -4 | 289 | 58% | 58% | 0 |
| Econ. Dis. | 247 | 80% | 81% | -1 | 247 | 64% | 60% | 4 |
| SWD | 66 | 59% | 68% | -9 | 65 | 20% | 42% | -22 |
| ELLs | 62 | 31% | 59% | -28 | 62 | 24% | 39% | -15 |
| All | 482 | 84% | 91% | -7 | 481 | 70% | 79% | -9 |

**Between 2014 and 2017, science proficiency for all students declined by 10 percentage points for all students and by 13 and 7 percentage points for high needs students and English language learners,** **respectively.**

| **Table 5: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10 by Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 909 | 46% | 36% | 40% | 33% | -13 | 31% |
| Econ. Dis. | 763 | -- | 42% | 46% | 35% | -- | 32% |
| SWD | 237 | 10% | 11% | 12% | 11% | 1 | 21% |
| ELLs | 242 | 22% | 20% | 20% | 15% | -7 | 20% |
| All | 1,539 | 52% | 47% | 50% | 42% | -10 | 53% |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment was 2 percentage points below the state rate in grades 3–8 as a whole and by 2 to 6 percentage points in the 5th through 8th grades, and above the state rate by 2 and 1 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades,** **respectively.**

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment was 3 percentage points below the state rate in grades 3–8 as a whole and by 2 and 4 percentage points in the 5th and 6th grades, respectively, and by 12 and 8 percentage points in the 7th and 8th** grades**, respectively. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations was above the state rate in math by 4 and 1 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades, respectively.**

| **Table 6: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding (M/E) Expectations in Grades 3–8, 2017** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **N** | **ELA M/E** | **State ELA** | **Difference** | **N** | **Math M/E** | **State Math** | **Difference** |
| 3 | 642 | 49% | 47% | 2 | 643 | 53% | 49% | 4 |
| 4 | 624 | 49% | 48% | 1 | 624 | 50% | 49% | 1 |
| 5 | 557 | 43% | 49% | -6 | 557 | 44% | 46% | -2 |
| 6 | 563 | 49% | 51% | -2 | 563 | 46% | 50% | -4 |
| 7 | 538 | 45% | 50% | -5 | 536 | 35% | 47% | -12 |
| 8 | 567 | 46% | 49% | -3 | 568 | 40% | 48% | -8 |
| 3–8 | 3,491 | 47% | 49% | -2 | 3,491 | 45% | 48% | -3 |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in science, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment declined by 10 percentage points for all students and declined by 12, 14, and 3 percentage points in the 5th, 8th, and 10th grades, respectively.**

| **Table 7: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grades 5, 8, and 10, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State** |
| 5 | 553 | 51% | 45% | 47% | 39% | -12 | 46% |
| 8 | 566 | 40% | 33% | 40% | 26% | -14 | 40% |
| 10 | 420 | 70% | 70% | 68% | 67% | -3 | 74% |
| All | 1,539 | 52% | 47% | 50% | 42% | -10 | 53% |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in ELA the median student growth percentile (SGP) improved by 12 points in the 4th grade and declined by 17.5 points in the 7th grade.**

| **Table 8: Revere Public Schools**  **ELA Median Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 568 | 43.0 | 56.0 | 59.0 | 55.0 | 12.0 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 514 | 64.0 | 53.0 | 53.0 | 56.0 | -8.0 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 511 | 58.0 | 49.0 | 65.0 | 51.0 | -7.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 481 | 64.5 | 46.0 | 51.0 | 47.0 | -17.5 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 518 | 57.0 | 52.0 | 60.0 | 56.0 | -1.0 | 50.0 |
| 10 | 350 | 35.0 | 39.0 | 47.0 | 38.0 | 3.0 | 50.0 |
| Changes in SGP of 10 points or more are considered meaningful. | | | | | | | |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in math the median SGP declined between 11 and 16 percentage points in the 5th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades.**

| **Table 9: Revere Public Schools**  **Math Median Student Growth Percentile by Grade, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr change** | **State (2017)** |
| 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 4 | 568 | 49.5 | 62.0 | 59.0 | 52.0 | 2.5 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 513 | 61.0 | 63.0 | 48.0 | 46.0 | -15.0 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 511 | 40.0 | 48.0 | 33.0 | 41.0 | 1.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 480 | 57.0 | 51.0 | 53.0 | 43.0 | -14.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 519 | 69.0 | 63.0 | 54.0 | 53.0 | -16.0 | 50.0 |
| 10 | 351 | 51.0 | 52.0 | 49.0 | 40.0 | -11.0 | 50.0 |
| Changes in SGP of 10 points or more are considered meaningful. | | | | | | | |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment ranged from 38 to 63 percent in the 3rd grade, from 42 to 68 percent in the 4th grade, and from 37 to 50 percent in the 5th grade in Revere’s six elementary schools. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA ranged from 47 to 51 percent in the 6th grade, from 35 to 55 percent in the 7th grade, and from 43 to 54 percent in the 8th grade in Revere’s three middle schools.**

| **Table 10: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Whelan Memorial | 48% | 47% | 45% | -- | -- | -- | 47% |
| Beachmont E | 62% | 68% | 50% | -- | -- | -- | 60% |
| Lincoln | 50% | 42% | 46% | -- | -- | -- | 46% |
| Hill | 50% | 47% | 50% | -- | -- | -- | 49% |
| Revere | 63% | 59% | 38% | -- | -- | -- | 54% |
| Garfield | 38% | 49% | 37% | -- | -- | -- | 41% |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | -- | -- | -- | 50% | 55% | 54% | 53% |
| Garfield | -- | -- | -- | 47% | 35% | 43% | 42% |
| Anthony Middle | -- | -- | -- | 51% | 46% | 43% | 47% |
| District | 49% | 49% | 43% | 49% | 45% | 46% | 47% |
| State | 47% | 48% | 49% | 51% | 50% | 49% | 49% |

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment ranged from 42 to 68 percent in the 3rd grade, from 37 to 84 percent in the 4th grade, and 32 to 57 percent in the 5th grade in Revere’s six elementary schools. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math ranged from 38 to 51 percent in the 6th grade, from 33 to 38 percent in the 7th grade, and 39 to 43 percent in the 8th grade in Revere’s three middle schools.**

| **Table 11: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS Math Percent Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by Grade and School, 2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **3–8** |
| Whelan Memorial | 55% | 37% | 52% | -- | -- | -- | 48% |
| Beachmont | 65% | 84% | 50% | -- | -- | -- | 67% |
| Lincoln | 53% | 35% | 33% | -- | -- | -- | 40% |
| Hill | 53% | 43% | 57% | -- | -- | -- | 51% |
| Revere | 68% | 67% | 32% | -- | -- | -- | 56% |
| Garfield | 42% | 62% | 43% | -- | -- | -- | 49% |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | -- | -- | -- | 49% | 38% | 42% | 43% |
| Garfield | -- | -- | -- | 38% | 33% | 43% | 38% |
| Anthony Middle | -- | -- | -- | 51% | 35% | 39% | 42% |
| District | 53% | 50% | 44% | 46% | 35% | 40% | 45% |
| State | 49% | 49% | 46% | 50% | 47% | 48% | 48% |

**On the MCAS assessment in the 10th grade the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced at Revere High was below the state rate by 3 percentage points in both ELA and math, and at Seacoast School was below the state rate by 32 and 54 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively.**

| **Table 12: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10 by School, 2017** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | ELA | Math |
| Revere High | 88% | 76% |
| Seacoast School | 59% | 25% |
| State | 91% | 79% |

**In science, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment ranged from 27 to 53 percent at in the 5th grade in the district’s six elementary schools, and ranged from 19 to 33 percent in the 8th grade in Revere’s three middle schools. Science proficiency was 76 percent in the 10th grade at Revere High.**

| **Table 13: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade, 2017** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **10** | **Total** |
| Whelan Memorial | -- | -- | 53% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 53% |
| Beachmont | -- | -- | 42% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 42% |
| Lincoln | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Hill | -- | -- | 52% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 52% |
| Revere | -- | -- | 38% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 38% |
| Garfield | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27% |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 33% | -- | 33% |
| Garfield | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 19% | -- | 19% |
| Anthony Middle | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 27% | -- | 27% |
| Revere High | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 73% | 73% |
| Seacoast | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6% | 6% |
| District | -- | -- | 39% | -- | -- | 26% | 67% | 42% |
| State | -- | -- | 46% | -- | -- | 40% | 74% | 53% |

**In ELA, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in the district’s elementary schools ranged from 41 to 60 percent and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 42 to 53 percent.**

* The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 34 to 54 percent in the district’s elementary schools, and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 32 to 40 percent.
* The percentage of economically disadvantaged students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 38 to 55 percent in the district’s elementary schools, and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 34 to 46 percent.
* The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 7 to 15 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 4 to 14 percent.
* The percentage of English language learners meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 23 to 42 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 13 to 16 percent.

**In math, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations on the Next-Generation MCAS assessment in the district’s elementary schools ranged from 40 to 67 percent and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 38 to 43 percent.**

* The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 30 to 57 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 30 to 32 percent.
* The percentage of economically disadvantaged students meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 33 to 61 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 33 to 36 percent.
* The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 7 to 20 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 5 to 10 percent.
* The percentage of English language learners meeting or exceeding expectations ranged from 27 to 52 percent in the district’s elementary schools and in the district’s middle schools ranged from 9 to 24 percent.

| **Table 14: Revere Public Schools**  **Next-Generation MCAS ELA and Math Percent Meeting and Exceeding Expectations by School, 2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ELA** | | | | | **Math** | | | | |
| **School** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **ELLs** | **All** | **High Needs** | **Econ. Dis.** | **SWD** | **ELLs** |
| Whelan Memorial | 47% | 37% | 39% | 15% | 33% | 48% | 40% | 44% | 20% | 32% |
| Beachmont | 60% | 54% | 55% | 15% | 42% | 67% | 57% | 61% | 10% | 52% |
| Lincoln | 46% | 35% | 39% | 10% | 31% | 40% | 30% | 33% | 10% | 27% |
| Hill | 49% | 40% | 43% | 8% | 30% | 51% | 41% | 44% | 9% | 33% |
| Revere | 54% | 44% | 47% | 7% | 33% | 56% | 48% | 51% | 7% | 38% |
| Garfield | 41% | 34% | 38% | 10% | 23% | 49% | 44% | 45% | 15% | 40% |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | 53% | 40% | 46% | 4% | 14% | 43% | 31% | 36% | 5% | 9% |
| Garfield | 42% | 32% | 34% | 14% | 16% | 38% | 32% | 33% | 10% | 24% |
| Anthony Middle | 47% | 33% | 38% | 9% | 13% | 42% | 30% | 34% | 7% | 21% |
| District | 47% | 36% | 40% | 9% | 25% | 45% | 36% | 39% | 9% | 30% |

**Between 2014 and 2017, ELA proficiency at Revere High did not improve for all students, improved by 30 percentage points for students with disabilities and declined by 5 and 6 percentage points for high needs students and English language learners, respectively. At the Seacoast School ELA proficiency declined by 21 and 32 percentage points for all students and high needs students.**

**Between 2014 and 2017, math proficiency at Revere High declined by 3 and 9 percentage points for all students and high needs students, respectively, and improved by 1 and 11 percentage points for English language learners and students with disabilities, respectively. At the Seacoast School math proficiency declined by 15 and 17 percentage points for all students and high needs students, respectively.**

| **Table 15: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS ELA and Math Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Grade 10 by School and Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **ELA** | | | | | **Math** | | | | |
| **School** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** |
| Revere High | 88% | 91% | 86% | 88% | 0 | 79% | 74% | 71% | 76% | -3 |
| High Needs | 85% | 83% | 75% | 80% | -5 | 75% | 67% | 57% | 66% | -9 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | 90% | 87% | 85% | -- | -- | 75% | 68% | 72% | -- |
| ELLs | 41% | 55% | 36% | 35% | -6 | 27% | 41% | 29% | 28% | 1 |
| SWD | 37% | 57% | 57% | 67% | 30 | 20% | 29% | 22% | 31% | 11 |
| Seacoast School | 80% | -- | -- | 59% | -21 | 40% | -- | -- | 25% | -15 |
| High Needs | 85% | -- | -- | 53% | -32 | 38% | -- | -- | 21% | -17 |
| Econ. Dis. | -- | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | -- | -- | 24% | -- |
| ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

**Between 2014 and 2017, in science, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS assessment declined in all six elementary schools by 2 to 24 percentage points. Science proficiency declined in all three middle schools by 7 to 24 percentage points, and declined by 2 percentage points at Revere High and improved by 6 percentage points at Seacoast School.**

* Science proficiency for high needs students declined in all six elementary schools by 5 to 28 percentage points, declined by 14 to 29 percentage points in all three middle schools, and declined by 3 percentage points at Revere High.
* In 2017, science proficiency for economically disadvantaged students ranged from 17 to 48 percent in the district’s elementary schools, ranged from 12 to 22 percent in the district’s middle schools, and was 70 percent at Revere High.
* In 2017, science proficiency for students with disabilities ranged from 7 to 28 percent in the district’s elementary schools, from 0 to 6 percent in the districts middle schools, and was 26 percent at Revere High.
* In 2017, science proficiency for English language learners ranged from 10 to 37 percent in the district’s elementary schools, ranged from 0 to 14 percent in the district’s middle schools, and was 17 percent at Revere High.

