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Westport Community Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

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

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Westport Community Schools was conducted from June 8–11, 2015. The site visit included 23 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 60 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted a focus groups with six elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Because of a misunderstanding the teachers’ focus groups were cancelled and then rescheduled. This resulted in one group for all teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 39 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

**District Profile**

Westport has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. The five members of the school committee meet twice each month.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2013. The district leadership team consists of the superintendent and the director of special education. Central office positions have been dramatically decreased in number over the past four years. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are two other school administrators, assistant principals at the middle and high schools. The teachers, aides, and custodians are members of a bargaining unit. According to ESE data, in 2014–2015 there were 108.7 teachers in the district. District leaders reported that in 2014–2015 there were 150 teachers in the district.

In the 2014–2015 school year, 1,568 students were enrolled in the district’s 4 schools:

**Table 1: Westport Community Schools**

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

| **School Name** | **School Type** | **Grades Served** | **Enrollment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Macomber | EES | PK–1 | 292 |
| Westport Elementary | ES | 2–5 | 521 |
| Westport Middle | MS | 6–8 | 404 |
| Westport High | HS | 9–12 | 351 |
| **Totals** | **4 schools** | **K-12**  | **1,568** |
| \*As of October 1, 2014 |

Between 2011 and 2015 overall student enrollment decreased] by 14.5 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 lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 50 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: $12,251 as compared with $15,544 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/default.html)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

**Westport is a Level 2 district because all three of its schools with reportable data are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets.**

* Westport Elementary is in the 47th percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 because its cumulative Progressive Performance Index (PPI) for all students is 74, below the target of 75. The cumulative PPI for high needs students is 83.
* Westport Middle is in the 57th percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 55 for all students and 56 for high needs students; the target is 75.
* Westport High is in the 26th percentile of high schools and is in Level 2 with a cumulative PPI of 71 for all students.

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

* ELA CPI was 87.6 in 2014, below the district’s target of 91.9.
* Math CPI was 80.6 in 2014, below the district’s target of 86.9.
* Science CPI was 81.4 in 2014, below the district’s target of 87.9.

**ELA proficiency rates were above the state for the district as a whole and in every tested grade except for the 5th and 6th grades. However, between 2011 and 2014 there were notable declines in ELA proficiency in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades.**

* ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 73 percent in 2011 and 71 percent in 2014, 2 percentage points above the 2014 rate of 69 percent.
* ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate by 12 percentage points in the 8th grade, by 9 and 6 percentage points in the 7th and 3rd grades, respectively, and by 1 percentage point in the 4th and 10th grades.
	+ Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates increased by 8 percentage points in the 10th grade, by 6 percentage points in the 8th grade, and by 2 to 3 percentage points in the 3rd and 7th grades.
* ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate by 7 percentage points in the 5th grade and by 5 percentage points in the 6th grade.
	+ Between 2011 and 2014 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 11 percentage points in the 6th grade and by 9 percentage points in the 4th and 5th grades.

**Math proficiency rates were above or equal to the state rate in the district as a whole and in each tested grade except for the 6th and 10th grades. Between 2011 and 2014 there were notable improvements in math proficiency rates in the 3rd, 4th and 8th grades, and notable declines in the 5th and 6th grades.**

* Math proficiency rates for all students in the district were 61 percent in 2011 and 60 percent in 2014, equal to the 2014 state rate of 60 percent.
* Math proficiency rates in the district were above the state rate by 11 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 6 percentage points in the 8th grade, and by 1 to 3 percentage points in the 4th and 7th grades. The 5th grade math proficiency rate was 61 percent, equal to the state rate.
	+ Between 2011 and 2014 math proficiency rates increased by 10 percentage points in the 3rd grade, by 9 percentage points in the 4th grade, and by 8 percentage points in the 8th grade.
* Math proficiency rates were below the state rate by 7 percentage points in the 6th grade and by 5 percentage points in the 10th grade.
	+ Between 2011 and 2014 the math proficiency rates declined by 11 and 13 percentage points in the 5th and 6th grades, respectively, and by 4 percentage points in the 7th grade.

**Science proficiency rates declined in each tested grade and in the district as whole between 2011 and 2014.**

* 5th grade science proficiency rates declined by 9 percentage points from 61 percent in 2011 to 52 percent in 2014, 1 percentage point below the 2014 state rate of 53 percent.
* 8th grade science proficiency rates declined 3 percentage points from 52 percent in 2011 to 49 percent in 2014, 7 percentage points above the 2014 state rate of 42 percent.
* 10th grade science proficiency rates declined 4 percentage points from 61 percent in 2011 to 57 percent in 2014, 14 percentage points below the 2014 state rate of 71 percent.

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

* On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for ELA was 47.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.
	+ ELA median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 5th grade (median SGP of 36.0).
* On the 2014 MCAS assessments, the districtwide median student growth percentile (SGP) for mathematics was 47.0; the state median SGP was 50.0.
	+ Math median SGP was 60.0 in the 8th grade.
	+ Math median SGP fell below 40.0 in the 5th grade (30.0) and the 6th grade (37.5).

**Four year and five year cohort graduation rates have improved over the past four years and the district reached the 2014 four year and five year cohort graduation rate targets.**[[1]](#footnote-1)

* The four year cohort graduation rate increased from 76.6 percent in 2011 to 92.2 percent in 2014, above the 2014 state rate of 86.1 percent.
* The five year cohort graduation rate increased from 83.5 percent in 2010 to 95.0 percent in 2013, above the 2013 state rate of 87.7 percent.
* The annual drop-out rate for Westport decreased from 4.1 percent in 2011 to 1.6 percent in 2014, below the 2014statewide rate of 2.0 percent.

Westport Community Schools District Review Findings

**Strengths**

***Curriculum and Instruction***

**1. In observed classrooms,a positive learning environment was consistently in place.**

 **A.** The tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students was clearly and consistently positive and respectful (# 1) in 92 percent of classrooms districtwide.

 **B.** Behavioral standards were clearly and consistently communicated and disruptions, if present, were managed effectively and equitably (# 2) in 85 percent of observed classrooms.

 **C.** The review team observed teachers politely addressing students as “friends”; explicitly reinforcing positive behavior; encouraging students to complete difficult assignments; and redirecting them with gentle reminders.

 **D.** Clear and consistent evidence of classroom rituals and routines that promoted transitions with minimal loss of instruction time (# 4) was found in 77 percent of classrooms observed by the review team.

 1. The highest incidence of this characteristic was found in the elementary school where clear and consistent evidence of practices that maximize student learning time was found in 94 percent of visited classrooms. In such classrooms teachers were observed using countdowns, visual and verbal cues, and explicit rituals to move students through the lesson and the day.

**Impact:** A positive and respectful climate is conducive to high levels of student engagement and learning.

***Assessment***

**2. The district has established a balanced set of formative and summative assessments PreK–12 that are routinely used.**

**A.** Teachers and administrators reported that each school has an established calendar of assessments.

**B.** A document review indicated that the assessments used across the system are both formative and summative.

**C.** Teachers and administrators reported that they find the range of assessments to be comprehensive. They consistently spoke of the value they place in using assessments to identify students’ needs and to provide appropriate interventions.

**D.** Special education staff told the team that the use of data is a necessary component of team meetings and of the placement of students in the least restrictive environment.

**E.** Administrators said that the development of District-Determined Measures (DDMs) is part of a more widespread effort to establish a culture of data use throughout the district.

**Impact**: The use of formative and summative data to assess and monitor student progress helps tailor instruction to meet students’ needs.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**3. The district has adapted and implemented an educator evaluation system consistent with the new educator evaluation regulations.**

 **A.** The team reviewed nine administrators’ personnel files.

 1. All eight administrators and the superintendent were found to be current in their evaluations for the 2014–2015 school year. Evidence was observed of self-assessment, goal setting, collection of evidence, mid- and end-of-cycle progress reports, and informative and instructive evaluations. [[2]](#footnote-2)

 2. Administrators told review team members that in year one of implementation, the superintendent conducted walkthroughs with the principals, and then the superintendent and the principals compared notes. The superintendent said that since then she has expanded the walkthroughs to a team of two or three administrators.

