

District Review Report

South Hadley Public Schools

Review conducted May 27-30, 2014



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

South Hadley Public Schools District Review Overview.....	1
South Hadley Public Schools District Review Findings.....	5
South Hadley Public Schools District Review Recommendations.....	30
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, and Site Visit Schedule	39
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, and Expenditures	41
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	52

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Replay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.

Commissioner

Published November 2014

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2014 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370

www.doe.mass.edu



South Hadley Public Schools District Review Overview

Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2013-2014 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 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 South Hadley was conducted from May 27 to May 30, 2014. The site visit included 35 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 85 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, parents, students and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups with seven elementary school teachers, nine middle school teachers, and seven high school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 51 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

South Hadley has a town manager form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are five members of the school committee and they meet monthly.

The current superintendent has been in the position since July 2012. The district leadership team includes principals, the assistant superintendent, the director of curriculum and grants, the director of student services, and the school business administrator. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past two years. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are three other school administrators, including assistant principals. In addition, the assistant principals are members of a bargaining unit. There are a total of 154 teachers in the district.

In the 2013-2014 school year, 1,939 students were enrolled in the district's 4 schools:

**Table 1: South Hadley Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment,* 2013-2014**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Plains Elementary School	EES	PK-1	328
Mosier Elementary School	ES	2-4	407
Michael E. Smith Middle School	MS	5-8	599
South Hadley High School	HS	9-12	605
Totals	4 schools	PK-12	1,939
*As of October 1, 2013			

Between 2010 and 2014 overall student enrollment decreased by 9 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were 7 percent higher than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal year 2013: \$13,388 compared with \$12,506 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been well above (19.1 percent in 2012 and 18.1 percent in 2013) what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

Student Performance¹

South Hadley is a Level 2 district because Mosier Elementary and Smith Middle are in Level 2.

- Mosier Elementary is in the 58th percentile of elementary schools and is in Level 2 for failing to meet its gap narrowing targets with a cumulative Progress Performance Index (PPI) of 71 for all students and 58 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Smith Middle is in the 40th percentile of middle schools and is in Level 2 for failing to meet its gap narrowing targets for all students.
- South Hadley High is in the 47th percentile of high schools and is in Level 1 with a cumulative PPI of 79 for all students and 77 for high needs students; the target is 75.

The district's 2013 Composite Performance Index (CPI) was considered on target for math and science but the district did not reach its CPI target for ELA.

- ELA CPI was 87.8 in 2013, below the district's target of 90.2.
- Math CPI was 82.2 in 2013. This was considered on target because it was within 1.25 percentage points of the district's target of 82.9.
- Science CPI was 81.3 in 2013. This was considered on target because it was within 1.25 percentage points of the district's target of 81.4.

ELA proficiency rates were above the state rate for the district as whole and for every grade except grades 3 and 8.

- ELA proficiency rates for all students in the district were 69 percent in 2010 and 71 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 69 percent.
- ELA proficiency was above the state rate by 11 percentage points in grade 4 and by 1 to 3 points in ^hgrades 5, 6, 7, and 10. ELA proficiency was below the state rate by 3 and 4 percentage points in grades 3 and 8, respectively.
- ELA proficiency was higher in 2013 than in 2010 by 11 percentage points in grades 7 and 10 and by 1 to 5 percentage points in grades 4, 5, and 6. ELA proficiency was lower in 2013 than in 2010 by 12 and 6 percentage points in grades 3 and 8, respectively.

¹ See also student performance tables in Appendix B.

Math proficiency was above the state rate for the district as a whole and equal to or above the state rate for every grade except grades 6 and 8.

- Math proficiency rates for all students in the district improved steadily from 58 percent in 2010 to 62 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 61 percent.
- Math proficiency in the district was equal to the state rate in grades 4 and 10 and above the state rate by 5, 10, and 3 percentage points in grades 3, 5, and 7, respectively. Math proficiency was below the state rate by 2 and 8 percentage points in grades 6 and 8, respectively.
- Math proficiency was higher in 2013 than in 2010 by 23 percentage points in grade 5, by 2, 7, and 9 points in grades 4, 6, and 7, respectively. Math proficiency was lower in 2013 than in 2010 by 3 to 7 percentage points in grades 3, 8, and 10.

Science proficiency was above the state rate for the district as a whole and in grades 5 and 8 and below the state rate in grade 10.