| **Table 16: Revere Public Schools**  **MCAS Science Percent Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Science by School and Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** |
| Whelan Memorial | 125 | 77% | 59% | 63% | 53% | -24 |
| High Needs | 70 | 74% | 48% | 49% | 46% | -28 |
| Econ. Dis. | 54 | -- | 50% | 53% | 48% | -- |
| SWD | 18 | 50% | 24% | 29% | 28% | -22 |
| ELLs | 18 | 61% | 40% | 26% | 28% | -33 |
| Beachmont | 50 | 53% | 23% | 27% | 42% | -11 |
| High Needs | 33 | 46% | 13% | 17% | 36% | -10 |
| Econ. Dis. | 27 | -- | 11% | 26% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 10 | -- | 12% | -- | 20% | -- |
| ELLs | 15 | 46% | 9% | 14% | 13% | -33 |
| Lincoln | 82 | 29% | 33% | 25% | 27% | -2 |
| High Needs | 50 | 23% | 27% | 19% | 18% | -5 |
| Econ. Dis. | 35 | -- | 35% | 30% | 17% | -- |
| SWD | 15 | 0% | 16% | 6% | 13% | 13 |
| ELLs | 23 | -- | 6% | 0% | 13% | -- |
| Hill | 87 | 58% | 63% | 51% | 52% | -6 |
| High Needs | 52 | 55% | 54% | 42% | 40% | -15 |
| Econ. Dis. | 43 | -- | 61% | 49% | 44% | -- |
| SWD | 15 | -- | -- | 10% | 7% | -- |
| ELLs | 19 | 31% | 33% | 40% | 37% | 6 |
| Revere | 73 | 51% | 65% | 54% | 38% | -13 |
| High Needs | 50 | 43% | 46% | 39% | 32% | -11 |
| Econ. Dis. | 42 | -- | 59% | 48% | 33% | -- |
| SWD | 16 | 6% | 8% | -- | 13% | 7 |
| ELLs | 21 | 40% | 42% | 25% | 29% | -11 |
| Garfield | 116 | 36% | 33% | 47% | 27% | -9 |
| High Needs | 84 | 34% | 29% | 41% | 24% | -10 |
| Econ. Dis. | 72 | -- | 31% | 41% | 25% | -- |
| SWD | 13 | -- | 20% | -- | 15% | -- |
| ELLs | 30 | 0% | 22% | 32% | 10% | 10 |
| Rumney Marsh Academy | 195 | 57% | 48% | 50% | 33% | -24 |
| High Needs | 104 | 49% | 37% | 42% | 20% | -29 |
| Econ. Dis. | 89 | -- | 40% | 48% | 22% | -- |
| SWD | 33 | 15% | 4% | 3% | 6% | -9 |
| ELLs | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Garfield | 181 | 32% | 32% | 31% | 19% | -13 |
| High Needs | 105 | 30% | 28% | 26% | 10% | -20 |
| Econ. Dis. | 89 | -- | 31% | 29% | 12% | -- |
| SWD | 13 | 0% | 0% | -- | 0% | 0 |
| ELLs | 36 | 13% | 6% | 5% | 0% | -13 |
| Anthony Middle | 179 | 34% | 21% | 43% | 27% | -7 |
| High Needs | 92 | 28% | 17% | 34% | 14% | -14 |
| Econ. Dis. | 77 | -- | 20% | 40% | 14% | -- |
| SWD | 27 | 6% | 4% | 0% | 0% | -6 |
| ELLs | 29 | 13% | 0% | 20% | 14% | 1 |
| Revere High | 382 | 75% | 72% | 70% | 73% | -2 |
| High Needs | 212 | 68% | 59% | 58% | 65% | -3 |
| Econ. Dis. | 188 | -- | 67% | 66% | 70% | -- |
| SWD | 38 | 10% | 20% | 22% | 26% | 16 |
| ELLs | 30 | 3% | 33% | 21% | 17% | 14 |
| Seacoast | 16 | 0% | -- | -- | 6% | 6 |
| High Needs | 9 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Econ. Dis. | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| SWD | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

**Between 2013 and 2016, the district’s four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.0 percentage points for all students and improved by 1.1 to 14.5 percentage points for each subgroup except for English language learners and Hispanic/Latino students.**

| **Table 17: Revere Public Schools**  **Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2014–2017** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| High needs | 405 | 75.7% | 81.3% | 75.9% | 76.8% | 1.1 | 80.0% |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 372 | 76.4% | 82.8% | 77.9% | 78.2% | 1.8 | 79.0% |
| ELLs | 92 | 63.8% | 61.7% | 57.5% | 52.2% | -11.6 | 63.4% |
| SWD | 78 | 62.3% | 67.5% | 57.5% | 73.1% | 10.8 | 72.8% |
| African American | 26 | 69.6% | 68.2% | 63.6% | 80.8% | 11.2 | 80.0% |
| Asian | 21 | 76.0% | 88.9% | 85.7% | 90.5% | 14.5 | 94.1% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 249 | 76.0% | 77.7% | 76.8% | 75.1% | -0.9 | 74.4% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 14 | 66.7% | 83.3% | 70.0% | 78.6% | 11.9 | 85.2% |
| White | 170 | 81.7% | 90.2% | 83.0% | 85.3% | 3.6 | 92.6% |
| All | 480 | 77.8% | 82.9% | 78.7% | 79.8% | 2.0 | 88.3% |
| \* Four-year cohort graduation rate for students from low income families used for 2014and 2015 rates. | | | | | | | |

**Between 2012 and 2016, the district’s five-year cohort graduation rate declined by 0.2 percentage point for all students, and declined by 0.1 to 8.6 percentage points for each subgroup except for Hispanic/Latino students. The 2016 five-year cohort graduation rate was below the state rate for all students and for each subgroup except for Hispanic/Latino students.**

| **Table 18: Revere Public Schools**  **Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2013–2016** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **N**  **(2016)** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2016)** |
| High needs | 424 | 80.2% | 78.6% | 84.0% | 79.7% | -0.5 | 82.9% |
| Economically Disadvantaged\* | 389 | 81.6% | 79.4% | 85.3% | 81.5% | -0.1 | 82.1% |
| ELLs | 80 | 69.6% | 72.4% | 68.3% | 66.3% | -3.3 | 70.9% |
| SWD | 87 | 64.2% | 63.6% | 72.7% | 63.2% | -1.0 | 76.5% |
| African American | 22 | 72.2% | 73.9% | 72.7% | 63.6% | -8.6 | 83.4% |
| Asian | 28 | 87.9% | 76.0% | 88.9% | 85.7% | -2.2 | 94.8% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 246 | 78.2% | 79.2% | 81.7% | 81.3% | 3.1 | 76.8% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hisp./Lat. | 20 | 76.0% | 66.7% | 83.3% | 75.0% | -1.0 | 87.4% |
| White | 176 | 87.0% | 84.4% | 92.0% | 85.8% | -1.2 | 93.5% |
| All | 494 | 82.4% | 80.6% | 85.7% | 82.2% | -0.2 | 89.8% |
| \* Five-year cohort graduation rate for students from low income families used for 2013 and 2014 rates. | | | | | | | |

**In 2017, in-school suspension rates were 0.2 percent for all students and 0.2 to 0.6 percent for each subgroup with reportable data, all below statewide rates.**

| **Table 19: Revere Public Schools**  **In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 0.1% | 0.9% | 0.2% | 0.3% | 0.2 | 2.6% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 0.1% | 0.9% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.3 | 2.9% |
| ELLs | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.1 | 1.7% |
| SWD | 0.2% | 2.1% | 0.4% | 0.3% | 0.1 | 3.1% |
| African American | 0.3% | 1.2% | -- | 0.6% | 0.3 | 3.3% |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.5% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 0.1% | 0.7% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 0.1 | 2.5% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 0.0% | 2.1% | -- | 0.6% | 0.6 | 2.1% |
| White | 0.1% | 0.8% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.1 | 1.3% |
| All | 0.1% | 0.7% | 0.1% | 0.2% | 0.1 | 1.7% |

\*Suspension rates for students from low income families used for 2014 rates.

**Between 2013 and 2016, out-of-school suspension rates declined by 1.3 percentage points for all students and declined for each subgroup with reportable data. In 2017 out-of-school suspension rates for each subgroup in the district were lower than statewide rates except for White students, and Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic students.**

| **Table 20: Revere Public Schools**  **Out-of-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 3.7% | 2.6% | 2.1% | 2.0% | -1.7 | 4.5% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 3.7% | 2.5% | 2.2% | 2.2% | -1.5 | 5.3% |
| ELLs | 1.3% | 1.5% | 0.9% | 0.9% | -0.4 | 3.8% |
| SWD | 6.7% | 5.2% | 3.5% | 3.1% | -3.6 | 5.5% |
| African American | 5.2% | 4.5% | 3.5% | 3.8% | -1.4 | 6.3% |
| Asian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3.5% | 2.1% | 2.1% | 1.8% | -1.7 | 5.2% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 6.6% | 5.2% | 4.3% | 5.7% | -0.9 | 3.1% |
| White | 2.9% | 2.6% | 1.4% | 1.9% | -1.0 | 1.6% |
| All | 3.3% | 2.3% | 1.9% | 2.0% | -1.3 | 2.8% |

\*Suspension rates for students from low income families used for 2014 rates.

**Between 2014 and 2017, Revere’s dropout rate declined by 0.3 percentage point and was 3.1 percent in 2017, above the state rate of 1.8 percent. Revere’s dropout rate for each subgroup was above the state rate for each subgroup except for Hispanic/Latino students.**

| **Table 21: Revere Public Schools**  **Dropout Rates by Subgroup, 2014–2017** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| High Needs | 3.8% | 2.7% | 6.1% | 4.9% | 1.1 | 3.5% |
| Economically disadvantaged\* | 3.4% | 3.0% | 5.2% | 3.8% | 0.4 | 3.6% |
| ELLs | 6.5% | 2.6% | 10.9% | 9.4% | 2.9 | 6.5% |
| SWD | 8.7% | 4.1% | 11.2% | 5.3% | -3.4 | 3.3% |
| African American | 6.5% | 5.8% | 2.2% | 3.2% | -3.3 | 2.9% |
| Asian | 2.1% | 3.0% | 1.9% | 0.9% | -1.2 | 0.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 3.7% | 2.4% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 0.3 | 4.2% |
| Multi-Race, non-Hispanic or Latino | 9.4% | 3.9% | 5.8% | 2.1% | -7.3 | 1.7% |
| White | 2.3% | 1.7% | 3.2% | 2.2% | -0.1 | 1.1% |
| All | 3.4% | 2.4% | 3.6% | 3.1% | -0.3 | 1.8% |
| . \*Dropout rates for students from low income families used for 2014 rates. | | | | | | |

Leadership and Governance

***Contextual Background***

Revere city leaders, school committee members, and district leaders share a common commitment to providing high-quality learning experiences for all students in a growing, culturally diverse community. The school committee, chaired by the mayor, has established a trusting and supportive relationship with the superintendent who leads the schools with an open, transparent approach and who has set high expectations for Revere’s school leaders and teachers. In 2016, all 11 schools were in Level 1 or Level 2 accountability status. In 2017, Revere High School shifted to Level 3 status. In 2017, all students and all subgroups met their targets in ELA, mathematics, and science under the Massachusetts accountability system.

The school committee and school staff value Revere’s stability in its district and school leadership. The superintendent of schools served as a teacher and administrator in the district for 14 years before becoming assistant superintendent for 5 years. Following her appointment in the spring of 2015, she worked on a transition with the then superintendent for six months prior to his retirement, following a similar process that was used by prior newly hired superintendents. Several school principals---as well as a number of assistant principals, directors, and coaches---have been promoted from within the district. A past superintendent serves on the six-member school committee that has also seen little turnover. Educators’ knowledge of the city, its neighborhoods, its families, and its diverse cultures is deep.

The model of leadership in Revere is one of innovation, inclusion, and collaboration among teachers and district and school leaders. The Revere Educators Leadership Board (RELB) is an effective distributive leadership model. The RELB consists of central office staff and representatives from six councils of teachers and administrators. Councils represent all facets of school operations: professional development; educator growth; teacher leadership and career ladders; organizational structure; adult professional culture; and recruitment, hiring, placement, and induction. The district is a member of the Five District Partnership (5DP) with Chelsea, Everett, Winthrop, and Malden, organized to improve instruction and curriculum, and the Massachusetts Consortium for Innovative Education Assessments with Lowell, Winchester, Somerville, Boston, and Attleboro, established to broaden and improve assessment practices.

The school committee, led by the mayor of Revere, and school district leaders have effective and collaborative relationships among themselves and city agencies. School committee members serve at large and elect a new vice-chair each year.

Relationships between the superintendent and the Revere Teachers’ Association were described as amicable, with weekly luncheon meetings to maintain open communication. The district was at the beginning stages of negotiating a new contract along with four other units in the school district at the time of the onsite visit in January 2018.

The district communicates students’ MCAS assessment results to families and the community via the district’s and schools’ websites. However, other assessment data are not reported or not readily visible on the district’s or schools’ websites. Documents, such as School Improvement Plans, can be found on each school’s website. A few data presentations are found within school committee packets as attachments and minutes accessible on the district’s website. At the time of the onsite review, the team did not find the District Improvement Plan on the district’s website.

***Strength Finding***

**1. District leaders foster teacher collaboration with administrators in making districtwide decisions, solving problems, and ensuring teacher growth through well-established distributed leadership structures and practices.**

**A**. The Revere Educators Leadership Board (RELB) is the overarching structure for the practice of distributive leadership in the district. It addresses a key goal in the district’s mission: “We will endeavor to empower all members of our educational community in the decision-making process.”