 3. Principals are required to submit a self-evaluation to the superintendent before their final evaluations are written.

 4. Interviews and a document review indicated that principals receive “global and actionable feedback” from the superintendent, verbally and in writing.

 5. The superintendent said and a document review indicated that she reviews observations submitted by principals throughout the school year.

 **B.** The team also reviewed the personnel files of 28 teachers randomly selected from across the district.

 1. All evaluations were timely and contained self-assessments.

 a. Evidence of classroom walkthroughs was found in all files reviewed.

 2. Evidence was found of informative and instructive feedback.

 **C.** The district is on pace with developing and implementing its District Determined Measures (DDMs) and inclusion of student feedback.

1. The superintendent indicated that DDMs are in process of being developed and implemented, and evaluated. Principals said that at the high school each course has a common task associated with it that was adapted to meet the requirements of DDMs. At the elementary schools, DDMs are in process of being developed, while at the primary school existing data points from assessments such as DIBELS are used.

2. Administrators reported that the district piloted the state student feedback survey last year, but said the pilot “did not go well” because it was administered during the state testing time period. They indicated that they do not intend to use the survey in 2014–2015 and are seeking another source of student input.

**Impact**: If the district remains fully committed to the collaborative implementation of its educator evaluation system and provides needed and ongoing support, continuous and comprehensive improvements in instructional practices and outcomes for all students will likely result.

***Student Support***

**4. The district has implemented a tiered-intervention system, to various degrees, at the primary/elementary, middle, and high school levels. Administrators and teachers analyze student assessment data and use the results to design appropriate academic supports.**

 **A.** At the primary and elementary levels, benchmark assessments are used to identify students in need of support. A principal reported that all decisions about support are based on data.

1. The continuum of supports at the elementary levels involves a push-in model with an interventionist as well as a pull-out model for social and emotional issues.

 2. Elementary teachers have immediate access to progress monitoring, running records, Achieve 3000, DIBELS Next and SPS data, all used to focus interventions.

 3. In addition to the general education curriculum, elementary students that the district identifies as “at risk” receive 30–45 minutes of intervention during WIN (What I Need) time.

 4. Staff reported that pre- and post-testing for Title I students and flexible programming enable teachers to make decisions to move students from Title I services once they have reached their academic goals.

 5. With the guidance of a consultant, elementary teachers discuss individual student data and identify learning objectives.

 **B.** Staff at the middle school use MCAS data, benchmark, and mid-year assessments to design interventions for students to move students into more appropriate levels.

 1. The principal, counselor, and teachers use a data tracking sheet for students in need of support and meet every six weeks to assess progress.

 a. It was reported that 137 students are currently being served through a reading intervention. The Exploratory course schedule is adjusted each year to carve out appropriate support time and not conflict with the physical education period.

 2. Interviewees reported that teachers plan lessons for students with varied reading levels to ensure equal access to the curriculum.

 **C.** High school staff and students reported that the various levels for accessing the curriculum – college prep, honors, and advanced placement – determine the intensity of support.

 1. High school staff meet with middle school staff before students transition to identify high-risk students and to ensure the appropriate level for accessing the curriculum.

 2. Interviewees reported using EWIS (Early Warning Indicator System) lists and DDM (District-Determined Measures) results in math, ELA, social studies, and science to design interventions.

 3. High school teachers reported having progress reporting with the assistant principal and said that support staff works actively with underperforming students.

 4. Teachers and counselors work together to help students. Counselors have set up a mentor-mentee group to work with students.

 a. As an additional intervention, the high school has established Advisory; students meet once per month with a mentor to address academic and non-academic concerns.

 5. A drop-out recovery program has been established to ensure students an opportunity to make up credits for failed classes.

 6. Students reported that their teachers, counselors, and administrators always try to help them. One student noted: “They care for you more than anybody.” Students expressed the belief that safety nets prevent them from falling through the cracks.

**Impact**: Through the establishment of tiered interventions at all levels, to various degrees, the students in the Westport Community Schools in need of support receive equal access to instruction. Students receive the support that they need to meet individual academic goals as they progress toward graduation.

***Financial and Asset Management***

1. **Staff in the district’s business office manage their fiscal responsibilities effectively and have a cooperative relationship with the town’s business office.**
2. In the judgment of the review team, the business office staff are knowledgeable about the laws governing public school expenditures as well as about standard accounting and bookkeeping practices.
3. Interviewees told the team that both the payroll and procurement systems require a minimum of three checks by three different people before funds are paid.
4. A document review indicated that a voluntary MASBO review found district practices to be appropriate.
5. Both the superintendent and the town manager reported that the two business offices work cooperatively on a daily basis.

**Impact:** Knowledgeable staff and appropriate financial systems, protocols, and controls help ensure that the district’s resources are spent effectively and appropriately.

**Challenges and Areas for Growth**

***Leadership and Governance***

1. **In recent years the district has cut or lost most of its administrative team and there has been much turnover in district leadership.**

 **A**. Multiple interviews with teachers and administrators and a document review indicated that district support for curriculum and instruction has been systematically removed in recent years, resulting in an absence of vertical articulation throughout the district.

* + 1. The positions of director of curriculum and K–12 coordinators in ELA, math, and science have been eliminated in the past four years. These positions were replaced with two .2 positions that were added to staff’s other responsibilities and cut the next year.
	1. The position of elementary assistant principal was eliminated leaving one administrator to supervise a school serving more than 500 students.

 3. The position of business manager was open at the time of the onsite.

 4. These cuts have left the superintendent as the sole central office administrator.

 5. The K–12 committees of teachers and administrators who were responsible for the review and alignment of curriculum have also been eliminated.

 6. The district’s Professional Development Committee has been disbanded.

**B.** There has been much movement among administrators in recent years.

1. The Macomber School has had four principals in as many years.

2. Westport Elementary School has had two changes in principals in the past three years.

**C.** Teachers and administrators told the review team that this situation has contributed to instability as well as to the uncoupling of districtwide initiatives.

**D.** The district does not have school-based positions for curricular and instructional support for teachers.

**E.** Teachers and administrators reported that although each school has some components of a comprehensive instructional program such as grade-level curriculum expectations, interventions for students, and assessment calendars, these efforts remain site based without PreK–12 coordination and articulation.

**F.** The superintendent said that to bring cohesion to the system the district has adopted a planning template that identifies the priorities of curriculum, instruction, assessment and school climate for both the District Improvement Plan and the School Improvement Plans.

**Impact**: Without structures for coordination, articulation, and supervision the district has become a loosely bound collection of schools with site-based programs rather than a cohesive system focused on providing a high-quality instructional program for all students. Frequent leadership turnover has a detrimental impact on the district’s practices as they shift without consistent direction. It also diminishes the ability of the district to sustain improvement initiatives and to attract and retain quality leaders and teachers.

**7. Except for some school committee members themselves, the perception among interviewees was that committee members involve themselves too much with matters that would best be handled by the superintendent and her administrative staff.**

1. Administrators and school committee members said that the school committee has not established goals.

 1. One member acknowledged that the school committee has not “self evaluated” in recent years and said that self-evaluation was “a good idea.” The member also said that the committee needed to evaluate its own progress and match its goals to the superintendent’s goals.

 2. In response to a question about how the committee uses student achievement as a driver in decision making, one member told the team, “We try not to cut teachers or classes.” Another member responded: “Too much time is spent teaching to the test.”

1. Teachers and administrators expressed the view that the committee did not advocate sufficiently for public education.

 1. Parents said that there was a “disconnect” between the teachers and the school committee.

 a. Teachers expressed the opinion that an absence of sincere communication between school committee members and the teachers’ association in prolonged negotiations has created distrust.

 2. Committee members told the team that they do “lobby” and noted that funding from the town was limited.

1. Interviewees said that the school committee micromanages some details of the daily operation of the schools.

 1. Teachers and administrators reported and a review of school committee meeting minutes indicated that the school committee concerns itself with decisions such as whether and where renters can be in housed in the schools, which teaching supplies such as pencils and folders should be purchased for classroom use, and which positions will be assigned to specific schools.