- Grade 5 science proficiency was 52 percent in 2010 and 60 percent in 2013, above the state rate of 51 percent.
- Grade 8 science proficiency was 42 percent in 2010 and 40 percent in 2013, and was above the state rate of 39 percent.
- Grade 10 science proficiency 67 percent in 2010 and 66 percent in 2013, below the state rate of 71 percent.

ELA and math proficiency for high needs students was higher in 2013 than in 2010.

- ELA proficiency for high needs students was 52 percent in 2013, 6 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 46 percent, and higher than the 2013 state rate of 48 percent.
- Math proficiency for high needs students increased steadily from 31 percent in 2010 to 41 percent in 2013, above the 2013 state rate of 40 percent.

South Hadley met the 2014 four-year cohort and five-year cohort graduation rate targets.

- The four-year cohort graduation rate was 88.8 percent in 2013, higher than the rate of 83.3 percent in 2010, and above the 2013 state graduation rate of 85.0 percent.
- The five-year cohort graduation rate was 91.7 percent in 2012, higher than the rate of 87.4 percent in 2009, and above the 2012 state graduation rate of 87.5 percent.
- The annual dropout rate for South Hadley was 2.8 percent in 2010 and 1.0 percent in 2013, below the statewide rate of 2.2 percent.

South Hadley Public Schools District Review Findings

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

- 1. Under the leadership of the superintendent, the district has identified several major areas in need of improvement and has developed immediate and long-range improvement plans and strategies to address these challenges.**
 - A.** Largely through attrition, the superintendent reduced the amount of personnel by 32.7 positions, resulting in a savings to the district of \$1,300,000.
 1. According to the superintendent, despite declining enrollments, the district employed the same number of staff for 2,300 students as it had for 1,600. The static staffing levels resulted in a “concern that we have more personnel than the town’s budget can sustain over time.”
 - B.** The district has recently adopted a “Five Year Curriculum and Program Evaluation Review Cycle” to ensure curriculum review and system-wide alignment.
 1. Although the district had engaged in curriculum development efforts in a number of areas, the superintendent noted that the district had not previously established a multi-year plan to ensure that all curricular areas were reviewed, aligned from pre-K to 12, and properly funded as needed to ensure systemwide cohesion.
 2. Mathematics was reviewed in 2012-2013, English language arts and science are under review in the current school year, and the remaining subject areas are slated for review through 2016. During the 2016-2017 school year, the district will return to a review of the mathematics program.
 - C.** In the spring of 2013, in preparation for the 2013-2014 school year, the superintendent made changes in leadership in the special education department and created an organizational chart to clarify areas of responsibility.
 1. Within the special education department, the superintendent determined that there were communication problems affecting the delivery of services resulting in “parent frustrations.” Additionally, the number of personnel, as well as their deployment, gave rise to concerns about cost and effectiveness.
 2. At the time of the review team visit, the district was engaged in an internal review of the special education department with the intent to report to the school committee in June 2014.

D. The superintendent noted the absence of a “clear and concise vision for the school system.” As a result, he initiated steps to develop both a District Improvement Plan (DIP) and School Improvement Plans (SIPs) for each of the four schools.

1. Principals acknowledged the importance of the DIP in their work; describing that it “guides what we do.”
 - a. The superintendent made it a practice to report on the progress of the DIP and each SIP to the school committee at the end of the school year, stating that it was “important for the school committee to know about achievement.”
 - b. The school committee noted that there was a “budget focus on student needs” and that the DIP represented an “ongoing theme of accountability and use of data to determine if the goals are being met.”

Impact: In addressing these four areas of school district operations with a sense of urgency, the district has created a framework for a more efficient and effective use of financial resources; it has laid the groundwork for continued student achievement through curriculum alignment; and it has created a process for developing and evaluating district- and building-level short- and long-term goals dedicated to student achievement.

2. The principals are beginning to operate with a spirit of collaboration by exhibiting a systemwide perspective in making critical decisions about the budget and closing the achievement gap. This represents a departure from the previous practice of operating exclusively from a strictly building-based perspective.

- A.** Administrators reported that the administrative team “works well together with a focus on closing the achievement gap.”
1. Administrators reported that in developing the budget, justifications for requests had to be viewed on a districtwide basis.
 - a. Principals reported that in developing the budget, a large part of the decision-making process was focused on student needs. They articulated key goals to improve student achievement and ensure student success when they transition to the next school within the district.
 - b. There was recognition within the district that needs vary among buildings and that because of this variation, different amounts of money were allocated to each school for instructional materials.
 2. According to the superintendent, recently hired administrators were selected primarily on the basis of their potential as instructional leaders. Principals see themselves as instructional leaders who focus on instructional improvement and improved student achievement.