1. Interviewees said the administrator-teacher group that worked on the adoption of the educator evaluation system was a “precursor of the RELB.” The superintendent stated that principals, program leaders, and teachers strongly support RELB and between 150 and 200 teachers have been involved since its inception under the former superintendent.

a. The main responsibilities of the RELB are: district decision making, facilitating communication, building teamwork, and piloting new initiatives which will lead to improved teaching and learning.

2. The RELB includes the superintendent, two assistant superintendents, the union president, and one liaison each from the six councils: recruitment, hiring, placement and induction of teachers; professional development; educator growth; adult professional culture; organizational structure; and teacher leadership and career ladders.

a. A teacher co-chairs each council with another teacher or administrator; teachers and administrators volunteer to serve for three years and are paid a stipend for their work beyond the school day.

b. The RELB meets monthly, with semi-annual all-council meetings; councils meet separately monthly.

c. A document review and interviews with teachers, administrators, the superintendent, and members of the school committee indicated that the RELB councils identify issues or areas of need; collect and analyze data; and propose, implement, monitor, and evaluate solutions.

d. Teachers told the team that they valued the opportunity for direct involvement in district leadership and the opportunity to grow professionally. One teacher said, “In most places you don’t have a voice. In Revere, every teacher has a chance to be a teacher leader.” Another teacher noted, “I felt that by working in Revere, I was becoming a better teacher.”

**B**. Interviewees said that major district initiatives emanate from the RELB.

1. In 2017–2018 the district established a peer-to-peer teacher consultant initiative, C2C, proposed by two RELB councils (professional development and the teacher leadership/career ladders). The superintendent said that four teachers serve as districtwide consultants to “help proficient teachers become exemplary.”

a. They work closely with teachers to improve instructional practices through job-embedded professional development.

b. Four teachers serve as consultants in the C2C program described above. They serve as district support staff in areas such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), ELL instruction, competency-based learning, and Positive Behaviors Intervention Systems (PBIS).

a. In January 2018, the district surveyed teachers served by the consultants; 19 (72 percent) of the 25 teachers who responded saw growth in an area of practice that they were working on and 21 teachers (84 percent of the teachers who responded) found the support provided by the consulting teacher to be “very helpful.”

2. In 2017–1018, RELB councils responded to the need to better transition incoming English language learners (ELLs) by establishing newcomer academies in selected schools.

a. The newcomer academies support ELLs who arrive in the district with limited or interrupted formal schooling. In addition, the councils continue to address improving instruction and programming for ELLs as the number of ELLs increases throughout the district.

3. Many interviewees stated that the RELB and its professional development council play a significant role in providing high-quality professional development for teachers. The council surveys teachers to determine the quality of its offerings and often uses highly skilled teachers to deliver its courses.

**C**. The district supports teacher leadership and collaboration in additional areas.

1. Teachers lead peer professional learning groups (PLGs), school-based structures for managing and improving the curriculum in the district.

2. Effective classroom teachers have been promoted to serve as instructional coaches to improve instruction.

3. Teachers serve as mentors to first-year teachers.

4. In the three Extended Learning Time schools, some teachers engage in peer review activities.

5. Newer teachers in the district said that the opportunities for all educators to engage in meaningful leadership is a strong recruitment tool.

**D**. Examples of shared leadership between principals and teachers can be found in each of the schools.

1. Principals told the review team that there was a strong collaborative spirit and mutual support among schools, noting that “Teamwork is key.” Principals said there were multiple ways to create teacher leaders. They stated “It’s a philosophy that the former and current superintendent brought in and support.”

2. Most schools have instructional leadership teams that include classroom teachers.

3. At the high school, teachers collaborate in decision making through the School Redesign and Innovation Team (SRIT).

4. At the elementary level, teachers with strong interest and skill in science have self-identified and are serving as teacher leaders.

**Impact**: Distributed leadership invites shared responsibility and ownership for the success of all students. A clearly visible career ladder for highly effective teachers encourages retention of well-trained veteran staff. By encouraging a talented pool of teachers to share their knowledge and practices through positions of leadership, the district provides a source of high-quality and strategic professional development. A key outcome to the work of the RELB is a climate marked by a mindset of teacher growth and cooperation.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**2. The district does not set measurable goals in its planning documents.**

**A.** The 2016–2021 District Improvement Plan (DIP) and the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are aligned. The DIP contains broad metrics to measure final outcomes; it does not contain SMART goals.[[2]](#footnote-2) Only one SIP includes student performance targets or benchmarks.

1. The district recognizes that this is an area for improvement.In its self-assessment submitted in advance of the onsite, the district rated district and school improvement planning as “Somewhat Well” described by the indicator “The plan specifies the assessment/measurement tools that will be used to gauge progress and when and how data will be reviewed during the year.”

**B.** An interview with the superintendent and a document review indicated that the DIP was in its second year of implementation at the time of the onsite in January 2018. The DIP is organized into “three core foci” or general “umbrella topics”: assessment of and assessment for student learning, teaching all students, and building community. Each focus area has one main sub-goal updated each year followed by lists of actions and timelines and a final outcome measure.

The 2017–2018 “assessment of and assessment for student learning” goal is to “support teachers and administrators to increase knowledge and understanding of effective, research-based, grading and assessment practices as measured by the accomplishment of the short-term goals of the Assessment Sub-Committee.” The success measure is the completion of 80 percent of the sub-committee’s goals.

This metric derives from a set of Revere Educators Leadership Board (RELB) council subcommittee goals which are not stated in measurable terms; for example, for grades 3–5 the short-term goals listed are: “Power Standards for future SBE report card, ELA Power Standards, and MS HoW (Habits of Work) Rubric.” Similarly, for grades 6–8 the short-term goals are: “HoW (Habits of Work) rubric revisions, Roll-out to staff, and Piloting with volunteer teachers.”

2. The “teaching all students” focus is “We will support students and teachers to increase social emotional skills and foster self-efficacy beliefs” and will be “measured by a 15% decrease in the performance gaps between our 2017–2018 performance data for general education students and our special populations as compared to our 2016–2017 data.”

3. The “building community” focus is “deepening existing partnerships and developing at least two (2) new partnerships that will be supportive of family needs and school needs.” Thesewill be measured by “developing at least two (2) new partnerships that will be supportive of family needs and school needs.”

4. The superintendent said that it will take five years to achieve the assessment of and assessment for student learning goal.

**C**. The SIPs provide lists of initiatives for the current year, as well as ongoing initiatives. A few SIPs list persons responsible for the actions and timelines. Of the 11 SIPs, 9 do not have rationales for their initiatives and 10 do not have benchmarks to measure progress and final outcomes.

**Impact:** Without planning documents with SMART goals, the district, schools and community are unable to systematically implement, monitor, and refine continuous, coordinated improvement initiatives. The district cannot ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district’s short- and long-term goals, and it is not possible to effectively measure progress.

***Recommendations***

**1. The district should review and revise its planning documents so that they include measurable goals and benchmarks.**

**A.** The district should convene a representative group of stakeholders to develop benchmarks (including progress benchmarks and final outcomes) for District Improvement Plan (DIP) goals.

1. The benchmarks should be specific and strategic; measurable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked.

**B.** Principals, in collaboration with school councils, should ensure that each School Improvement Plan includes specific measures to determine the progress of school-based initiatives.

1. Similar to the DIP, these measures should be specific and strategic; measurable; action oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results focused; and timed and tracked.

**C.** The district should ensure that district- and school-level goals are communicated to the district community and that progress toward the goals is measured and reported on frequently.

**Benefits:** By developing, communicating, and using measureable goals, the district will make a commitment to the yearly amount of change it plans to achieve. This will help the district and schools to prioritize actions that are most likely to lead to the desired change and to modify or stop ineffective systems and practices.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning. In particular, the resources called *Setting Outcomes for the District Plan* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/PfS-SettingOutcomes.docx>) and *Selecting Outcome Measures and Setting Targets* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/PfS-SelectingOutcomes.docx>) might be useful as the district establishes measures of progress and success.
* *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs.

Curriculum and Instruction

***Contextual Background***

Overall, the district has established an effective system to provide curriculum leadership at the district and school levels. While the superintendent plays an overarching leadership role in teaching and learning in the district, the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment has direct responsibility for the district’s curriculum. Five districtwide directors provide leadership in content areas: STEM (science, technology, engineering and math), humanities and fine arts, foreign language and English language learners, and physical education/health/athletics. The district recently added the position of assistant director of curriculum and instruction K–12 to support curricular and instructional practices in STEM and in humanities with a particular focus on the elementary grades. At the school level, the district has established an effective instructional coaching model in ELA and in mathematics K–8 that provides robust leadership for curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.

Curriculum practices in the district are enhanced by the district’s membership in the Five District Partnership (5DP). This inter-district collaboration (Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop) enables the district to provide a seamless curriculum for students who move within the 5DP as well as high-quality standards based curricula and collaborative assessment practices. The 5DP has Yearlong Plans (YLPs) in every subject at every grade level. They are used with fidelity K–8. However, block scheduling at the high school prevents teachers from using the YLPs as they are designed. In addition to the YLPs, the 5DP offers a range of resources that teachers in the district can easily access on the 5DP website.

The district uses a balanced approach to literacy K–5. For both ELA and math, teachers follow standards-based units and develop lessons based on the YLPs. Districtwide, teachers in all content areas have access to online resources on the district’s shared drive. Teachers follow and/or develop standards-based units using Understanding by Design (UbD), a backwards design model. At the time of the onsite visit in January 2018, a number of the district’s schools were participating in the Massachusetts Consortium for Innovative Education Assessment (MCIEA), which is focused on performance-based assessments. In observed classrooms, the review team noted examples of students engaged in performance-based assessment tasks.

Districtwide, at each level, teachers collaborate in common planning time, in professional learning group time, and as members of each school’s instructional leadership team. Teachers share a common language about instruction, as all teachers are required to complete the Studying Skillful Teaching course by Research for Better Teaching before the start of their third year in the district. At the school level, teachers are involved in informal peer observations while school and district leaders conduct frequent learning walks and walk-throughs.

At thetime of the onsite visit in January 2018, the science curriculum for grades 9–12 reflected alignment with the 2006 standards. The team was told that teacher teams were well on their way to completing Yearlong Plans for each STE course at the high-school level for implementation in September 2018.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district has an ongoing collaboration with the Five District Partnership (5DP) to create shared curriculum documents and assessments and to provide opportunities for teachers in the district to collaborate and share expertise.**

* 1. The district is a member of the 5 District Partnership (5DP) composed of Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop. This partnership was formed to address the needs of the highly mobile inter-district student population. The 5DP provides aligned curricula, performance standards, assessments, and professional development across the five districts. District leaders stated that the 5DP drives the curriculum work of the district.
     1. As a member of the 5DP, the district has been involved in ongoing curriculum and assessment work in recent years.
     2. The 5DP has collaboratively developed Yearlong Plans (YLPs) for all grades and subjects, Understanding by Design units (UbD) and common assessments in ELA, math (grades 2–8), and science (grades 4-8) administered three times yearly.

**B.** YLPs are the cornerstone of the district’s K–8 curriculum.

* + 1. The team’s review of the YLPs indicated that they are extensive documents divided into five two-month blocks that show when standards should be taught. They include a detailed standards overview and block-by-block curriculum map, assessment information, and suggested UbD units.
    2. District leaders reported that the 5DP YLPs are used with fidelity K–8, but cannot be used as designed at the high school because of block scheduling.

a. The district follows the 5DP YLPs in English language arts, mathematics, and science K–8 and history/social studies in grades 2–8.

b. Principals refer to the YLPs in reviewing lesson plans and visiting classes. Teachers, coaches, and district leaders stated that they use the YLPs to develop curriculum maps and UbD units following the backwards design model: goals, understandings, knowledge, skills, standards and assessments, and the learning plan including lessons and resources.

c. Resources to support teaching, including UbD units, are on the 5DP website; in addition, the district has a shared Google drive for curriculum resources.

d. YLPs for all departments and all grades are on the district’s website.

3. District leaders told the team that all curricular work done in the district is connected with the 5DP.

**C.** Collaboration with the 5DP is ongoing and involves many levels within the district.

1. The superintendent is a member of the 5DP leadership team.
2. The humanities director, the STEM director, the assistant director of curriculum and instruction, and the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment sit on the 5DP steering committee and meet regularly with the executive director of the 5DP.
3. Teachers serve on the 5DP teacher advisory board and provide a conduit for information from teachers to the 5DP leadership board.
4. ELA and math coaches collaborate with the 5DP to help to create the assessments.

5. The 5DP provides resources and training to district teachers. The 5DP executive director coordinates professional development (PD) offerings for the five district partners. District coaches reported that they received training through the 5DP in backwards design and in developing UbD units.

6. Coaches stated that following the administration of the 5DP common assessments the 5DP data analyst compiles assessment reports for the district which the coaches make user friendly.

7. The 5DP provides district teachers with additional PD opportunities and access to resources.

**Impact:** By participating in an inter-district collaborative partnership to align curriculum and assessment practices, the district is ensuring that all its students, including those who move within the five districts, are accessing a high-quality curriculum that is likely to improve student outcomes.

1. **The district has established structures, practices, and resources that support the consistent use, alignment, and delivery of the district’s curriculum.**
2. Across the district at every level and in every school, structures are in place for teacher collaboration in implementing curriculum, assessments, and effective instructional practices.

Every school in the district has Professional Learning Groups (PLGs) composed of a teacher leader or facilitator, teachers, and coaches. School leaders reported that PLGs may vary by school, but they follow agendas and meet at least weekly and in some cases more often. PLGs meet by content areas or by grade -level teams covering topics relating to the standards, data, specific course content, and instruction.