 2. School committee members had different perceptions. Several members expressed confidence in the superintendent’s decision making. One member noted that members “allow the superintendent to do her job as we provide support for her and the entire district.” Another member indicated “a confidence issue.” Yet another member expressed the view that sometimes the superintendent “needs help . . . just in the business management piece.”

 3. Interviews and a review of school committee meeting minutes indicated that the school committee tends to reserve the right to review the approved budget line item by line item; interviewees said that this compromises the district’s ability to organize the district’s resources in a timely way to support the education program.

 a. A school committee member said that members approve the budget with the understanding that “they can address where the money is to go.”

**Impact:** The absence of a shared understanding about the most appropriate and effective role of the school committee in the work to support the district diminishes the ability of the superintendent, other administrators, and the school committee itself to contribute to and build a culture of collaboration around the education mission.

***Curriculum and Instruction***

**8. The district does not have aligned, complete curriculum documents or a system of curriculum development, review, and oversight of implementation.**

 **A.** The district’s documented curriculum does not provide a basis for consistent, aligned instruction in Westport’s classrooms.

1. A review of documents provided to the team indicated individual units of study that are generally incomplete and do not constitute a full course collectively.

 a. For example, the 9th grade ELA document includes three units that are incomplete and contain direction for 6 weeks of instruction. The 10th grade document spans 10 weeks of instruction.

 2. Teachers at all levels said that the documents, while useful to individual teachers or teacher teams that created them, are not widely used by faculty and are not perceived as being a useful guide for daily instruction in classrooms throughout the district.

 **B.** The district does not have structures and procedures to develop, to review, and to implement consistent curriculum across grade levels.

 1. The leadership structure that was previously used to focus and to align curriculum across the four schools has been dismantled.

1. Administrators and teachers reported that four years ago the district’s curriculum was developed and managed by a curriculum supervisor and curriculum coordinators in English Language Arts, mathematics, and science. These positions have since been eliminated.
2. Standing curriculum committees also met regularly to review and to align curriculum, a practice that has also been discontinued.
3. The district has also ended the five-year curriculum review cycle that was used to keep its curriculum current.

 **C.** The district is without sufficient structures to manage curriculum at the school level.

 1. The primary/elementary and the high schools do not have common meeting time to consider curriculum issues.

 a. While the high school principal reported and a document review confirmed that faculty meeting time is often used to discuss instruction, teachers do not have the time to meet to work on common curricular and instructional issues at the departmental level.

 b. The elementary school has five grade-level meetings per year, but both teachers and administrators said that these meetings are without sufficient leadership and structure.

 2. The middle school has an established weekly structure for lesson study.

 a. Both teachers and administrators reported that this structure is well used by English department faculty, but said the structure is not as well developed in other departments.

 **D.** The absence of structural support for curriculum at the district and school levels has adversely affected vertical alignment.

 1. In several interviews, teachers and school leaders mentioned the absence of vertical integration of curriculum.

 a. School leaders suggested that there is little alignment between the mathematics programs at the high school and the middle school.

 b. A high school teacher said that United States history taught in grade 8 is repeated in grade 10.

 c. On many occasions the district was described as four separate schools rather than an integrated school district.

 **E.** Administrators and teachers do not share a common understanding of the district’s expectations for effective instruction and the delivery of a guaranteed curriculum.

 1. The district does not have a stated instructional model.

 a. While the high school continues to enjoy the benefits of a shared instructional approach that is the result of common training that the district no longer provides, teachers and administrators stated that the district does not share a common set of instructional expectations for teachers.

 2. Elementary teachers told the review team and observations confirmed that teachers take varied and often conflicting approaches to early literacy.

 3. Teachers at all levels said that they generally work independently and are not required to document instructional practices. Lesson plans are not required.

 4. While school leaders said that the district relies on the work that has been done to implement District-Determined Measures (DDMs) to promote accountability, teachers at both the middle and high schools questioned the validity and reliability of current DDMs.

**Impact**: Without a guaranteed and viable standards-based curriculum the district and its schools are hindered in their efforts to meet the needs of students. Without standards-based units and lessons, the district has no assurance that teachers are systematically addressing state standards and preparing students adequately for college and career. Furthermore, without uniform implementation of a standards-based curriculum, the schools are without the foundation for targeted intervention and meaningful program and student assessment.

**9. In observed classrooms, key instructional practices were inconsistently in place across the district.**

The team observed 39 classes throughout the district: 13 at the high school, 10 at the middle school, and 16 at the two elementary schools. The team observed 18 ELA classes, 10 mathematics classes, and 11 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

 **A.** Classes with multiple resources to meet students’ diverse learning needs of students were infrequently observed.

1. Clear and consistent evidence of the availability of multiple resources to meet all students’ diverse learning needs (# 5) was found in 36 percent of observed classrooms across the district: in 31 percent of elementary classes, in 40 percent of middle school classes, and in 38 percent of high school classes.

 2. The review team observed teachers clearly and consistently using appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities (# 10) in only 10 percent of classrooms across the district: in 6 percent of elementary lessons, in 0 percent of middle school lessons, and in 23 percent of high school lessons.

 **B.** Effective teaching practices associated with lesson design were inconsistently observed districtwide.

 1. Teachers clearly and consistently used appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content (#9) in 36 percent of observed classes: in just 13 percent of elementary classrooms, in 50 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 54 percent of high school classrooms.

 2. The team found clear and consistent evidence that teachers paced lessons to match content and meet students’ learning needs (# 14) in 38 percent of observed classes: in 13 percent of elementary school lessons, in 50 percent of middle school lessons, and in 62 percent of high school lessons.

 3. Teachers clearly and consistently implemented teaching strategies that promoted a safe learning environment where students gave opinions, made judgments, explored and investigated ideas (# 13) in 44 percent of the classes visited by the team: in only 25 percent of elementary school classrooms, in 60 percent of middle school classrooms, and in 54 percent of high school classrooms.

 4. Clear and consistent evidence of teachers conducting frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction (# 15) was observed in 33 percent of classrooms: in only 0 percent of elementary school lessons, in 50 percent of middle school lessons, and in 62 percent of high school lessons.

 **C.** Instruction marked by rigor and high expectations was inconsistently in place.

 1. Students were clearly and consistently engaged in challenging academic tasks (# 17) in 33 percent of observed classes: in only 13 percent of elementary classes, in 30 percent of middle school classes, and in 62 percent of high school classes.

 2. Teachers clearly and consistently planned and implemented lessons marked by rigor and high expectations in 38 percent of observed classes.

 a. Evidence of rigor and high expectation for student performance was strongest at the high school where 62 percent of observed classes were marked by challenging activities and high expectations; clear and consistent evidence of this characteristic was noted in just 13 percent of elementary lessons and in 50 percent of middle school lessons.

 3. In many observed classes students completed worksheets in their learning centers, listened to lectures, and read or sat quietly as lessons unfolded.

 a. A few classes were marked by more rigorous instruction. For example, very young students conducted sophisticated inquiry in science and did close reading in English Language Arts; in the middle school students actively worked in groups to complete a science assignment; and at the high school biology students completed a very challenging exercise associated with human digestion.

 **D.** The review team found overall limited evidence of instruction that promotes higher-order thinking.

1.Clear and consistent evidence of teachers providing opportunities for students to engage in higher-order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (# 11) was found in just 31 percent of classrooms districtwide.

 a. This characteristic was most evident at the high school where it was observed in 62 percent of classrooms; however, clear and consistent evidence of this characteristic was observed in only 13 percent of elementary and in 20 percent of middle school classrooms.

**Impact**: Without consistent implementation of a high-quality curriculum through effective instruction, of the district cannot guarantee that all students have equal opportunities to reach high levels of achievement.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

1. **The district’s professional development program has not been planned collaboratively by leaders and teachers. Teachers spoke of not evaluating professional development activities in recent years.**
2. Administrators told the team that the superintendent and members of the district’s administrative team planned the 2014–2015 professional development calendar for the district with little or no input from the teaching staff.
3. A document review indicated that the Professional Development Plan calendar for the 2014–2015 school year is composed of activities in four categories: assessment, curriculum, instruction, and climate.