- a. School-to-school transition activities for both students and parents added to a sense of ownership for the success of all. These were embedded within the structure of each school, with “step-up days” at each level as well as evening activities for families.
 - b. Principals confirmed the superintendent’s perspective regarding their role as instructional leaders in an interview.
- B.** The school committee viewed the principals as instructional leaders, citing the collaborative approach to learning they have brought to the district’s improvement goals.

Impact: By working collaboratively, principals help ensure that all students can benefit from improved, high quality PK-12 programs as they move upward in the system. By collaborating on challenging budget issues, the principals help present a unified front to the community regarding the needs of its children.

Curriculum and Instruction

3. The district has developed and aligned new K-12 curriculum documents in ELA, mathematics, and science to the 2011 MA Curriculum Frameworks. The district has also recently created a curriculum review and revision cycle.

- A.** The district leadership has established robust expectations and a template for all of its curricular development work.
1. Its *Technical Guidelines for Curriculum Units* requires specific components to all curriculum development work: alignment to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, learning objectives, essential questions/essential understandings, instructional strategies, assessments, resources, and timelines.
 2. At the time of the review team visit, the district had fully developed curriculum documents aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks in mathematics, English language arts, and science.
- B.** The district has developed a five-year curriculum and program evaluation review cycle.
1. There is a districtwide curriculum review committee with representation from each school.
 2. Curriculum facilitators and department chairs review and revise the curriculum with teachers at the school level and align curriculum across grades and content areas. Some upper grade vertical alignment has also taken place.
- C.** The superintendent’s concerns about curricular “discrepancies” led to the selection of a new mathematics program in grades K-9, and the strengthening and extension of the Literacy Collaborative Model in grades K-5.

1. The district, working with groups of teachers, chose a new mathematics series. It was selected not only for its alignment to 2011 MA Curriculum Frameworks but also for its embedded differentiated instructional strategies and its K-8 vertical alignment.
 - a. The district has created technology goals to provide support for the effective use of technology and media in classrooms. The goals also support implementation of the software in the new mathematics series.
2. The district chose to extend its K-5 Literacy Collaborative Model followed by an anthology series, with literacy support, in grades 6- 12 in order to improve curricular alignment and provide greater opportunities for differentiation.

Impact: Newly revised curriculum documents provide the foundation for cohesive and vertically aligned curriculum materials for ELA, math and science, helping to ensure that the curriculum is guaranteed and viable for all students. The review cycle will provide for the regular and timely review and revision and assist leaders in the identification of needed resources to meet the needs of all learners. New technology goals have the capacity to improve how technology is used to enhance teaching and learning.

Assessment

4. **The district has begun to establish a culture of data-driven decision-making focused on student academic performance. The district has adopted the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments in ELA and mathematics for students in Grades 2-8, providing an aligned and cohesive measure of student progress in meeting district and state standards.**
 - A. The district and school improvement plans are focused on improving student achievement.
 1. The district uses a Performance Improvement Model (PIM) for its improvement plans. A review of the DIP and SIPs indicated the use of elements of a data-driven protocol: analysis of student test data, a discussion of causes leading to student performance, targeted student learning objectives, instructional strategies, and timelines.
 - B. There were several examples of the use of data analysis and data-driven decisions at the district and school levels.
 1. The superintendent used a five-year trend analysis to guide budget decisions, including staff cut-backs, and realigning the staff-to-student ratio relative to an enrollment decrease.
 2. The district implemented a tutorial program for students at Plains Elementary, Mosier Elementary, and Michael E. Smith Middle School based on analyzing student performance data.