1. At the high school, a late start in the schedule twice per week provides regular PLG time for teacher collaboration in content areas (math, ELA, science and social studies) or by courses. PLGs are led by facilitators who have content expertise in their area. Coaches and content directors also attend PLGs. Facilitators in biology, chemistry, and math meet several times a year with the STEM director.

i. Teachers stated that they develop lessons and strategies and analyze data during PLG time.

b. In each school, teachers submit monthly reflections on their work in PLGs.

School leaders said that every school has an instructional leadership team (ILT) which meets approximately every three weeks. ILTs include the principal and representatives from each grade-level team, including ESL and special education teachers. ILTs review and cultivate ideas from the teacher level and work with principals to develop school-level professional development.

a. Topics covered in ILTs include: data, learning walks, support for social-emotional learning, and high-quality instruction. Districtwide, elementary and middle-school teachers have a grade-level common planning period at least once weekly; some schools have additional time. The team was told that coaches attend grade-level meetings to help teachers plan the curriculum and ensure consistent pacing.

a. Teachers reported that they use common planning time to co-plan and to share information and strategies.

**B.** Math and literacy coaches play a pivotal role in ensuring that curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned and in providing teachers with broad support. In addition, beginning in 2017, a consulting teachers’ initiative has provided one-on-one support to teachers.

The district has a math and literacy coach in every elementary and middle school and one literacy coach at the high school, a total of 19 coaches districtwide.

District and school leaders and teachers outlined the role of math and literacy coaches. Coaches model lessons, provide non-evaluative instructional feedback to teachers, help teachers plan lessons and units and to implement center work. Coaches support teachers’ understanding of data and of the standards.

a. For example, the math and ELA coaches have supported the implementation of the 2017 ELA/Literacy and Math frameworks.

Principals reported that they meet with their coaches weekly to discuss teachers’ practices as well as what principals should look for in the curriculum when visiting classes.

Literacy coaches meet weekly with the director of humanities and math coaches meet weekly with the STEM director. District leaders told the team that alignment was a big focus during these meetings as well as setting priorities about what should be happening during meetings in their respective schools.

Interviews and a document review indicated that the district established a colleague-to-colleague coaching initiative (C2C). Four Consulting Teachers districtwide work with volunteer participating teachers and provide embedded professional development and support in a non-evaluative way.

* + - 1. Interviewees said that a consulting teacher at the elementary level focused on supporting practices for English language learners; two consulting teachers at the middle level provided teachers with support for project-based assessment tasks and for Universal Design for Learning strategies; and one consulting teacher at the high-school level provided support for assessment practices and reading in the content area.

**Impact:** By providing teachers with multiple structures for collaboration along with resources to facilitate the alignment of the curriculum and effective instructional practices, the district is following a research-based model likely to improve student achievement**.**

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was inconsistent. There was a consistently lower incidence of characteristics of effective instruction at the high-school level.**

**A. Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives and Expectations** Although in 94 percent of observed classrooms teachers demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter, there was less consistency in setting learning objectives and expectations and in checking for student understanding districtwide. Consistent implementation of these practices was more evident at the elementary and middle-school levels.

1. Review team members found sufficient and compelling evidence that teachers ensured that students understood what they were learning and why (characteristic # 2) in 75 percent of elementary classes observed, in 80 percent of middle-school classes, and in 50 percent of high-school classes.

a. Throughout the district, the review team routinely observed posted lesson itineraries, including learning objectives that often indicated what students would be able to do (SWBAT). The review team noted that in classes where learning objectives were clearly explained, students understood what they were learning and why and, when asked, could explain this to review team members. For example, the team noted effective use of learning objectives in a grade 5 mathematics class where the teacher frequently reviewed the goals of the lesson and asked students multiple follow-up questions to make certain that they understood.

b. In contrast, in some observed classes where there was an ineffective use of learning objectives, teachers either missed opportunities to explain the posted learning objectives or learning objectives were not present. For example, in a grade 9 math class, a team member noted an agenda listing the question of the day, topics to be covered, and an exit ticket. During the observation, the teacher did not explain why the topics were important.

2. In 81 percent of elementary classes and in 77 percent of middle-school classes observed, the review team found sufficient and compelling evidence of the teacher conducting frequent checks for student understanding, providing feedback, and adjusting instruction (characteristic # 4). In contrast, at the high-school level, this practice was seen in only 37 percent of classes observed.

a. At the elementary and middle-school levels, the review team observed a wide range of teachers’ strategies to check for understanding. In these classes, teachers circulated around the room, providing one-to-one feedback; asked students to explain their thinking; used “thumbs-up, thumbs-down” or “hands on head” to determine student understanding; and randomly called on students using Popsicle™ sticks.

b. While some high-school classrooms showed evidence of effective checking for understanding with targeted one-on-one feedback to students or to groups working together and exit tickets, in the majority of classes observed teachers infrequently checked for understanding and provided limited feedback to students.

i. Teachers directed questions to the whole class and accepted answers from one or two students and then moved on. Teachers relied on unison answers or answers called out.

**B. Focus Area #2: Student Engagement and Higher-Order Thinking** The review team found more consistency in students taking responsibility for their learning in observed classrooms at the elementary and middle schools. Although the School Redesign Innovation Team (SRIT) at the high school is focused on student-centered learning, in 50 percent of high-school classes the team saw limited evidence of this practice. Districtwide students were not consistently engaged in challenging higher-order thinking tasks.

1. The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students assumed responsibility for their learning and were engaged in the lesson (characteristic #5) in 83 percent of elementary classes, in 81 percent of middle-school classes, and in 50 percent of high-school classes observed.

a. The team characterized most observed elementary and middle-school classes as student centered, with students taking responsibility for their own learning. In elementary classes, students worked individually or with partners and in small groups with the teacher in timed, intentionally designed centers supporting the content of the learning objective. While the team observed station work at the middle-school level, they also noted students working in small groups or pairs completing specific assignments. For example, in a grade 6 ELA class, students worked in pairs completing a Venn diagram and engaged in questioning and challenging each other concerning the evidence used. The team also noted that teachers used engaging games to help student review content.

b. In contrast, the team noted examples of high levels of student engagement in only 50 percent of observed high-school classes. In these classes, the team characterized students as highly engaged in content and lesson objectives and having multiple opportunities for doing the thinking in the classroom. Students were involved in drama presentations, doing research on Chromebooks, peer editing/reviewing, solving mathematics problems in small groups and completing science projects. In the remaining 50 percent of observed high-school classes the team found limited evidence of student engagement. In these classes, teachers directed learning and many students were not participating or answering questions.

2.The team sawsufficient and compelling evidence that students were engaged in tasks such as analysis, synthesis, problem-solving, evaluation or application of new knowledge (characteristic # 6) in 65 percent of elementary classes, in 69 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 44 percent of high-school classes observed.

a. In observed elementary and middle-school classes, the team noted that in most mathematics classes there was a focus on understanding concepts and students were required to explain their thinking and answers fully. The team noted examples of students solving problems and applying new knowledge. For example, in a grade 4 mathematics class students were designing a playground, applying area and perimeter concepts learned in math to the performance task. In ELA classes, students were asked to explain their thinking and to compare/contrast and synthesize.

b. In the majority of classes observed at the high school, review team members found limited evidence of students engaged in higher-order thinking. For example, the team noted that in mathematics classes there was a heavy reliance on procedural versus conceptual knowledge. Students worked on pencil and paper activities, but did not have consistent opportunities to explain their reasoning.

3. The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that students communicated their ideas connected to the content (characteristic # 7) in 59 percent of elementary classes, in 66 percent of middle-school classes, and in only 44 percent of high-school classes.

a. In elementary and middle-school classes, the review teams saw the frequent use of turn and talk as a strategy to have students share their thinking. In middle-school classes, the team noted that students also shared their thinking in small groups and in large groups. In contrast, at both levels, when teacher-centered whole-class instruction was observed, students’ opportunities to exchange ideas were more limited.

b. In the majority of observed high-school classes, students had limited opportunities to communicate their ideas. In these classes, students answered questions posed by the teacher, but did not explain their answers and did not share their thinking about content with their classmates. In addition, teacher-directed lessons and a focus on procedural versus conceptual knowledge in some mathematics classes limited student exchanges about content.

**C. Focus Area #3: Inclusive Practice and Classroom Culture: Although inclusive practices and positive classroom culture were firmly established in observed elementary and middle school classrooms, the team found that these practices were less consistently observed at the high school level.**

1. In81 percent of elementary classes, in 74 percent of middle-school classes, and in 62 percent of high-school classes observed, the review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that lessons were designed to support students with varied learning needs.

a. The review team saw a range of examples of how elementary and middle- school classes were designed to support all students. For example, in many observed inclusion classes the general education teacher worked seamlessly with the special education teacher to support all learners. Student-centered classrooms provided opportunities to support students’ individual needs as teachers worked with differentiated groups. In addition, center work included opportunities for students to use Chromebooks to access content in programs such as Achieve 3000.

b. In observed inclusion classes at the high-school level, teachers frequently checked in with students to support their learning. The review team cited examples of lessons that were designed to appeal to students’ varied learning needs. For example, in a geometry class students collaborated in groups using Play-DoTM to answer questions on volume.

2. The review team found that teachers used multiple approaches to support instruction (characteristic # 10) in 84 percent of elementary classes, in 88 percent of middle-school classes, and in 51 percent of high-school classes.

a. The dominant use of student-centered learning in observed elementary and middle-school classes provided students with multiple approaches and formats to support their learning.

b. The team noted high-school classes where the teacher provided a variety of instructional approaches. For example, in a grade 10 ELA class, students worked in small groups, in pairs, or independently, researching on Chromebooks, writing, discussing, and peer editing. However, in many classes observed at the high school level, teachers relied heavily on teacher-directed lessons with whole-class instruction.

3. In 100 percent of elementary classes, in 96 percent of middle-school classes, and in 62 percent of high-school classes observed, the team noted sufficient and compelling evidence of routines and positive supports in place to ensure students behave appropriately (characteristic # 11).

a. In almost all observed elementary and middle-school classes, teachers had established strong routines. Team members saw multiple examples of strategies teachers used to get students’ attention or to signal a transition to another activity or center. For example, teachers used timers, bells and/or routinized sayings to get students’ attention in a positive way. The team observed that teachers used positive reinforcements to redirect students.

b. Although the review team observed established routines and supports in a majority of observed high-school classes, in 37 percent of observed classes observers found limited evidence of these practices. In several classes there was an undercurrent of off-task student talking without redirection by the teacher. In addition, the review team cited instances where students had their headphones on with music audible, or---unrelated to the lesson---were looking at their cell phones without redirection by the teacher.

4. The review team found sufficient and compelling evidence that the classroom climate was conducive to learning (characteristic # 12) in 97 percent of elementary classes, in 93 percent of middle-school classes, and in 63 percent of high-school classes observed.

a. The review team described observed elementary and middle -school classes as respectful with positive, supportive and enthusiastic student and teacher interactions.

b. Although the team observed students and teachers having respectful relationships without interruptions to learning in a majority of high-school classes observed, in 37 percent of classes, a disruptive classroom environment and behavioral management issues compromised teaching and learning.

**Impact:** When effective, research-based instructional practices are not fully in place at all levels, the district cannot ensure that students are sufficiently prepared to achieve at high levels.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should ensure that effective teaching and learning practices are consistently implemented districtwide, with a particular focus on the high-school level.**

1. District leaders, principals, assistant principals, coaches, teacher leaders and consulting teachers should continue articulating and monitoring the district’s expectations of high-quality teaching and learning practices. Particular attention should be paid to effective practices relating to well-structured lessons, student ownership of their learning, higher-order thinking and student opportunities to communicate their thinking.

At the high-school level, high-quality instructional practices should be clarified for teachers during professional development meetings and PLG meetings as well as by the consulting teacher and the literacy coach.

The School Redesign Innovation Team (SRIT) at the high school should redouble its efforts to ensure that teachers have a clear understanding of how to achieve effective student-centered learning in their classrooms.

The district should ensure that all levels share the same understanding of what constitutes inclusive practices and classroom environments that are conducive to learning.

**B.** The district should build on its practice of conducting learning walks to include teachers and coaches as well as directors and principals for the purpose of understanding and maintaining high-quality instruction districtwide.

1. The district should consider developing a learning walk protocol.

* 1. The district should continue to use its Educator Growth procedures and observation tools (see Human Resources and Professional Development below) to systematically promote high-quality instructional practices and provide instructive feedback and support to teachers.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include a common understanding among teachers and evaluators of what high-quality instruction should look like in all classrooms.

**Recommended resources:**

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

• ESE’s *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* (Updated August 2017) (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.

Assessment

***Contextual Background***

All Revere schools have teams of personnel who collect and analyze student achievement data throughout the year. Assessment drives instruction and staff regularly use assessment data to make decisions about achievement, lessons, programs, and grades. In fact, “assessment of and assessment for student learning” is one of three core foci for the district’s 2016–2021 improvement plan. Further, the district is implementing a comprehensive study of assessments and grading structures as teachers expand performance assessments and move to standards-based grading practices.

Over the course of the year, when state and local assessments are administered to district students, educators analyze assessment data, and teachers monitor students’ progress and make decisions based upon results. Dialogue about assessment and instruction happens consistently across the district: teachers talk with teachers, teachers talk with coaches, coaches talk with school and district leaders, and leaders talk with central office administrators. Moreover, this dialogue continues during staff meetings, grade-level meetings, professional-growth meetings, and directors’ meetings. A distributive leadership model promotes opportunities for many educators to talk about their practice.