2. The Professional Development Plan for 2014–2015 primarily focuses on educator evaluation, District-Determined Measures (DDMs), MCAS data, strategies for differentiating instruction, and teacher goal alignment with SIP goals – with most activities focused on development of DDMs.

3. Teachers told review team members that when the district had curriculum personnel a couple of years ago the professional development plan was developed with input from staff.

 a. In the 2014 TELL Mass survey, the latest year for which TELL Mass data is available, 62 percent of those teachers who responded (n= 32) said that teachers had no role or a small role in determining the content of in-service professional development programs.

 4. Principals reported that the Professional Development Plan used to be developed by a Professional Development Committee and said that the practice was desirable. They indicated that professional development is no longer planned by a committee districtwide.

 **B.** Teachers expressed the view that professional development over the past few years has been primarily directed toward mandates. Teachers indicated that professional development is not scheduled to meet teachers’ needs. They said that they see more focus on district operations than on curriculum and instruction.

 **C.** Interviewees indicated that they had not seen the Professional Development Plan for 2014–2015, adding their perception that it had not been disseminated to the whole staff.

 **D**. Teachers reported that they would like to re-establish options for teachers to participate in the planning of professional development activities in the district. Teachers told review team members that they would like professional development around initiatives to demonstrate best practices, the opportunity to talk and collaborate, and the development of curriculum units.

 **E.** Review team members were provided with a copy of a professional development needs assessment that was intended for distribution to staff at the end of June, 2015, to help determine professional development needs in the district.

 **F.** Principals reported that the schools use feedback forms to evaluate professional development. Teachers told review team members that in the past they evaluated professional development activities in which they had participated, but have not done so in the last three years.

 **G.** Interviewees said that the absence of common planning time and PLCs does not afford the district’s teachers the opportunity to grow professionally and learn new skills.

 **H.** Members of the teachers’ association expressed the opinion that there is “no professional development,” that any professional development time is reserved primarily for DDMs, and that there is “no content, no time to plan curriculum, no time for teams to work.”

 **I.** The superintendent indicated that she has put forth a collective bargaining agreement proposal in the current teacher negotiations that would net more professional development time.

**Impact**: By not involving teachers in the formation and evaluation of the district’s professional development offerings, the district risks an absence of “buy in” by teachers and misses the opportunity to more closely target its professional development opportunities to meet differentiated teachers’ needs and to advance the district’s educational goals.

***Student Support***

1. **Although it has school councils, the district has not developed an effective system of communication between school and families and parent engagement with the schools is not strong enough to assist in improving student achievement.**

 **A.** Interviews indicated that there were issues with the district’s support and engagement of families and dissemination of student data.

 1. Some parents said they only find out what is happening in the schools because they are members of school councils, which serve as the voice for parents.

 2. Parents expressed the view that communication needs to improve. They said that it is fair at the elementary and middle school levels but tapers off at the high school level. They expressed a desire for a monthly newsletter.

 3. Parents said that many students (approximately 50) leave the district each year to attend alternate high schools and expressed the opinion that the district does not do enough to promote its schools.

4. An interviewee reported that the community does not sufficiently support the schools, noting that attendance is low at specifically planned family events such as financial aid night and college planning night.

 5. An administrator expressed the view that the community should have a greater understanding of students’ needs. This administrator said that the community does not have a perception of the depth of students’ needs and what the schools are doing to address these needs.

 6. School counselors said that without the direction of districtwide communication protocols they attempt to engage parents as partners and to reach out to support agencies to collaborate around student issues.

 7. Parents reported that they do not have adequate opportunities to see assessment data to understand how their children are performing. They also reported that they do not get MCAS results. They noted that the student achievement data that they do receive is not clear, concise, or well distributed.

 8. Parents expressed the opinion that accountability is everyone’s job. They said that they would welcome more opportunities for input into teaching and learning in Westport.

 **B.** Teachers do not have consistent time and opportunity to collaborate.

 1. Schedules do not include designated time for regular teacher-to-teacher communication.

 2. Teachers said that teachers could better support students if they had more opportunities to talk and collaborate.

**Impact**: Without consistent, regular communication between schools and families, parents do not have complete confidence in the district’s ability to meet their children’s needs and are not working with the schools to improve student achievement. Without regular opportunities to collaborate, teachers’ ability to address students’ needs is compromised.

Westport Community Schools District Review Recommendations

***Leadership and Governance***

**1. The district should explore ways to reestablish the structures needed to adequately supervise and coordinate the instructional program.**

1. The district may wish to redefine the administrative roles in the system to include districtwide coordination and articulation of instructional programs.
2. The district should re-examine its budget for the upcoming year in an effort to recapture funds from positions and/or programs that are not effective or do not meet the needs of students and reassign them to support the district’s priorities.

**Recommended resource:**

* The Rennie Center’s *Smart* *School Budgeting* (<http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html>; direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and real­location.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will result in much needed support to coordinate, articulate, and supervise the instructional program ensuring that it is viable for all students. The district’s ability to ensure the delivery of a high-quality instructional program to all students will likely be enhanced.

**2. The school committee, within the scope of its responsibilities under the 1993 Educational Reform Act, together with the superintendent, should create a more collaborative culture that encourages all stakeholders to work together to support higher levels of student achievement.**

**A.** The school committee should delegate to the superintendent the educational and operational leadership of the district, foregoing direct involvement in the administration of the school system and in the administration of individual schools.

1. School committee members should recognize that the superintendent is the educational leader for the school system; the superintendent provides administrative leadership for all school staff in operational matters and in proposing and implementing policy changes.

**Recommended resources:** Labor-Management-Community Collaboration in Springfield Public Schools (<http://www.renniecenter.org/research/LaborMgmtCommunityCollab.pdf>) is a case study from the Rennie Center describing how a district improved collaboration, communication, and relationships among adult stakeholders with the goal of improved student achievement.

* The Massachusetts Association of School Committees (MASC) (<http://www.masc.org/>), which provides training and information to school committees.
	+ The District Governance Program is designed to focus on continuous improvement and to help school committees and superintendents develop new strategies for teamwork and collaboration that will enhance student achievement.
	+ The examples listed and described in MASC’s member publication *Protocols and Best Practices for Effective School Committees* could be a useful reference.
* *Setting and Monitoring District Goals: The School Committee’s Role* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/2014-0516EdEvalCommittee.pdf>) is a concise synthesis of guidance about the school committee’s role in district planning and educator evaluation.

**Benefits:** implementing this recommendation will enable the school committee and the superintendent to carry out their roles and responsibilities more effectively, with enhanced communication, more public confidence, and a more strategic commitment of the city’s resources toward improving instructional quality and raising student achievement.

***Curriculum and Instruction***

* 1. **The district should take steps to increase its ability to manage curriculum and instruction.**

**A.** The district should convene a representative group of administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders to use a range of data to assess the state of curriculum and instruction in Westport.

 1. Once this assessment has been completed, this group should develop a plan to manage curriculum in the district in the short term and in the long term, and communicate this to the educational community.

 a. This plan should include a timeline for curriculum development and an ongoing cycle of curriculum revision.

 b. The plan should also describe the roles and responsibilities needed in order to provide effective oversight and support related to curriculum and instruction.

 **B.** The district should continue its work to complete its K–12 curriculum so that all students have access to a comprehensive and aligned curriculum.

 **C.** The district should define the characteristics of high-quality instruction.

 1. The recommended model of instruction should promote high levels of student engagement, high expectations and rigor, and use multiple instructional strategies that reflect skill development, inquiry, and higher-order thinking.

 2. The district’s recent use of a common instructional framework at the high school could serve as an example to build upon.

 3. The district is encouraged to provide opportunities for educators to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model. These opportunities might include grade level, department meetings, faculty meetings, common planning time, or professional development days.

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

 5. Key instructional practices should be prioritized as the district’s non-negotiables.

 6. The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs/small groups, to generalize and share feedback about trends observed, and to discuss improvement strategies with teachers.