Teachers and curriculum leaders in the Five District Partnership (5DP) develop ELA, math, and science curriculum and assessments (ELA, math, and science). These assessments are administered to students in grades 2–8 three times per year in ELA and math and twice in science. Revere teachers provide input into all aspects of these assessments. In addition, teachers and leaders represent the district in the 5DP. Staff members have access to curriculum, assessment, and assessment results through a platform called MasteryConnect, a K-–12 assessment and curriculum tool.

Assessment data are used for student placement, lesson planning, and pedagogy. Teachers provide support and enrichment depending upon students’ progress.

***Strength Finding***

* + 1. **All district schools have structures in place to continuously collect and analyze multiple sources of data to monitor student progress, inform instructional practices, provide interventions, and make decisions about assessment policies and practices.**

1. The district has a year-long cycle of assessments which is published and disseminated to teachers. Teachers administer and collect data from these assessments and regularly use assessment data to monitor student progress and achievement.

Kindergarten teachers initially screen their students to determine students’ knowledge and they administer three local ELA assessments during the year.

K–5 teachers administer the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessment three times per school year. DIBELS information is typically entered by literacy coaches and shared with teachers.

K–2 students take a placement assessment using Lexia, which has its own monitoring and management program. Students use this program throughout the year.

Students in grades 3–5 take a Lexile level placement assessment using the Achieve 3000 program. Students use this program throughout the year.

Teachers in grades 2–8 administer three common performance assessments (for ELA and mathematics) during the school year. Teachers, coaches, and administrators developed these assessments in partnership with 5DP.

Teachers in grades 4–8 administer two common performance assessments for science, also developed through the 5DP process.

High-school teachers administer quarterly and summative assessments.

Teachers and administrators use MasteryConnect, an online platform, to track 5DP curriculum and assessments for grades 2–8. Other assessments are shared on Google Drive or Google Classroom.

1. Although structures to analyze data vary by levels and by school, all teachers, coaches, school leaders, directors, and central office administrators review data throughout the year.

1. The district implements a distributed leadership approach to data analysis and decision-making.

a. The assistant superintendent reviews and analyzes data with directors and principals.

b. The directors meet with the school coaches on Fridays and prioritize their work and plan with teachers.

c. In turn, the coaches meet with teachers to offer support; for example, they update quarterly exams, look at MCAS 2.0 assessment questions, revise and improve 5DP assessments, analyze data, and discuss lessons.

d. At the elementary-school level, the instructional leadership teams (school administrator, coaches, teachers, teacher leader) review and analyze data. Team meetings vary in frequency from weekly to monthly.

e. At the middle schools, the instructional learning team, grade-level teams, and professional learning groups meet to review schoolwide data, specific team data, or subject area data. “At-risk” teams also meet to focus on retention, attendance, and tardiness data.

f. At the high school, administrators meet once per month with directors. Subject-area teachers and/or professional learning groups meet weekly.

1. The district analyzes and use data to drive decision-making.
   * 1. Teachers use a variety of data (including MCAS, MasteryConnect reports, performance-based assessments, Lexia, Achieve 3000, classroom pre- and post-tests) to determine which students achieved mastery of standards and which ones need intervention support or enrichment.
     2. Coaches said that “everybody does the cycle: collect data, analyze, and inform instruction,” noting that staff “identify strengths and weaknesses and prepare to reteach and reassess.”
     3. Teachers in grades 2–8 analyze their 5DP assessment data and create and implement a re-teaching plan at least three times per year. High-school teachers write re-teaching plans after receiving the results of their quarterly assessments.
     4. High-school teachers use data to identify goals and develop summative assessments.
     5. Assessment data help to determine intervention support or enrichment opportunities for students.
        1. Opportunities for support include: Support, Title I, special education, and ELL services are available for students who qualify. Opportunities include:

Teachers provide additional support through small-group instruction.

Middle-school students receive an hour of intervention during half school days.

At the high school, students at risk are identified and receive help from teachers or student tutors. High-school students told the team that the writing center is active and that students help each other with writing assignments. One student noted, “There is always someone to help if you need it.”

* + 1. Professional Learning Groups (PLGs) meet regularly and are organized by facilitators. Teachers work together to use the data to re-focus instruction on state standards. One interviewee said: “If a high number of students are failing courses, we discuss practice and have honest conversations about what needs to happen to improve outcomes.”
    2. The district is helping teachers to expand their performance-based assessments and standards-based grading practices.
       1. Some teachers are participating in the Massachusetts Consortium for Innovative Education Assessment (MCIEA). The training emphasizes performance assessments as the primary means of assessing student learning.
       2. Teachers and administrators have a structured a year-long action plan to implement standards-based grading practices.
       3. Teachers are participating in professional development meetings to write assessments tied to power standards identified in the state curriculum frameworks.

**Impact**: When systems are in place to effectively monitor students’ progress to inform instructional decisions in the classroom, the district is more likely to improve teaching and learning.

Human Resources and Professional Development

***Contextual Background***

The district demonstrates a genuine commitment to developing a culture and structures that support and promote ongoing professional growth. This is particularly apparent in its professional development and educator evaluation systems, both of which have been designed to align closely with relevant state standards and expectations.

The district’s professional development program is distinguished by its commitment to creating a climate that advances adult learning through collaboration, effective communication, ongoing opportunities for professional improvement, and recognition of a joint responsibility for student learning. The district endeavors to support and sustain a program that is appropriately differentiated, designed to support educators at all stages of their careers, and provides ample opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles and positions. The review team found considerable evidence that the district’s professional development programs and services are systematically based on district priorities, staff needs, student achievement, and assessments of instructional practices and programs in the schools. As a consequence, Revere professional development programming is serving the needs of staff, the district, and ultimately, students in a highly effective manner.

Much the same can be said of the district’s efforts to implement the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework. The district promotes a professional culture of growth-oriented supervision through a combination of formal evaluations and regular and frequent supervisory feedback. Evaluators receive ongoing training designed to enhance the accuracy and fairness of written evaluations and the timeliness and efficacy of supervisory practices and feedback. Most importantly, the district is using the evaluation process to generate a thoughtful and continuous professional dialogue between teachers and administrators that focuses on student learning and professional growth.

More work remains to be done, however, before the district realizes the full benefit of its educator evaluation system. There is inconsistency and unevenness in the quality of educators’ evaluations. Although the majority of evaluations are instructive and growth oriented---containing constructive feedback and concrete, actionable recommendations for improved practice---many are not. Over one third of the teachers’ evaluations reviewed by the team did not include clear and actionable feedback and/or specific recommendations capable of meaningfully improving classroom instruction or contributing effectively to enhanced professional practice.

Further, the district has not taken action on the components of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework which require the collection and use of multiple measures of evaluative evidence. The Educator Evaluation Framework now calls for the inclusion of student and staff feedback and the results of common and standardized student assessments as integral components of educator evaluation.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district has adopted an educator evaluation system that is closely aligned with the Standards for Effective Administrative Leadership and Teaching Practice articulated in the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework. It has made its effective implementation a strategic priority and has made progress in developing a comprehensive, growth-oriented evaluative system.**

**A.** Key district documents, organizational structures and systems, and interviews with district leaders, school principals, and teachers confirm the district’s genuine commitment to the systematic implementation of growth-oriented evaluative policies and practices designed to improve professional competencies and increase student academic achievement and well-being.

1. The 2016–2021 District Improvement Plan (DIP) speaks directly to the importance of providing all administrators with “professional development training in the area(s) of supervising, evaluating, and providing effective feedback” to all staff.

* + - 1. Administrators reported that all Revere evaluators receive continuous training and support designed to calibrate evaluative feedback and ensure consistent and fair staff supervision and evaluation practices. They said, and documents confirmed, that a variety of training activities and exercises are conducted throughout the year, including those incorporated in monthly cabinet and assistant principals’ meetings, as well as provided more formally through consultant-led PD programs.
      2. Reviewers were told that all administrators are required to take the course “Teacher Supervision and Evaluation That Works” (Ribas Associates) during their first year in the district in order to enhance their capacity to supervise and evaluate effectively.
         1. Teachers and administrators stated that all teachers also receive formal training to promote their understanding of and active participation in the evaluation process. This is provided primarily through the district’s orientation and mentoring program for new teachers, annual professional development workshops and presentations, and by requiring that all staff complete the district provided “Skillful Teacher” (Research for Better Teaching) course by the start of their third year of employment.

2. District leaders and principals confirmed that the superintendent has made the effective implementation of the district’s educator evaluation system a priority. Her high expectations for principals and all evaluators are clearly stated and consistently maintained. The superintendent and central office administrators use the district’s online platform EdGrowth to closely monitor the process and provide timely and targeted feedback to principals throughout the school year. The annual evaluations of principals clearly reflect their level of accountability for meeting all evaluative requirements.

* + 1. Interviewees said that through the Revere Educators Leadership Board (RELB) and the affiliated Educator Growth Council, both of which are composed of administrators and teachers, the implementation of the district’s educator evaluation system is continually and collaboratively monitored to ensure equity and overall effectiveness.
  1. The district’s commitment to the principles and practices articulated in its educator evaluation system are clearly reflected in the quality, consistency, and timeliness of its evaluative documentation and the favorable opinions expressed by teachers and administrators alike.
     1. The team reviewed the 2015–2017 evaluation documentation of 30 teachers selected randomly from across the district. These included both professional teacher status and non-professional teacher status staff. All evaluative documents (e.g., goals, self-assessments, and evidence) were appropriate and complete. The formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations were timely and informative in that they were evidence based and addressed teacher performance in the four State Standards for Effective Teaching Practice. Although there was unevenness in quality and consistency, the majority of the evaluations also contained constructive feedback and concrete, actionable recommendations for improved classroom practice and professional growth.
     2. Team members also reviewed the 2015–2017 formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations of each of the district’s 11 principals. The superintendent directly supervises and evaluates all principals. The principals’ evaluations were uniformly high quality assessments which were fully aligned with the requirements and standards of the state framework. They were comprehensive, informative, and thoroughly evidence based. Further, all evaluations were instructive and contained feedback that was clear, timely, and concrete, as well as recommendations that were specific, growth oriented, and actionable, with the capacity to contribute directly to professional improvement, leadership capacity, and overall effectiveness.

3. In multiple interviews, teachers and administrators confirmed that classroom observations, both unannounced and announced, were conducted regularly and frequently across the district. The teachers’ primary and secondary evaluator(s) observe classes and feedback from observations must be posted on the district’s Edgrowth platform within three days of the observation. Teachers and administrators agreed that the quality, volume, and value of the continuous written and oral feedback was high. They stated that this practice contributed greatly to improved pedagogical competency and enriched professional dialogue. According to a 2016–2017 district survey in which over 200 district staff participated, more than 80 percent of teachers who responded indicated that their educator evaluation system supports teacher growth and development, improves teacher practice, and improves their impact on student learning. These favorability rates are more than twice those recorded in state data. These positive views were also consistently reflected in teachers’ focus groups conducted by the review team.

**Impact**: By embracing the principles and practices embedded in the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework, the district is demonstrating its commitment to using supervision and evaluation as a primary mechanism by which to systematically improve the professional competencies and practices of educators and to increase the leadership capacity of administrators. This likely provides increased learning opportunities and academic achievement for the district’s students.

**2. The district has developed a comprehensive and collaborative professional development program that is aligned with district and school priorities, supports teachers and administrators, and is informed by student achievement data and the needs and interests of staff.**

**A.** The district’s professional development (PD) program incorporates many of the core components of the Massachusetts Standards for PD. Among those principles is that PD should be a systematic and purposeful process directed by effective and collaborative leadership.

1. The district’s PD program is under the central direction of the Revere Educators Leadership Board (RELB) and its designated subcommittee, the Professional Development Council. These committees collaboratively develop and oversee the framework of PD priorities, resource allocation, and implementation strategies for the district.

a. Interviewees stated that the RELB and its affiliated council coordinate and plan 5 of the 10 scheduled PD early release days, and that these are designated for districtwide programming. The remaining five sessions are used for school-based PD aligned with the School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and are directed by each school’s principal and its Instructional Leadership Team (ILT).

1. The district produces a comprehensive and detailed catalogue of director-developed PD programs available to K–12 staff throughout the school year. The catalogue includes the name, presenter, description, date, and location of all courses/programs. The catalogue is available electronically through the district’s web site and teachers can readily select workshops and manage their PD profiles, recertification progress, etc., through their individual “My Learning Plan” portals.

**B**. The district’s PD further reflects the state standards in that it is directly aligned with District Improvement Plan (DIP) priorities while appropriately supporting the improvement objectives of the schools and individual educators.

1. Interviewees stated that the district’s PD plan and programs are developed to align with and advance the district’s strategic priorities, as articulated in the DIP, as well as those unique to the needs and objectives of individual schools, as identified in their SIPs.

2. Administrators and teachers said that although the PD program is directly aligned with district priorities, it is appropriately differentiated and flexible to meet the diverse needs, professional goals, and skill and experience levels of all teachers. Interviewees and district documents identified a broad range of programs, workshops, and learning formats available to both new and experienced educators, specialists, and administrators throughout the year.

3. Experienced teachers are provided extensive instructional leadership opportunities. Interviewees cited numerous committee opportunities created by the district’s RELB distributed leadership structure, including the train-the-trainer model of embedded PD, the mentor program, and the design and presentation of workshops and programs.

1. Consistent with state expectations, the district makes effective use of data to identify, plan, and subsequently improve its PD programming. It systematically collects and analyzes a range of relevant student and staff data and regularly assesses PD programs to ensure that progress is being made and objectives are being met.

District and school leaders stated that PD planning and prioritizing is directly informed by the ongoing collection and analysis of student performance data. These include state assessments (e.g., MCAS and ACCESS), standardized grade-level testing, including DIBELS and MasteryConnect data in grades 2–8, and common departmental quarterly assessments at the high school.

Interviewees said that the district compiles data from staff for planning and evaluating PD programs. Teachers are surveyed annually to determine areas of professional interest/need. All staff are required to submit a timely assessment of programs attended in order to receive their PDPs. RELB’s professional development council collects and analyzes staff feedback on districtwide PD and the school principal and ILT compile school-based formative data.

**D.**  In accordance with the state’s PD standards, the district is making a substantial commitment of resources, including time, funding, and personnel, to provide the sustained attention and support required to attain its goals and objectives.

The district has embedded considerable time in its calendar and school schedules and offers a wide range of opportunities and formats for teachers to learn and grow. School and district leaders said that the district provides one early-release day each month throughout the school year, as well as three full days in mid-August for all new teachers, and two full days before the opening of school for all professional staff.

1. Interviewees identified a variety of additional vehicles and structures by which the district provides PD across the district. Although opportunities vary considerably in frequency and format from school to school, they include common planning time at the elementary schools, with additional common planning time at the extended learning and innovation schools, regularly scheduled professional learning group (PLG) meetings, and monthly faculty, departmental, and grade-level meetings.
2. Particular note was made of the introduction in 2017–2018 of the consulting teacher (Colleague to Colleague/C-2-C) program. The four consulting teachers collaborate with teachers to provide job embedded PD support through goal setting, collaboration, peer observation, and targeted, non-evaluative feedback.
3. Administrators cited the valuable role of coaches in providing embedded PD support and services to staff. These include literacy and math coaches K-–8 and a literacy coach at the high school. In addition to modeling lessons, attending and directing PLG meetings, and analyzing student data, coaches are actively involved in providing school-based PD.

District administrators spoke favorably about the district’s membership in the Five District Partnership (5DP). Through this formal collaboration, the district seeks to raise student achievement by developing, aligning, and sharing high-quality curriculum, assessments, instructional resources, and PD programs and services.

**Impact**: The district’s commitment to providing opportunities for teachers and administrators to collaborate in purposeful and structured ways is creating a culture of continuous professional learning and growth and recognition of the shared responsibility among educators and educational leaders for student achievement. Ultimately, this should result in significant and lasting improvements in classroom instruction, professional competencies, and the curriculum, as well as increased learning opportunities and outcomes for all students.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. The district has not undertaken formal action on the components of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence.**

**A.** As of the 2015–2016 school year state educator evaluation regulations (603CMR 35.07) call for districts to collect and use student feedback as evidence in a teacher evaluation process and staff feedback as evidence in the administrator evaluation process.[[3]](#footnote-3) This feedback may also be used to inform an educator’s self-assessment and goal setting, or as evidence to demonstrate changes in practice over time.

1. Administrators said that although the district has conducted some districtwide surveys on school culture and some teachers informally use student satisfaction data, the district has not taken formal action to implement this component of the state’s Educator Evaluation Framework.

**B.** The educator evaluation regulations also require districts to common assessments to determine student learning growth, or achievement and inform judgments about educator impact.

1. Interviewees stated that the district has been working to create content-area common assessments and to compile and analyze data from a range of standardized student assessments to determine program effectiveness and student achievement. They acknowledged, however, that student assessment data is not used as a component of teacher evaluation and at the time of the onsite in January 2018 the district did not have plans to use student assessment data to inform educator’s evaluations.

**Impact**: Without implementing the components of the Educator Evaluation Framework that call for the collection and use of multiple sources of evaluative evidence, the district cannot provide all educators with a comprehensive and accurate description of their overall effectiveness. This diminishes educators’ ability to reflect objectively on the efficacy of their professional efforts, to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement, and to improve learning experiences and outcomes for students.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should continue to focus on improving the quality and consistency of all formal staff evaluations and should ensure that all components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework are fully and effectively implemented.**

**A.** The district should continue its efforts to ensure that all administrators consistently produce high-quality formative and summative staff evaluations. Evaluations must uniformly be growth oriented and contain specific feedback and concrete, actionable recommendations capable of contributing directly to expanded pedagogical competencies and improved professional capacity and performance.

**B.** The district is urged to implement the components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evidence to inform the evaluations of both teachers and principals.

Policies and procedures appropriate for the collection and use of student and staff feedback as evidence for teacher and principal summary assessments should be collaboratively developed. In addition to informing evaluations, feedback could be included in an educator’s self-assessment and goal setting, and/or used to demonstrate improvements in practice over time.

The district should develop an effective process, consistent with current state guidelines, whereby the results of common and standardized student assessments are factored as a component of each educator’s evaluation. Evidence of student learning should be a key element of an educator’s summary evaluation.

**Benefits**: By continuing to focus attention on improving the quality and consistency of formative and summative evaluations, the district will ensure that the full benefits of the educator evaluation system will be achieved. The implementation of the components of the regulations that require the collection and use of multiple measures of evidence in the evaluation of teachers and administrators will significantly improve the district’s capacity to provide staff with a comprehensive and accurate description of their overall effectiveness and to identify areas of strength and opportunities for growth. Improved student learning opportunities and increased academic achievement will be the ultimate result.

**Recommended resources:**

* Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf>) and Administrators (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf>) are designed to provide schools and districts with information about the status of their educator evaluation implementation. Information from these surveys can be used to target district resources and supports where most needed to strengthen implementation.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Student and Staff Feedback* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Feedback.pdf>) provides information about how to select feedback instruments and use feedback as part of the educator evaluation system, along with links to relevant resources.
* Through the *Online Calibration Training Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/tool/>), educators watch videos of classroom instruction from ESE's Calibration Video Library (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/>) tagged to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII_AppxC.pdf>). Using an online form, participants assess the teacher's practice based on evidence from the video and provide written feedback. Real-time data displays allow participants to calibrate their assessments of practice and written feedback with one another, as well with educators throughout the state.

Student Support

***Contextual Background***

In the 2017–2018 school year, 67.3 percent of district students are part of the high-needs subgroup because they are in one or more of the following groups: economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners (ELLs) or former ELLs. Many students come to school each day with high programmatic and support needs. For example, economically disadvantaged students represent 49.7 percent of student enrollment, compared with 32 percent of the state; students with disabilities make up 15.8 percent of enrollment, compared with 17.7 percent of the state; and ELLs represent 22.8 percent of the student population, compared with 10.2 percent across the state. Between 2013 and 2018 the proportion of English language learners in the district increased steadily from 11.4 percent in 2013 to 22.8 percent in 2018.

The district’s approach to student support is marked by inclusive classrooms, common practices to identify students who need support, and a range of interventions.

Special education and general education teachers work side by side in classrooms to support students with disabilities. Other specialists, including interventionists, reading specialists and Title I paraprofessionals, may come into the classroom to support small-group instruction. While the district provides pull-out services, teachers of English language learners also work with students in some classrooms. In addition, all classroom teachers in the district are expected to be Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) endorsed and implement strategies in the daily lessons.

School-based student support teams in each school meet to discuss and offer additional strategies to teachers who have struggling students. Also, at-risk teams meet in the middle and high schools to monitor students identified from EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) data.

The district is a Title I schoolwide district where each school uses its funding to provide academic support in different ways including providing literacy or reading interventionists, reading teachers, or after-school support. Several schools in the district participate in the Massachusetts Extended Learning Time Initiative, giving them opportunities for an extended school year or school day. The district’s alternative high school, Seacoast, offers flexible scheduling and small classes and at the time of the review in January 2018 enrolled approximately 100 students. In June 2017, Seacoast was awarded a planning grant from the Barr Foundation’s Engage New England: Doing High School Differently initiative. The school is expected to develop a new model for students who have been underserved. The review team found that the district is proactive in engaging community partners and parents to expand learning opportunities and support students’ social, emotional, and health needs. The district has partnered with colleges and local businesses to further students’ readiness for college and careers.

High-school retention and chronic absence[[4]](#footnote-4) are challenges, despite district efforts in these areas. The largest number of retentions in the district over the last several years has come from 9th graders (66 in 2014, 74 in 2015, 94 in 2016, and 79 in 2017). In 2017, 23.3 percent of 9th graders and 29.9 percent of 12th graders were chronically absent.

***Strength Findings***

**1. The district implements data-based practices to identify and provide academic support for students.**

**A.** Common data-based practices are used across the district to identify students who need academic support.

1. Interviewees reported that DIBELS is administered three times a year in kindergarten through grade 5 and district math assessments in grades two to five. Assessments are followed by data meetings where teachers discuss literacy and math results, monitor growth, create groupings and assign interventions based on need.

2. MasteryConnect, a standards-based online assessment used in grades 2– 8, provides results that teachers use to create reteach plans. The review team was told that results drive instruction, create groupings, and suggest interventions.

3. Middle- and high-school teachers administer common quarterly assessments. Middle- school teachers and administrators confirmed that data results are analyzed during instructional leadership team (ILT) meetings and during professional learning group (PLG) time. High-school teachers reported that they discuss results and identify opportunities to reteach during PLG time.

4. School- based student support teams (BBSTs) in elementary, middle-, and high schools provide additional strategies for teachers whose students are not making satisfactory progress. BBSTs may composed of an administrator, a social worker, a special education teacher, an ESL teacher, and a referring teacher. The BBST suggests strategies and meets again after six weeks to discuss progress.

5. Interviewees reported that the middle and high schools conduct at-risk meetings where risk data including EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) data are used to identify students for support.

1. The district provides a range of supports and interventions for students across the district who are not making adequate progress in ELA and mathematics.
2. Two of the five elementary schools (Hill and Whalen) and one of the three middle schools (Garfield) participate in the Massachusetts Extended Learning Time (ELT) initiative, adding approximately 300 hours to their school schedule. Schools may start five days earlier than the rest of the district or extend the daily school schedule. Interviewees reported that ELT has allowed at least one school to schedule a block of time when a wide range of personnel provide interventions.
3. Other elementary school interventions provided during the school day include small group instruction provided by teachers, coaches, reading specialists or Title 1 teachers.
4. Administrators reported that middle-school interventions include:
   1. Read 180 for identified 6th graders,
   2. a “Path to Pride” action plan for struggling students at the Susan B. Anthony Middle School,
   3. a weekly literacy block for interventions at the Rumney Marsh Academy, and
   4. scheduled intervention classes at the Garfield Middle School.

4. Administrators, parents, and students told the team that middle- and high-school teachers readily stay after school beyond their contractual 20 minutes to tutor and support students.

5. Administrators, high school teachers, and students reported that the Writing Center, an elective class for students who have exhibited excellent writing skill, provides peer support. Peer tutors may meet classmates before or after school in the Learning Commons (the library) or are invited to classes to help their other students with writing.

1. The district maintains inclusion classrooms that provide support for special populations inside the classroom and targeted support outside the classroom.
2. Interviewees told the review team that students with disabilities access general education curriculum through inclusive classrooms. While the district provides pull-out services and substantially separate classrooms for some students, most students with disabilities have their needs met in inclusive classrooms where general education and special education teachers co-teach. The review team saw co-teaching in 23 of the 85 observed classrooms.
3. Most English language learners (ELLs) across the district are included in general education classrooms taught by SEI (Sheltered English Immersion) endorsed teachers and supported by ESL teachers providing targeted support outside the class based on students’ ACCESS test scores.
   1. Administrators reported and teachers confirmed that all teachers are expected to be SEI endorsed and regularly incorporate those strategies in their classrooms.
   2. In most elementary schools, ESL instruction is mostly pull-out with pockets of push-in. One middle school provides pull-out instruction while in another school there is a combination of co-teaching in math, science, and history and pull-out for ELA
   3. The high-school program of studies includes a range of courses under the heading of English Language Learners Program, including ELL 1, 2 and 3 English, ELL 1 Read/ Write, and a host of sheltered math, history, and science courses. Teachers recommend students for these classes based on their ACCESS test scores.
   4. A new ELL program is being piloted at Garfield Elementary School. Two of five homerooms at each grade level enroll “newcomers” throughout the year. At the end of each day students receive ESL instruction for 90 minutes from three ESL teachers who have their own classrooms.
   5. The review team was told that in addition to support during the school day, the district provides after-school and summer programs for newcomers and ELLs in levels one to three.

**Impact**: Student support which is based on regularly reviewed data and provisions for interventions in classrooms and outside when needed ensure that students’ needs are met and likely leads to improved achievement.

**2. Schools across the district are continually working to maintain and strengthen partnerships with families, community organizations, and colleges to support students’ academic progress and social-emotional well-being.**

1. Building community is one of the three core foci for the Revere Public Schools’ 2016-–2021 Improvement Plan and included among the superintendent’s’ team goals. The focus states: “We want parents to see the school administration and teachers as their partners in the success of their children.”
2. When asked about parent engagement, interviewees described the Parent Information Center (PIC), a parent’s first introduction to the district, as very welcoming. The PIC has a linguistically diverse staff who assist parents in the registration process and also connect families to community based organizations for social, emotional, and heath needs.
3. Schools have a range of opportunities for parents and family members to become active partners in their child’s education.
4. Each School Improvement Plan for 2017–2018 lists an assortment of ways in which parents can be involved in schools, including traditional parent teacher organizations (PTOs), parent teacher conferences, coffee with the principal, parent workshops, math and literacy night, cultural night, English language learner family coffee hours, parent/teacher basketball game, and parent volunteering in the classroom.
5. Many interviewees said that information for parents and families is available in multiple languages. Parents, teachers, and administrators frequently use electronic media and software that can immediately translate messages when needed.
6. Parents, teachers, and administrators said that parents are involved in decision making, participating on school improvement committees and school councils.