**Recommended resources:**

* + - * ESE’s *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) includes links to several resources designed to support the transition to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
			* ESE’s *Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/download_form.aspx>) provide exemplars that can be useful as the district develops its systematic approach to curriculum. Supplemental presentations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/resources/>) provide more information about the units.
			* *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf>) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units.
		- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a full year as they worked to develop Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units. The series includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
			* *Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu>) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts’ Model Curriculum Units.
			* The *Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts’ and schools’ curriculum development and revision.
			* ESE’s *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
			* *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/CandI/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf> ) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
			* Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
			* *Mathematics Framework Exploration Activities* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/mathexplore/default.html>) are a growing set of activities designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education mathematics staff and educators. The activities can be accessed and used to promote discussion and collaborative inquiry.
	+ *Science and Technology/Engineering Concept and Skill Progressions* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/ste/default.html>) articulate of possible ways for students to progress through levels of understanding of concepts.
	+ ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>)isa resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a walkthroughprocess and a culture of collaboration.
* Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice (*<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at instruction.

**Benefits:**

* Alignment of the curriculum to state standards will provide students with high quality content and solid preparation for college and career.
* The establishment of a shared instructional model will provide a vehicle for instructional consistency, professional learning, and ultimately student success.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**4. The district should consider reestablishing its Professional Development Committee and charging it with planning and overseeing professional development for the district.**

 **A.** The Professional Development Committee should include wide representation. It should use data, including input from staff, to develop a professional development (PD) plan for the district that is aligned with the District and School Improvement Plans.

1. As part of this effort, the committee should outline and document a set of learning experiences for its educators that is systemic, sustained, and aligned with district goals. It should include goals focused on improving teacher practice and student outcomes.

2. The plan should identify specific PD needs, determine how they might be met, and recommend adjustments in PD practices to meet them.

a. These adjustments might include changing the amount of time allocated to professional development and/or the way that PD is scheduled.

3. The plan should address needs identified by student performance data and trends from classroom observations.

4. The committee should periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the PD program and modify it as appropriate.

 5. PD requires a long-term commitment by administrators and embedded support structures, such as facilitated team meetings, to convey and promote a common understanding of instructional practices expected from all educators.

**Recommended resources**:

* *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
* ESE’s *Professional Development Self- Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/dsac/pd/PDProviderGuide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings’ alignment with the Massachusetts High-Quality Professional Development Standards, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.
* *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncg&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqtEmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.
* *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
* *PBS LearningMedia* (<http://www.pbslearningmedia.org/>) is a free digital media content library that provides relevant educational resources for PreK-12 teachers. The flexible platform includes high-quality content tied to national curriculum standards, as well as professional development courses.
* ESE’sMathematics Learning Community materials(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/mlc/default.html>) are designed to support job-embedded professional development for K–8 mathematics teachers. Their focus is to develop teachers' content knowledge through examining students' work in professional learning communities.
* *Classroom Connections* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/mlc/ClassConnections/>) is a professional development (PD) curriculum that explores important mathematical content across the grade levels and provides teachers with the opportunity to examine written student work in order to identify evidence of the Standards for Mathematical Practice.
* The *Teacher Education Materials Project Database* (<http://www.te-mat.org/default.aspx>) is a website that was developed to support professional development providers as they design and implement programs for pre-service and in-service K - 12 mathematics and science teachers.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will include a clearer understanding of the district’s expectations about professional development and the development of a system that prioritizes student learning, supports teachers as lifelong learners, and helps to implement best practices throughout the district. A high-quality professional development program coupled with the time and resources already available in the district will likely lead to educator growth and improved student achievement.

***Student Support***

**5. District leaders and teachers should work together to improve communication throughout the educational community.**

 **A.** The district should make a stronger effort to connect with families, inform them about students’ academic, social and emotional progress, and bring them into partnership with the schools for the benefit of their children.

 1. The district should find a way to engage all parents and guardians in their children’s education.

 2. The district is encouraged to establish policies and expectations based on best practices about family engagement and two-way communication with families (see resources below).

 3. The district should consider which community resources might help them achieve this goal.

**Recommended resources:**

* *Parents’ Guides to Student* *Success* (<http://pta.org/parents/content.cfm?ItemNumber=2583> ) are grade-specific guides from the National PTA (available in English and Spanish) with specific descriptions for parents of what children should be learning once Common Core standards are fully implemented, along with suggestions for helping students at home and communicating with teachers.*Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/parent/FSCPfundamentals.pdf>) provide a framework for family engagement, along with a self-assessment tool.
* *Family and Community Engagement Standards*(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/PCEIstandards.pdf>)**:** Developed by the Parent and Community Education and Involvement Advisory Council, this document defines each of the six Family and Community Engagement Standards and includes a rubric for each. A related self-assessment (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/parent/FSCPfundamentals.pdf>) is also available.
* ESE’s *Title I Family Engagement* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/titlei/parta/family-engagement/?section=FE>) includes links to family engagement policies, toolkits, research, presentations, and other resources.

**Benefits:** Increased communication with and engagement of students’ families will likely mean more collaborative and effective support for students’ academic progress and social and emotional well-being.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from June 8–11, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Magdalene P. Giffune, leadership and governance, assessment and finance; *review team coordinator*
2. Dr. Thomas Pandiscio, curriculum and instruction
3. Dr. William Contreras, human resources and professional development
4. Willette Johnson, student support

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business assistant and payroll administrator.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers’ association: executive board consisting of president, vice president, secretary, and four building representatives.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrator: the superintendent.

The team visited the following schools: Macomber (K–1), Westport Elementary (grades 2–5), Westport Middle (grades 6–8), and Westport High (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and a focus group with six elementary, middle, and high school teachers. Because of a misunderstanding the teacher focus groups were cancelled and then rescheduled. This resulted in one group for all teachers. The team observed 39 classes in the district: 13 at the high school, 10 at the middle school, and 17 at the elementary schools.

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

* + Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.
	+ Data on the district’s staffing and finances.
	+ Published educational reports on the district by ESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA).
	+ District documents such as 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**06/08/2015 | **Tuesday**06/09/2015 | **Wednesday**06/10/2015 | **Thursday**06/11/2015 |
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association; meeting with one school committee member | Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; student focus group; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Westport High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Westport Middle and Westport Elementary schools for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Macomber and Westport High School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals. |

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Westport Community Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Group** | **District** | **Percent****of Total** | **State** | **Percent of****Total** |
| African-American | 8 | 0.5% | 83,556 | 8.7% |
| Asian | 11 | 0.7% | 60,050 | 6.3% |
| Hispanic | 38 | 2.4% | 171,036 | 17.9% |
| Native American | 5 | 0.3% | 2,238 | 0.2% |
| White | 1,456 | 92.9% | 608,453 | 63.7% |
| Native Hawaiian | -- | -- | 930 | 0.1% |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic  | 50 | 3.2% | 29,581 | 3.1% |
| **All Students** | 1,568 | 100.0% | 955,844 | 100.0% |
| Note: As of October 1, 2014 |

**Table B1b: Westport Community Schools**

**2014–2015 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations[[3]](#footnote-3)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Groups** | **District** | **State** |
| **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of District** | **N** | **Percent of High Needs** | **Percent of State** |
| Students w/ disabilities | 262 | -- | 16.7% | 165,060 | -- | 17.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| ELLs and Former ELLs | 7 | -- | 0.4% | 81,146 | -- | 8.5% |
| All high needs students | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Notes: As of October 1, 2014. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,569; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,391. |