**D.** Interviews and a review of district documents indicated that the district partners with community-based organizations and local businesses to expand career awareness opportunities for students and to support their social, emotional, and health needs.

1. Students and administrators reported that juniors and seniors may take an elective which allows them to participate in external internships. Documents provided showed a wide range of external partners used for internships, including the Massachusetts State House, the Revere police station, Revere Public Schools, Boston Children’s Hospital, law offices, local newspapers, and hotels.
2. Interviewees named several community partners that support students’ social, emotional, and physical health, including North Suffolk mental health, the Home for Little Wanderers, the Cambridge Health Alliance, and Massachusetts General Hospital.
3. The Gateway to College program at North Shore Community College Higher Education enrolled five students during the onsite in January 2018. There are dual enrollment opportunities at Northshore Community College, Bunker Hill Community College, and Salem State College.

**Impact**: Districts and schools that actively work with parents, invite them to participate in decision making, and are culturally and linguistically responsive to their needs are more likely to have parents’ help and support in improving student achievement. Engaging community partners and colleges garners more support for students’ social-emotional needs and helps to ensure preparedness for college, careers, and civic responsibility.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. The district’s policies and practices are not sufficiently improving a high retention rate in grade 9 and high chronic absence in grades 9–12.**

**A**. The district has several initiatives designed to reduce retention and chronic absence.[[5]](#footnote-5)

1. The review team was told that the district has a summer program for incoming 9th graders. Middle-school teachers identify students for the four-week summer program.
2. Revere High School students who fail a course can take credit recovery courses during the summer.
3. The district’s alternative high school (Seacoast) offers at-risk students flexible scheduling and small classes. At the time of the review in January 2018, Seacoast enrolled approximately 100 students.
4. Several attendance officers in the district make home visits and follow up with students who are chronically absent.

**B**. Retention and chronic absence continue to challenge high-school students.

1. According to ESE data, in school year 2016–2017 the percentages of chronically absent high-school students in the district were as follows: 23.3 percent in grade 9; 19.8 percent in grade 10; 16.2 percent in grade 11; and 29.9 percent in grade 12. Grade 9 retention rates were the highest in the district in recent years: 13 percent (66 students) in 2014; 12.7 percent (74 students) in 2015; 16.8 percent (94 students) in 2016; and 13.8 percent (79 students) in 2017.

3. The review team was told that block scheduling and the attendance policy at the high school are “rigid” and “hard” for students.” The attendance policy, developed 10 years ago, indicates that after three unexcused absences from an 80-minute class students fail the course for that quarter. Interviewees said that after the fourth absence, “students quit for the semester.”

4. Interviewees reported that recently 25 percent of ninth graders needed additional grade recovery credits to move on to sophomore status.

5. Student engagement at the high school is a challenge for the district. The team observed active engagement in lessons in 50 percent of high school classrooms compared to 83 percent in the elementary schools, and 81 percent in the middle schools.

**Impact**: Chronic absence and 9th grade retention are early indicators for low achievement and dropping out of school.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should collect and analyze information from students, families, and teachers to identify the root causes of the high retention and chronic absence rates and develop plans to improve attendance and reduce retention.**

1. The district should collect information from students, teachers, and families (for example, through surveys and focus groups) to identify the barriers that prevent ninth grade students from successfully completing the designated program of studies in 9th grade and to determine what could be put in place to be more helpful.

The district should use the information collected to analyze its current approach to addressing this issue and should revise its approach as needed.

Support and safety nets for ninth graders should be strengthened in order to aid in their successful completion of credit expectations to move to sophomore status.

1. The district should review its attendance policy and consider if it is responsive to the needs of students and families.

The district should gather information from students and families to identify the causes of chronic absence and should use that information to review and revise its attendance policy.

It might be useful to review attendance polices of similar districts with block schedules that have better attendance results, including but not limited to the Five District Partnership (5DP) of which Revere is a part.

Addressing attendance issues may also involve a variety of wider initiatives such as improving instruction to promote more student engagement in learning.

1. Like other improvement efforts at the high school, teachers, students and families should be involved in the development of plans to reduce retention and chronic absences.

**Benefits**: Implementing this recommendation will enable the district to better pinpoint why students are absent and not successfully completing 9th grade and to address those issues directly. Involving teachers, students, and families will help to ensure that the district can develop or improve strategies that will effectively address the root causes of these challenges. Reducing retention and absences will ultimately lead to overall improved achievement.

**Recommended resource:**

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

Financial and Asset Management

***Contextual Background***

The city of Revere is governed by a city council and a mayor. The Department of Revenue At-A-Glance report for Revere notes that its population is 53,226 with a total fiscal year 2016 city budget of $228,508,621 of which $98,999,872 (43 percent) is for education. The city’s average per-capita income in 2014 was $21,629 and the average family tax bill (for fiscal year 2018) is $4,452.

The district and the city have exceeded their net school spending obligation by approximately 5 percent every year since 2013, except for 2017, and district and school officials alike reported that they worked collaboratively to approve budgets that meet this goal. The superintendent reported that the recent redefinition of economically disadvantaged students adversely affected the Chapter 70 aid awarded the city by approximately $4 million, and through joint efforts of the superintendent, city officials, and legislative representatives the state has offset the loss by hold harmless funding for Revere and some similar districts. District and city leaders reported that they had a written agreement on city charges for municipal services to the schools, and a policy of carrying forward free cash from previously unspent district budgets adding up to over $7 million for fiscal year 2018; this is the source of funds exceeding the net school spending obligation.

The development of district budget expenditures begins with an estimate of payroll costs based on existing staffing levels and negotiated pay increases along with an estimate of fixed-cost operations expenses such as special education tuitions and utilities. Some changes are then considered for new needs, such as staffing for increased enrollments and for the growing numbers of English language learners (ELLs). Proposed initiatives and priorities are considered, such as the proposed four C2C consulting teachers (including a consulting teacher to help teachers instruct ELLs). To the extent possible the district has reallocated unfilled teaching positions and other positions to support its key initiatives. In past years the district has reallocated funding to support other needs, such as additional funding for teachers at a Level 3 school which subsequently improved to Level 1. The district has also received over $10 million to date for fiscal year 2018 in grants, of which over $1 million are private grants. These grants have supported other initiatives in the district, such as redesign and innovation planning at the high schools and extended learning time at the K–8 schools.

The document for the proposed budget is comprehensive and detailed, comparing proposed budgets and staffing to current levels. The document does not include trends allowing comparison to actual expenditures for previous years or a description of proposed initiatives and changes. However, PowerPoint presentations for the ways and means subcommittee and the school committee hearing on the budget detail some initiatives and changes along with the reallocations proposed to fund them.

Since 2006, 6 of the district’s 11 schools have been constructed or renovated with Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) assistance, and two others have undergone accelerated repairs. The city has bonded additional capital funding for school improvements, and in 2017 it developed a capital plan including roofs, boilers, lighting, windows, and doors at the older schools. The district and the city have plan to submit a third in 2018. The district supports technology in all the schools, including interactive white boards and internet access in classrooms, and plans additional laptops for students at four schools.

***Strength Findings***

**1. School and city leaders have worked together effectively to meet the state’s net school spending requirement and the building needs of the district.**

**A.** School and municipal leaders described a cooperative working relationship during the development and approval of the annual school budget.

1. District administrators stated that the district superintendent, the chief financial officer, the mayor, the city director of finance, and the city auditor work together to estimate Chapter 70 aid and city charges for services to the schools in preparing the annual budget.

* + - 1. In 2017 they agreed on a budget of $80,215,681 for fiscal year 2018.
      2. They also agreed to carry forward any unspent surplus from prior year school budgets as free cash earmarked for the school budget, which totals $7 million for the fiscal year 2018 budget.
      3. Between fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2018, except for fiscal year 2017, the city’s allocation for education has been 5 to 6 percent above the net school spending requirement, which is funded by the annual free cash carry forward amount.
      4. School committee members described amicable and supportive relationships with the city council and the mayor.

2. City and district leaders stated that they have an agreement for estimates for city chargebacks on Schedule 19, noting that discussions about city chargebacks and revenue estimates were collaborative. They said that as chair of the school committee the mayor has quite a bit of knowledge about the district budget.

3. When the budget was submitted to the city council in 2017 the school committee’s requested budget and the mayor’s recommendation matched and the budget was approved.

**B**. District and city leaders have worked together to meet the capital and building needs of the district.

1. City officials reported that with city support and bonding the district has built or renovated six schools since 2006 and completed accelerated repairs for two others.

2. In addition to its share of Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) projects, the city has bonded roof, boiler, HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning), and window projects at other schools.

3. The superintendent and the mayor reported that they worked together with the district’s maintenance director, the school committee, and the city council to submit two statements of interest for MSBA aid to construct a new high school.

4. With the help of the University of Massachusetts Collins Center, in 2017 the city developed a five-year capital plan. The superintendent, the maintenance director, and school committee members worked with the mayor to prioritize school projects such as roofs, boilers, walkways, windows, and lighting, which total 17 percent of the l cost of the plan.

**C.** Administrators reported that the district business office works closely with the city auditor on accounting and bill payments, the city purchasing department on bids and contracts, and the city treasurer on cash receipts. The district and the city share a MUNIS accounting system.

**Impact**: The collaboration of district and city leaders on budgeting, capital projects, and day-to -day business dealings has contributed to support for school budgets above the net school spending requirement, the carry forward of unspent funds, and capital improvements to most of the district ‘s schools.

**2. The district has leveraged its funding by reallocating funds, seeking government and private grants, and implementing efficiencies in purchasing and maintenance practices.**

**A.** By redefining personnel positions and using unspent funds the district has been able to fund several new initiatives and priorities.

1. Administrators reported that they have been able to take advantage of retirements to add staff where needed to maintain class size and programs.

a. As custodians retired the district has reduced some night custodial positions.

b. The district was able to cut 18 teaching positions in 2017 by attrition, so that no teachers lost their jobs.

1. In order to implement new initiatives the district redefined positions and reallocated staff. It reallocated unfilled teaching positions to add needed classroom teachers and the four C2C consulting teachers, and reallocated funding from grants such as Title I to cover some teachers’ salaries.
2. The district has used some unspent surplus funds to carry forward more than $7 million into the following fiscal year to add to annual budget allocations, including staffing and technology.
3. The district has implemented efficiencies to save funds for educational purposes.

1. Administrators reported a contract with Ameresco to maintain, repair, and increase efficiencies in HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) and lighting. The city has a contract with a solar farm to provide utility bill credits.

2. In order to reduce the cost of contracts for special education transportation, the district purchased mini-buses; In order to reduce repair costs, the district has used capital funding and amortization to replace some food service equipment.

3. The district reduced costs by replacing Achievement Network assessments with the MasteryConnect achievement data system.

**C.** The district has been aggressively seeking grant funding, both governmental and private; at the time of the onsite in January 2018 the district had received over $10 million in grants for fiscal year 2018.

1. Administrators stated that federal and state grants support special school programs such as Extended Learning Time, MCIEA (MA Consortium for Innovative Education Assessments) professional development and assessment activities, and additional social workers as well as Title I and special education programs.

2. Private grants totaling over $1 million include a Nellie Mae grant to fund programs such as high-school innovation planning, a Project Lead the Way grant, and grants from Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) for health programs.

**D**. The district has partnered with other school districts, organizations, and agencies to provide enhanced services.

The district is a member of the Five District Partnership (5DP) which shares curriculum, assessment, instruction, and professional development (PD) services with its five member districts. Teachers participate in Center for Collaborative Education (CCE) and MCIEA PD.

2. The district has partnerships with many local agencies for services and programs for students, such as the Home for Little Wanderers, Education, Inc., and the Chelsea Boys and Girls Club. MGH, Shore Collaborative, and the Community School have spaces at the high school and offer social-emotional, health, adult education, and career transitional services.

3. Local colleges, including Bunker Hill Community College, North Shore Community College, and Salem State, offer dual enrollment, credit recovery, dropout prevention, and intern opportunities to district students.

4. Administrators and students reported that several local businesses offer internship opportunities to students, including Legal Sea Foods, the mayor’s office, Comfort Inn, and Planet Fitness.

**Impact**: By leveraging its funds and seeking outside funding the district has made additional monies available for teaching and learning programs and materials. Partnerships with other districts share costs for high-quality curriculum and professional development opportunities, and local partnerships provide enhanced social/-emotional and health services for students, educational opportunities, and preparation for college, career, and civic responsibility.

***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**3. The high school has overcrowded classrooms and inadequate facilities for science and other programs. The district and the city have submitted statements of interest to the Massachusetts School Building Authority for assistance in renovating the high school.**

**A.** Administrators, school committee members, and parents characterized the high school as inadequate and needing significant work.

1. According to Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) data, the high school opened in 1974.

2. School leaders reported that overcrowded classrooms, inadequate science laboratories, and HVAC (heating, ventilations, and air conditioning) systems are issues at the high school.

3. Increasing enrollments in the district and especially at the high school are contributing to crowded classrooms. Between 2013 and 2017, enrollment has increased by 12 percent districtwide and by 19.5 percent at the high school, School committee members stated that a new high school is necessary to alleviate overcrowding.

4. Some parents told the team that the high school was “an old building” with a “burgeoning population” that was “running out of space.”

**B.** The district and the city have submitted two statements of interest to the MSBA to study and consider needs and funding for the high-school building.

1. A review of school committee minutes indicated that the MSBA has rejected the district’s statements of interest because of limited funding, but has agreed with the need for a new high school and has encouraged the district to apply again.

2. City officials and school leaders stated that in 2017–2018 they intend to file another statement of interest for a study and construction of the high school.

**C.** Reviewers observed overcrowded classrooms at the high school, including several with over 25 students and small classrooms with up to 32 students. They found that many spaces were inadequate for learning including science classrooms without labs or space for teachers’ demonstrations of experiments.

**Impact**: The condition of its school buildings and their suitability for education is critical to the quality of teaching and learning in the district. This is particularly true at the high school where up to date science labs and facilities for other programs are an integral part of the curriculum.

***Recommendation***

**1. The district should continue its efforts to renovate or rebuild its high school to provide sufficient classroom space for its growing enrollment and adequate facilities for science labs and other programs.**

**A.** The district should follow through with its plans to file a third statement of interest to the MSBA for assistance in analyzing its high-school building needs and in funding for the project.

A professional analysis of the high school and its educational space and program needs is an essential first step, along with options for renovating or replacing the building.

Close collaboration with the MSBA on the analysis, options, and funding will be essential to their continued support to the district for school building improvements.

**B.** Continued collaboration with city officials on options and costs of the project is also essential to their continued support for improving school buildings and the high school in particular.

1. As in all its major building projects, the bonding capacity of the city is also a factor.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include:

* + Adequate spaces for high-school classrooms, the district’s growing school enrollments, and alleviated pressure on class sizes.
  + Improved facilities and educational programs in high-school science and other essential programs.
  + Financial assistance from the state for a high-school project that could be extremely costly.

**Recommended resources:**

* ESE’s *School Building Issues* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/sbuilding/>) includes funding opportunities, guidelines, and resources related to school buildings.
* *Planning Guide for Maintaining School Facilities* (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003347>), from the National Center for Education Statistics, is intended to help school districts plan for efficient and effective operations. It addresses various topics, including conducting a facilities audit, planning and evaluating maintenance, and managing staff and contractors.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from January 8–11, 2018, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Christine Brandt, Leadership and Governance, *review team coordinator*
2. Suzanne Kelly, Curriculum and Instruction
3. Marc Kerble, Assessment
4. Frank Sambuceti, Human Resources and Professional Development
5. Lenora Jennings, Student Support
6. George Gearhart, Financial and Asset Management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the chief financial officer, the payroll manager, the special funds manager, and the payables manager.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: the president, two vice-presidents, the membership secretary, the recording secretary, and two building representatives.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent; the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and the assistant superintendent for pupil personnel services,

The team visited the following schools: Beachmont (Pre-K-–5), Garfield Elementary (Pre-K-–5), Hill (K–5), Lincoln (Pre-K–5), Paul Revere (K–5), Whelan (K-–5), Susan B. Anthony (grades 6–8), Garfield Middle (grades 6–8), Rumney Marsh Academy (grades 6–8), Revere High School (grades 9–12), and Seacoast High School (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with focus groups with three elementary-school teachers, one middle-school teacher, and six high-school teachers.

The team observed 85 classes in the district: 16 at the two high schools, 26 at the three middle schools, and 43 at the six elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monday**  01/08/2018 | **Tuesday**  01/09/2018 | **Wednesday**  01/10/2018 | **Thursday**  01/11/2018 |
| Orientation with district leaders; interviews with district staff; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; and visits to Revere and Seacoast high schools and Beachmont Elementary School for classroom observations. | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Garfield elementary and middle schools, Revere High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Rumney Marsh, S.B. Anthony , Hill, Lincoln, Paul Revere elementary schools, for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; teacher focus group; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Whelan, Garfield Middle School, and Beachmont Elementary School for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Attendance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Revere Public Schools**

**2017–2018 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

| **Group** | **District** | **Percent**  **of Total** | **State** | **Percent of**  **Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| African-American | 285 | 3.8% | 86,305 | 9.0% |
| Asian | 381 | 5.0% | 65,667 | 6.9% |
| Hispanic | 4,045 | 53.6% | 191,201 | 20.0% |
| Native American | 22 | 0.3% | 2,103 | 0.2% |
| White | 2,660 | 35.2% | 573,335 | 60.1% |
| Native Hawaiian | 2 | 0.0% | 818 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 157 | 2.1% | 34,605 | 3.6% |
| **All** | 7,552 | 100.0% | 954,034 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2017 | | | | |

**Table B1b: Revere Public Schools**

**2017–2018 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

| **Group** | **District** | | | **State** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 1,218 | 23.5% | 15.8% | 171,061 | 38.0% | 17.7% |
| Econ. Dis. | 3,751 | 72.5% | 49.7% | 305,203 | 67.9% | 32.0% |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 1,724 | 33.3% | 22.8% | 97,334 | 21.6% | 10.2% |
| All high needs students | 5,176 | 100.0% | 67.3% | 449,584 | 100.0% | 46.6% |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2017. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 7,690; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,806. | | | | | | |

**Table B2: Revere Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2014–2017**

| **Group** | **N (2017)** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **4-yr Change** | **State (2017)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| High Needs | 4,935 | 95.0 | -- | -- | 94.0 | -1.0 | 93.1 |
| Econ. Dis. | 3,524 | -- | 94.5 | 94.6 | 93.9 | -- | 92.6 |
| ELLs | 1,793 | 95.5 | 95.6 | 95.5 | 94.7 | -0.8 | 93.5 |
| SWD | 1,325 | 93.5 | 93.1 | 93.5 | 93.1 | -0.4 | 93.0 |
| African American | 321 | 96.1 | 95.5 | 96.4 | 95.8 | -0.3 | 94.0 |
| Asian | 412 | 96.7 | 96.5 | 96.7 | 96.6 | -0.1 | 96.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 4,227 | 95.1 | 95.3 | 95.1 | 94.5 | -0.6 | 92.8 |
| Multi-Race | 180 | 93.8 | 94.6 | 94.4 | 93.9 | 0.1 | 94.5 |
| White | 2,955 | 94.9 | 94.8 | 95.1 | 94.7 | -0.2 | 95.1 |
| All | 8,118 | 95.1 | 95.1 | 95.2 | 94.7 | -0.4 | 94.6 |
| 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 B3: Revere Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2015–2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FY15** | | | **FY16** | | | **FY17** | | | |
|  | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | | **Estimated** | | **Actual** | |
| Expenditures | | | | | | | | | | |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  | | | | | | | | | |
| By school committee | $76,130,323 | $79,241,213 | | $80,238,149 | | $77,260,093 | | $81,649,575 | | $77,399,729 |
| By municipality | $17,099,926 | $17,741,217 | | $17,799,609 | | $25,941,705 | | $18,422,182 | | $22,350,770 |
| Total from local appropriations | $93,230,249 | $96,982,430 | | $98,037,758 | | $103,201,798 | | -- | | $99,750,499 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $14,295,227 | | -- | | $15,528,071 | | -- | | $16,618,330 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $111,277,657 | | -- | | $118,729,869 | | -- | | $116,368,829 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $50,950,075 | | -- | | $54,216,144 | | -- | | $56,509,506 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $29,010,426 | | -- | | $30,065,688 | | -- | | $30,306,709 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $79,960,501 | | -- | | $84,281,832 | | -- | | $86,816,215 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $83,956,323 | | -- | | $88,457,905 | | -- | | $88,432,499 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $3,995,822 | | -- | | $4,176,073 | | -- | | $1,616,284 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 5.0% | | -- | | 5.0% | | -- | | 1.9% |
| \*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: FY15, FY16, and FY17 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website  Data retrieved 12/13/17 and 2/2/18 | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table B4: Revere Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** |
| Administration | $398 | $403 | $422 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $989 | $974 | $967 |
| Teachers | $5,806 | $5,750 | $5,916 |
| Other teaching services | $518 | $525 | $572 |
| Professional development | $126 | $108 | $199 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $625 | $593 | $455 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $279 | $285 | $289 |
| Pupil services | $1,170 | $1,415 | $1,415 |
| Operations and maintenance | $1,113 | $1,108 | $1,063 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $2,045 | $2,008 | $2,097 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $13,067 | $13,169 | $13,394 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/)  Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding. | | | |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

| **Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Expectations** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Average  Number of points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter. | **ES** | 0% | 2% | 81% | 16% | 3.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 8% | 77% | 15% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 13% | 75% | 13% | 3.0 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 5 | 67 | 13 | 3.1 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 6% | 79% | 15% |  |
| 2. The teacher ensures that students understand what they should be learning in the lesson and why. | **ES** | 0% | 26% | 63% | 12% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 19% | 65% | 15% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 50% | 50% | 0% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 24 | 52 | 9 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 28% | 61% | 11% |  |
| 3. The teacher uses appropriate classroom activities well matched to the learning objective(s). | **ES** | 0% | 14% | 65% | 21% | 3.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 8% | 77% | 15% | 3.1 |
| **HS** | 0% | 31% | 56% | 13% | 2.8 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 13 | 57 | 15 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 15% | 67% | 18% |  |
| 4. The teacher conducts frequent checks for student understanding, provides feedback, and adjusts instruction. | **ES** | 0% | 19% | 60% | 21% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 23% | 58% | 19% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 63% | 31% | 6% | 2.4 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 24 | 46 | 15 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 28% | 54% | 18% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #1** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 12.1 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 10.8 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 11.8 |

| **Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Higher-Order Thinking** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Average Number of points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 5. Students assume responsibility to learn and are engaged in the lesson. | **ES** | 0% | 16% | 60% | 23% | 3.1 |
| **MS** | 0% | 19% | 46% | 35% | 3.2 |
| **HS** | 6% | 44% | 44% | 6% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 19 | 45 | 20 | 3.0 |
| **Total %** | 1% | 22% | 53% | 24% |  |
| 6. Students engage in higher-order thinking. | **ES** | 2% | 33% | 65% | 0% | 2.6 |
| **MS** | 0% | 31% | 50% | 19% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 6% | 50% | 38% | 6% | 2.4 |
| **Total #** | 2 | 30 | 47 | 6 | 2.7 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 35% | 55% | 7% |  |
| 7. Students communicate their ideas and thinking with each other. | **ES** | 2% | 40% | 47% | 12% | 2.7 |
| **MS** | 12% | 23% | 54% | 12% | 2.7 |
| **HS** | 6% | 50% | 31% | 13% | 2.5 |
| **Total #** | 5 | 31 | 39 | 10 | 2.6 |
| **Total %** | 6% | 36% | 46% | 12% |  |
| 8. Students engage with meaningful, real-world tasks. | **ES** | 0% | 14% | 79% | 7% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 31% | 50% | 19% | 2.9 |
| **HS** | 13% | 19% | 56% | 13% | 2.7 |
| **Total #** | 2 | 17 | 56 | 10 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 2% | 20% | 66% | 12% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #2** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 11.3 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 11.6 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 10.1 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 11.2 |

| **Focus Area #3: Inclusive Practice & Classroom Culture** |  | Insufficient Evidence | Limited Evidence | Sufficient Evidence | Compelling Evidence | Average Number of points |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1 to 4) |
| 9. The teacher ensures that students are engaging in challenging tasks regardless of learning needs. | **ES** | 0% | 19% | 72% | 9% | 2.9 |
| **MS** | 0% | 27% | 62% | 12% | 2.8 |
| **HS** | 6% | 31% | 56% | 6% | 2.6 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 20 | 56 | 8 | 2.8 |
| **Total %** | 1% | 24% | 66% | 9% |  |
| 10. The teacher uses a variety of instructional strategies. | **ES** | 0% | 16% | 70% | 14% | 3.0 |
| **MS** | 0% | 12% | 73% | 15% | 3.0 |
| **HS** | 0% | 50% | 38% | 13% | 2.6 |
| **Total #** | 0 | 18 | 55 | 12 | 2.9 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 21% | 65% | 14% |  |
| 11. Classroom routines and positive supports are in place to ensure that students behave appropriately. | **ES** | 0% | 0% | 53% | 47% | 3.5 |
| **MS** | 0% | 4% | 58% | 38% | 3.3 |
| **HS** | 6% | 31% | 56% | 6% | 2.6 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 6 | 47 | 31 | 3.3 |
| **Total %** | 1% | 7% | 55% | 36% |  |
| 12. The classroom climate is conducive to teaching and learning. | **ES** | 0% | 2% | 53% | 44% | 3.4 |
| **MS** | 0% | 8% | 62% | 31% | 3.2 |
| **HS** | 6% | 31% | 50% | 13% | 2.7 |
| **Total #** | 1 | 8 | 47 | 29 | 3.2 |
| **Total %** | 1% | 9% | 55% | 34% |  |
| **Total Score For Focus Area #3** | **ES** |  |  |  |  | 12.8 |
| **MS** |  |  |  |  | 12.5 |
| **HS** |  |  |  |  | 10.6 |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  | 12.3 |

1. See the Contextual Background in the Financial and Asset Management section of this report for more information about the sources of these funds. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. SMART goals are Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. On Tuesday, February 28, 2017, after collecting public comment since November 2016, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted 9-1 to amend the educator evaluation regulations. The most significant change in the regulations is the elimination of a separate student impact rating. Under the [amended regulations](http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/FY2017/2017-02/item6.html), evaluators do not have to make a separate judgment about an educator’s impact on student learning. Instead, student learning is embedded as an indicator within one of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework’s four standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students who were absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Chronic absence is defined as the percentage of students who were absent 10 percent or more of their total number of student days of membership in a school. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)