 **Table B2a: Westport Public Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 3 | CPI | 117 | 81.2 | 83.8 | 84.8 | 86.8 | 82.6 | 5.6 | 2 |
| P+ | 117 | 60.0% | 61.0% | 55.0% | 63.0% | 57.0% | 3.0% | 8.0% |
| 4 | CPI | 128 | 83.4 | 77.1 | 77.7 | 83.2 | 79.1 | -0.2 | 5.5 |
| P+ | 128 | 64.0% | 51.0% | 51.0% | 55.0% | 54.0% | -9.0% | 4.0% |
| SGP | 122 | 63.5 | 51 | 43 | 52 | 49 | -11.5 | 9 |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 89.6 | 84.4 | 83.7 | 80.5 | 84.5 | -9.1 | -3.2 |
| P+ | 132 | 66.0% | 66.0% | 65.0% | 57.0% | 64.0% | -9.0% | -8.0% |
| SGP | 129 | 38.5 | 58 | 63 | 36 | 50 | -2.5 | -27 |
| 6 | CPI | 130 | 91.8 | 91.1 | 89.8 | 83.1 | 85.8 | -8.7 | -6.7 |
| P+ | 130 | 74.0% | 78.0% | 78.0% | 63.0% | 68.0% | -11.0% | -15.0% |
| SGP | 124 | 53 | 55 | 62 | 42 | 50 | -11 | -20 |
| 7 | CPI | 160 | 91.2 | 94.3 | 94.2 | 91.4 | 88.3 | 0.2 | -2.8 |
| P+ | 160 | 79.0% | 83.0% | 80.0% | 81.0% | 72.0% | 2.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 150 | 52 | 48 | 43 | 51.5 | 50 | -0.5 | 8.5 |
| 8 | CPI | 115 | 94 | 95.2 | 96.8 | 95.7 | 90.2 | 1.7 | -1.1 |
| P+ | 115 | 85.0% | 89.0% | 91.0% | 91.0% | 79.0% | 6.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 104 | 58 | 63 | 58.5 | 55 | 50 | -3 | -3.5 |
| 10 | CPI | 82 | 94.2 | 97 | 96.1 | 96 | 96 | 1.8 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 82 | 83.0% | 89.0% | 85.0% | 91.0% | 90.0% | 8.0% | 6.0% |
| SGP | 76 | 47 | 50 | 49 | 43 | 50 | -4 | -6 |
| All | CPI | 864 | 89.2 | 88.8 | 88.7 | 87.6 | 86.7 | -1.6 | -1.1 |
| P+ | 864 | 73.0% | 73.0% | 72.0% | 71.0% | 69.0% | -2.0% | -1.0% |
| SGP | 705 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 47 | 50 | -7 | -7 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. |

**Table B2b: Westport Public Schools**

**Mathematics Performance, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 3 | CPI | 117 | 86.8 | 84.3 | 89.4 | 91 | 85.1 | 4.2 | 1.6 |
| P+ | 117 | 69.0% | 68.0% | 73.0% | 79.0% | 68.0% | 10.0% | 6.0% |
| 4 | CPI | 128 | 77.8 | 80.8 | 85.6 | 82 | 79.6 | 4.2 | -3.6 |
| P+ | 128 | 46.0% | 54.0% | 59.0% | 55.0% | 52.0% | 9.0% | -4.0% |
| SGP | 123 | 47 | 52 | 53.5 | 53 | 50 | 6 | -0.5 |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 88.8 | 79.5 | 79.3 | 78.2 | 80.4 | -10.6 | -1.1 |
| P+ | 132 | 72.0% | 58.0% | 57.0% | 61.0% | 61.0% | -11.0% | 4.0% |
| SGP | 129 | 40 | 54 | 46 | 30 | 50 | -10 | -16 |
| 6 | CPI | 130 | 86.9 | 83.1 | 82.4 | 76.2 | 80.2 | -10.7 | -6.2 |
| P+ | 130 | 66.0% | 59.0% | 62.0% | 53.0% | 60.0% | -13.0% | -9.0% |
| SGP | 126 | 44.5 | 25 | 53 | 37.5 | 50 | -7 | -15.5 |
| 7 | CPI | 162 | 75.2 | 78 | 76.3 | 74.2 | 72.5 | -1 | -2.1 |
| P+ | 162 | 55.0% | 51.0% | 55.0% | 51.0% | 50.0% | -4.0% | -4.0% |
| SGP | 153 | 51 | 38.5 | 54 | 53 | 50 | 2 | -1 |
| 8 | CPI | 117 | 76.2 | 75 | 78.6 | 79.5 | 74.7 | 3.3 | 0.9 |
| P+ | 117 | 50.0% | 53.0% | 54.0% | 58.0% | 52.0% | 8.0% | 4.0% |
| SGP | 107 | 49 | 46 | 52 | 60 | 50 | 11 | 8 |
| 10 | CPI | 81 | 88.8 | 90.5 | 88.9 | 88.6 | 90 | -0.2 | -0.3 |
| P+ | 81 | 74.0% | 77.0% | 77.0% | 74.0% | 79.0% | 0.0% | -3.0% |
| SGP | 75 | 47 | 42 | 49.5 | 52 | 50 | 5 | 2.5 |
| All | CPI | 867 | 82.5 | 81.4 | 82.7 | 80.6 | 80.3 | -1.9 | -2.1 |
| P+ | 867 | 61.0% | 60.0% | 62.0% | 60.0% | 60.0% | -1.0% | -2.0% |
| SGP | 713 | 46 | 43 | 52 | 47 | 50 | 1 | -5 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.  |

**Table B2c: Westport Public Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4-Year Trend** | **2 Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **State 2014** |
| 5 | CPI | 132 | 87.3 | 83.3 | 79.3 | 80.9 | 79 | -6.4 | 1.6 |
| P+ | 132 | 61.0% | 62.0% | 50.0% | 52.0% | 53.0% | -9.0% | 2.0% |
| 8 | CPI | 117 | 80.2 | 79.8 | 78.4 | 81 | 72.4 | 0.8 | 2.6 |
| P+ | 117 | 52.0% | 54.0% | 43.0% | 49.0% | 42.0% | -3.0% | 6.0% |
| 10 | CPI | 75 | 84.8 | 86.2 | 84.5 | 83 | 87.9 | -1.8 | -1.5 |
| P+ | 75 | 61.0% | 64.0% | 63.0% | 57.0% | 71.0% | -4.0% | -6.0% |
| All | CPI | 324 | 83.8 | 83 | 80.2 | 81.4 | 79.6 | -2.4 | 1.2 |
| P+ | 324 | 57.0% | 60.0% | 50.0% | 52.0% | 55.0% | -5.0% | 2.0% |
| Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. |

**Table B3a: Westport Public Schools**

**English Language Arts (All Grades)**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 335 | 79.8 | 78.8 | 80.6 | 78.1 | -1.7 | -2.5 |
| P+ | 335 | 55.0% | 53.0% | 55.0% | 54.0% | -1.0% | -1.0% |
| SGP | 259 | 52.5 | 51 | 53 | 43 | -9.5 | -10 |
| State | CPI | 241,069 | 77 | 76.5 | 76.8 | 77.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 241,069 | 48.0% | 48.0% | 48.0% | 50.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| SGP | 183,766 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 47 | 1 | 0 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 246 | 83 | 80.4 | 83.3 | 79.8 | -3.2 | -3.5 |
| P+ | 246 | 62.0% | 58.0% | 63.0% | 59.0% | -3.0% | -4.0% |
| SGP | 199 | 50 | 50 | 53 | 41 | -9 | -12 |
| State | CPI | 189,662 | 77.1 | 76.7 | 77.2 | 77.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 189,662 | 49.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 51.0% | 2.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 145,621 | 46 | 45 | 47 | 47 | 1 | 0 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 147 | 65.8 | 65.2 | 64.5 | 65.6 | -0.2 | 1.1 |
| P+ | 147 | 28.0% | 30.0% | 22.0% | 31.0% | 3.0% | 9.0% |
| SGP | 104 | 40 | 56 | 47.5 | 43 | 3 | -4.5 |
| State | CPI | 90,777 | 68.3 | 67.3 | 66.8 | 66.6 | -1.7 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 90,777 | 30.0% | 31.0% | 30.0% | 31.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 66,688 | 42 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 1 | 0 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 10 | 0 | 65.9 | 78.8 | 85 | 85 | 6.2 |
| P+ | 10 | 0.0% | 18.0% | 46.0% | 70.0% | 70.0% | 24.0% |
| SGP | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 47,477 | 66.2 | 66.2 | 67.4 | 67.8 | 1.6 | 0.4 |
| P+ | 47,477 | 33.0% | 34.0% | 35.0% | 36.0% | 3.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 32,239 | 50 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 4 | 1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 864 | 89.2 | 88.8 | 88.7 | 87.6 | -1.6 | -1.1 |
| P+ | 864 | 73.0% | 73.0% | 72.0% | 71.0% | -2.0% | -1.0% |
| SGP | 705 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 47 | -7 | -7 |
| State | CPI | 488,744 | 87.2 | 86.7 | 86.8 | 86.7 | -0.5 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 488,744 | 69.0% | 69.0% | 69.0% | 69.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 390,904 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 0 | -1 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.  |

**Table B3b: Westport Public Schools**

**Mathematics (All Grades)**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 334 | 71 | 69.8 | 71.7 | 70.4 | -0.6 | -1.3 |
| P+ | 334 | 41.0% | 40.0% | 43.0% | 43.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 263 | 43 | 41 | 46.5 | 44 | 1 | -2.5 |
| State | CPI | 241,896 | 67.1 | 67 | 68.6 | 68.4 | 1.3 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 241,896 | 37.0% | 37.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 184,937 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 1 | 1 |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 247 | 73.8 | 70.9 | 73 | 71.3 | -2.5 | -1.7 |
| P+ | 247 | 46.0% | 43.0% | 45.0% | 43.0% | -3.0% | -2.0% |
| SGP | 202 | 41.5 | 41 | 48 | 45 | 3.5 | -3 |
| State | CPI | 190,183 | 67.3 | 67.3 | 69 | 68.8 | 1.5 | -0.2 |
| P+ | 190,183 | 38.0% | 38.0% | 41.0% | 41.0% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 146,536 | 46 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 1 | 1 |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 145 | 59 | 60 | 58.5 | 59.3 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| P+ | 145 | 23.0% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 27.0% | 4.0% | 3.0% |
| SGP | 105 | 43.5 | 40.5 | 45 | 39 | -4.5 | -6 |
| State | CPI | 91,181 | 57.7 | 56.9 | 57.4 | 57.1 | -0.6 | -0.3 |
| P+ | 91,181 | 22.0% | 21.0% | 22.0% | 22.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SGP | 67,155 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 43 | 0 | 1 |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 10 | 0 | 65.9 | 75 | 70 | 70 | -5 |
| P+ | 10 | 0.0% | 27.0% | 46.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 4.0% |
| SGP | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| State | CPI | 47,847 | 62 | 61.6 | 63.9 | 63.8 | 1.8 | -0.1 |
| P+ | 47847 | 32.0% | 32.0% | 35.0% | 36.0% | 4.0% | 1.0% |
| SGP | 32,607 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 52 | 0 | -1 |
| **All students** | District | CPI | 867 | 82.5 | 81.4 | 82.7 | 80.6 | -1.9 | -2.1 |
| P+ | 867 | 61.0% | 60.0% | 62.0% | 60.0% | -1.0% | -2.0% |
| SGP | 713 | 46 | 43 | 52 | 47 | 1 | -5 |
| State | CPI | 490288 | 79.9 | 79.9 | 80.8 | 80.3 | 0.4 | -0.5 |
| P+ | 490,288 | 58.0% | 59.0% | 61.0% | 60.0% | 2.0% | -1.0% |
| SGP | 392,953 | 50 | 50 | 51 | 50 | 0 | -1 |
| Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.  |

**Table B3c: Westport Public Schools**

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

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group and Measure** | **Number Included (2014)** | **Spring MCAS Year** | **Gains and Declines** |
| **4 Year Trend** | **2-Year Trend** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** |
| High Needs | District | CPI | 115 | 73.7 | 69 | 70 | 73.5 | -0.2 | 3.5 |
| P+ | 115 | 37.0% | 36.0% | 33.0% | 36.0% | -1.0% | 3.0% |
| State | CPI | 100,582 | 63.8 | 65 | 66.4 | 67.3 | 3.5 | 0.9 |
| P+ | 100,582 | 28.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 33.0% | 5.0% | 2.0% |
| Econ. Disad. | District | CPI | 91 | 76.8 | 71.8 | 73.3 | 74.2 | -2.6 | 0.9 |
| P+ | 91 | 45.0% | 41.0% | 38.0% | 38.0% | -7.0% | 0.0% |
| State | CPI | 79,199 | 62.8 | 64.5 | 66.1 | 66.8 | 4 | 0.7 |
| P+ | 79,199 | 28.0% | 31.0% | 32.0% | 33.0% | 5.0% | 1.0% |
| Students w/ disabilities | District | CPI | 47 | 61.9 | 57 | 54.5 | 60.6 | -1.3 | 6.1 |
| P+ | 47 | 14.0% | 14.0% | 10.0% | 15.0% | 1.0% | 5.0% |
| State | CPI | 38,628 | 59.2 | 58.7 | 59.8 | 60.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 |
| P+ | 38,628 | 20.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 22.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| P+ | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| State | CPI | 16,871 | 50.3 | 51.4 | 54 | 54 | 3.7 | 0 |
| P+ | 16,871 | 15.0% | 17.0% | 19.0% | 18.0% | 3.0% | -1.0% |
| All students | District | CPI | 324 | 83.8 | 83 | 80.2 | 81.4 | -2.4 | 1.2 |
| P+ | 324 | 57.0% | 60.0% | 50.0% | 52.0% | -5.0% | 2.0% |
| State | CPI | 211,440 | 77.6 | 78.6 | 79 | 79.6 | 2 | 0.6 |
| P+ | 211,440 | 52.0% | 54.0% | 53.0% | 55.0% | 3.0% | 2.0% |
| Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet. |

**Table B4: Westport Public Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **School Year Ending** | **Change 2011–2014** | **Change 2013–2014** | **State (2014)** |
|  | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent** |
| All students | 4.1% | 3.3% | 0.9% | 1.6% | -2.5 | -61.0% | 0.7 | 77.8% | 2.0% |
| Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. |

**Table B5a: Westport Public Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Number Included (2014)** | **School Year Ending** | **Change 2011–2014** | **Change 2013–2014** | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 43 | 59.6% | 72.0% | 88.9% | 81.4% | 21.8 | 36.6% | -7.5 | -8.4% | 76.5% |
| Econ. Disad.  | 35 | 64.5% | 72.5% | 87.9% | 82.9% | 18.4 | 28.5% | -5.0 | -5.7% | 75.5% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 18 | 46.4% | 57.9% | 81.8% | 83.3% | 36.9 | 79.5% | 1.5 | 1.8% | 69.1% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 63.9% |
| All students | 116 | 76.6% | 82.1% | 94.1% | 92.2% | 15.6 | 20.4% | -1.9 | -2.0% | 86.1% |
| Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. |

**Table B5b: Westport Public Schools**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** |  | **School Year Ending** | **Change 2010–2013** | **Change 2012–2013** | **State (2013)** |
| **Number Included (2013)** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| High needs | 45 | 74.2% | 69.2% | 76.0% | 91.1% | 16.9 | 22.8% | 15.1 | 19.9% | 79.2% |
| Econ. Disad, | 33 | 77.3% | 74.2% | 77.5% | 90.9% | 13.6 | 17.6% | 13.4 | 17.3% | 78.3% |
| Students w/ disabilities | 22 | 56.7% | 57.1% | 63.2% | 86.4% | 29.7 | 52.4% | 23.2 | 36.7% | 72.9% |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 70.9% |
| All students | 119 | 83.5% | 82.3% | 85.5% | 95.0% | 11.5 | 13.8% | 9.5 | 11.1% | 87.7% |
| Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.  |

**Table B6: Westport Public Schools**

**Attendance Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | **Change 2011–2014** | **Change 2013–2014** | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| All students | 94.9% | 95.1% | 95.1% | 96.2% | 1.3 | 1.4% | 1.1 | 1.2% | 94.9% |
| Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student’s attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. |

**Table B7: Westport Public Schools**

**Suspension Rates, 2011–2014**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **School Year Ending** | **Change 2011–2014** | **Change 2013–2014** | **State (2014)** |
| **2011** | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** | **Percentage Points** | **Percent Change** |
| In-School Suspension Rate | 5.5% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.7% | -4.8 | -87.3% | 0.4 | 133.3% | 2.1% |
| Out-of-School Suspension Rate | 3.7% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 2.0% | -1.7 | -45.9% | -0.2 | -9.1% | 3.9% |
| Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. |

**Table B8: Westport Public Schools**

**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **FY12** | **FY13** | **FY14** |
|   | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** | **Estimated** | **Actual** |
| Expenditures |
| From local appropriations for schools: |  |
| By school committee | $15,110,085 | $15,260,420 | $15,110,085 | $15,068,201 | $15,875,785 | $15,723,703 |
| By municipality | $4,717,531 | $7,992,351 | $4,799,969 | $4,358,034 | $5,031,109 | $4,750,233 |
| Total from local appropriations | $19,827,616 | $23,252,771 | $19,910,054 | $19,426,235 | $20,906,894 | $20,473,936 |
| From revolving funds and grants | -- | $2,413,021 | -- | $2,442,233 | -- | $2,518,895 |
| Total expenditures | -- | $25,665,792 | -- | $21,868,468 | -- | $22,992,831 |
| Chapter 70 aid to education program |
| Chapter 70 state aid\* | -- | $4,154,597 | -- | $4,221,997 | -- | $4,262,947 |
| Required local contribution | -- | $12,313,381 | -- | $12,625,582 | -- | $12,949,560 |
| Required net school spending\*\* | -- | $16,467,978 | -- | $16,847,579 | -- | $17,212,507 |
| Actual net school spending | -- | $17,067,027 | -- | $16,972,211 | -- | $17,772,238 |
| Over/under required ($) | -- | $599,049 | -- | $124,632 | -- | $559,731 |
| Over/under required (%) | -- | 3.6 | -- | 0.7 | -- | 3.3 |
| \*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.\*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.Sources: FY12, FY13, FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE websiteData retrieved April 27, 2015  |

**Table B9: Westport Public Schools**

**Expenditures Per In-District Pupil**

**Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expenditure Category** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** |
| Administration | $385 | $396 | $466 |
| Instructional leadership (district and school) | $772 | $824 | $823 |
| Teachers | $3,837 | $4,131 | $4,339 |
| Other teaching services | $947 | $1,019 | $1,072 |
| Professional development | $205 | $257 | $215 |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | $457 | $467 | $409 |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services | $453 | $460 | $489 |
| Pupil services | $1,137 | $1,157 | $1,138 |
| Operations and maintenance | $817 | $900 | $910 |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs | $1,482 | $1,545 | $1,510 |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil | $10,492 | $11,156 | $11,372 |
| Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/statistics/)  |

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning Environment & Teaching** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive & respectful. | **ES** | 6% | 0% | 100% |
| **MS** | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| **HS** | 8% | 8% | 85% |
| **Total #** | 2 | 1 | 36 |
| **Total %** | 5% | 3% | 92% |
| 2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably. | **ES** | 0% | 19% | 81% |
| **MS** | 0% | 10% | 90% |
| **HS** | 8% | 8% | 85% |
| **Total #** | 1 | 5 | 33 |
| **Total %** | 3% | 13% | 85% |
| 3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities. | **ES** | 6% | 19% | 75% |
| **MS** | 30% | 40% | 30% |
| **HS** | 38% | 15% | 46% |
| **Total #** | 9 | 9 | 21 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 23% | 54% |
| 4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time. | **ES** | 0% | 6% | 94% |
| **MS** | 0% | 20% | 80% |
| **HS** | 31% | 15% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 4 | 5 | 30 |
| **Total %** | 10% | 13% | 77% |
| 5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students’ diverse learning needs. | **ES** | 50% | 19% | 31% |
| **MS** | 0% | 60% | 40% |
| **HS** | 8% | 54% | 38% |
| **Total #** | 9 | 16 | 14 |
| **Total %** | 23% | 41% | 36% |
| 6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content. | **ES** | 0% | 19% | 81% |
| **MS** | 0% | 10% | 90% |
| **HS** | 0% | 8% | 92% |
| **Total #** | 0 | 5 | 34 |
| **Total %** | 0% | 13% | 87% |
| 7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations. | **ES** | 31% | 56% | 13% |
| **MS** | 10% | 40% | 50% |
| **HS** | 31% | 8% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 10 | 14 | 15 |
| **Total %** | 26% | 36% | 38% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Teaching** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to the *2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks*. | **ES** | 38% | 50% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 10% | 70% |
| **HS** | 31% | 15% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 12 | 11 | 16 |
| **Total %** | 31% | 28% | 41% |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective (s) and content. | **ES** | 25% | 63% | 13% |
| **MS** | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| **HS** | 8% | 38% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 5 | 20 | 14 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 51% | 36% |
| 10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products. | **ES** | 88% | 6% | 6% |
| **MS** | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| **HS** | 62% | 15% | 23% |
| **Total #** | 29 | 6 | 4 |
| **Total %** | 74% | 15% | 10% |
| 11. The teacher provides opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy). | **ES** | 50% | 38% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 60% | 20% |
| **HS** | 8% | 31% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 11 | 16 | 12 |
| **Total %** | 28% | 41% | 31% |
| 12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding. | **ES** | 31% | 56% | 13% |
| **MS** | 10% | 30% | 60% |
| **HS** | 15% | 38% | 46% |
| **Total #** | 8 | 17 | 14 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 44% | 36% |
| 13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a safe learning environment where students give opinions, make judgments, explore and investigate ideas. | **ES** | 25% | 50% | 25% |
| **MS** | 0% | 40% | 60% |
| **HS** | 8% | 38% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 5 | 17 | 17 |
| **Total %** | 13% | 44% | 44% |
| 14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students’ learning needs. | **ES** | 44% | 44% | 13% |
| **MS** | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| **HS** | 0% | 38% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 7 | 17 | 15 |
| **Total %** | 18% | 44% | 38% |
| 15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction. | **ES** | 38% | 63% | 0% |
| **MS** | 20% | 30% | 50% |
| **HS** | 15% | 23% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 10 | 16 | 13 |
| **Total %** | 26% | 41% | 33% |
| 16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning. | **ES** | 50% | 13% | 38% |
| **MS** | 30% | 20% | 50% |
| **HS** | 23% | 46% | 31% |
| **Total #** | 14 | 10 | 15 |
| **Total %** | 36% | 26% | 38% |
| **Learning** | **By Grade Span** | **Evidence** |
| **None** | **Partial** | **Clear & Consistent** |
| **(0)** | **(1)** | **(2)** |
| 17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks. | **ES** | 13% | 75% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 50% | 30% |
| **HS** | 15% | 23% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 6 | 20 | 13 |
| **Total %** | 15% | 51% | 33% |
| 18. Students articulate their thinking verbally or in writing. | **ES** | 44% | 38% | 19% |
| **MS** | 0% | 30% | 70% |
| **HS** | 8% | 31% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 8 | 13 | 18 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 33% | 46% |
| 19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy). | **ES** | 38% | 50% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 30% | 50% |
| **HS** | 15% | 31% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 10 | 15 | 14 |
| **Total %** | 26% | 38% | 36% |
| 20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions. | **ES** | 44% | 38% | 19% |
| **MS** | 20% | 60% | 20% |
| **HS** | 23% | 31% | 46% |
| **Total #** | 12 | 16 | 11 |
| **Total %** | 31% | 41% | 28% |
| 21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experience, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects. | **ES** | 50% | 38% | 13% |
| **MS** | 40% | 0% | 60% |
| **HS** | 23% | 15% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 15 | 8 | 16 |
| **Total %** | 38% | 21% | 41% |
| 22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding. | **ES** | 13% | 75% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 50% | 30% |
| **HS** | 15% | 23% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 6 | 20 | 13 |
| **Total %** | 15% | 51% | 33% |
| 23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | **ES** | 44% | 38% | 19% |
| **MS** | 0% | 30% | 70% |
| **HS** | 8% | 31% | 62% |
| **Total #** | 8 | 13 | 18 |
| **Total %** | 21% | 33% | 46% |
| 24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars. | **ES** | 38% | 50% | 13% |
| **MS** | 20% | 30% | 50% |
| **HS** | 15% | 31% | 54% |
| **Total #** | 10 | 15 | 14 |
| **Total %** | 26% | 38% | 36% |

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