3. School committee members told the team that they were provided with more data than in previous years, particularly now that the district was using MAP to measure student progress. In meetings with committee members they described the use of data to determine whether or not the DIP goals were being met. For example, one member said that the Grade 8 math data “did not look good” and that they were now able to reevaluate the DIP goals and make adjustments knowing these performance results.
- C.** Principals provided evidence of an emerging culture of school-based data analysis and data-driven decision-making at each building.
1. The high school conducted a *Four Year Data Trend Review* that included results from the SAT, the PSAT/ National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (NMSQT), Advanced Placement (AP) results, and the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). As a result, the high school staff looked at how to incorporate assistive technology to support struggling readers and added new classes to better accommodate different learning levels and needs.
 2. Middle school leaders told the team that they used MAP data to help them regroup students for instruction and for support.
 3. Plains Elementary and Mosier Elementary leaders described data discussions based on DRA and MAP results at grade-level and staff meetings. Principals described the main goals of data discussions were to identify students in need of interventions and support, re-group students for instruction, and monitor student performance.
- D.** School leaders also described formal meetings where teachers reviewed and analyzed student performance data.
1. At the high school, department chairs were responsible for monthly meetings where student performance was discussed. In addition, in a document entitled *SHHS Data Team Protocol*, school leaders described a wide variety of ways in which teachers and leaders interacted in teams to discuss data and student performance.
 2. At the middle school, grade-level and content area teams met formally following MAP testing and used a common team protocol that addressed observation of the data, discussion about what the data revealed, reflection on ways to improve student performance, and the development of a group action plan. Leaders and teachers noted that this process was facilitated by the availability of daily common planning time of 40 minutes for Grade 8 teachers, and 35 minutes for all other middle school grades.
 3. At the elementary level, principals reported that teachers used staff meetings, monthly grade-level meetings, and professional development days to review Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) results, benchmark tests, and MAP data. They noted also that there was insufficient meeting time for them to engage in formal data team meetings.

- E. In 2013-2014 the district implemented the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) tests in ELA and mathematics in grades 2 to 8. The district began to use this data to determine areas for student support and program improvements.
 - 1. The district implemented MAP tests in ELA and mathematics in Grades 2 to 8. It planned to expand the program to grade 9 in the fall of 2014 in mathematics and reading, and was considering its use for special education students in grade 10.
 - 2. The district was also planning to extend the MAP testing program to grade 1 in 2014-2015, although there was concern expressed by school leaders about the availability of computers for use by first graders.
 - 3. The district relied on two additional assessments to monitor student growth. The schools administered the DRA in grades K–3 and the Fountas and Pinnell reading assessments in grades 4–8. Teachers and school leaders reported that this data also helped them determine student needs as students progressed through the grades.

Impact: The district has begun to use student achievement data to drive decision-making at the district and building level resulting in better use of resources, improved programs and better monitoring of student progress. By ensuring sufficient time at the middle and high school levels, the district has begun to signal to all staff that using and understanding student data is critical to ensuring improvements to instruction that can result in stronger student achievement.

Human Resources and Professional Development

- 5. **The district met its Race to the Top requirement by adopting and implementing an educator evaluation system consistent with the new educator evaluation regulations in 2012-2013. This was accomplished despite the January 2012 departure of the former superintendent and the six-month term of an interim superintendent before the arrival of the new superintendent.**
 - A. The support and leadership demonstrated by the new superintendent throughout the necessarily condensed and accelerated implementation process in 2012-2013 have been essential to the adoption of the new evaluation system, as well as to the ongoing improvements in its implementation.
 - 1. The superintendent set a positive example for all district educators by having the school committee develop his 2012-2013 annual performance review according to the new state evaluation standards.
 - 2. The superintendent wrote comprehensive summative evaluations for the 2012-2013 school year for each of the district’s principals and central office administrators. These evaluations corresponded fully with the requirements and expectations of the new educator evaluation regulations.

3. District administrators confirmed that, despite the absence of an appropriate software program to support and manage the extensive volume of documents and data generated by the new evaluation system, the superintendent endeavored to monitor its implementation to ensure both consistency and fidelity. He maintained an ongoing dialogue with district administrators to reinforce his expectation that all steps, stages, and timelines were met and to the extent possible reviewed relevant evaluative documents, reports, and data.
 4. The implementation of the new educator evaluation system during the 2012-2013 school year was shortened and accelerated because of the untimely transition between superintendents.
 - a. Both administrators and teachers described the implementation as “stressful,” “inconsistent,” and “confusing.”
 - b. In response, the new superintendent convened joint meetings for the administrative team and the South Hadley Education Association (SHEA) to identify and to address problems associated with the rapid adoption of the new system. This has resulted in significant revisions and improvements to supervisory and evaluative practices and procedures as incorporated in the recently signed Memorandum of Agreement to the teacher collective bargaining agreement, as well as the creation of a more collaborative relationship between SHEA and the school district on the educator evaluation process.
- B.** Despite the challenges noted during the initial year of implementation, the district has made a commendable effort to implement an educator evaluation system aligned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s new educator evaluation framework.
1. The review team examined the personnel folders of 31 faculty members selected randomly from across the district. All district educators received formative evaluations in 2012-2013 and, according to district administrators, approximately half also received summative evaluations.
 2. According to district leaders, all administrators and teachers have completed and submitted all documents and met all deadlines required by the new educator evaluation regulations.
 - a. These include self-assessment, goal setting, educator plan development, and the collection of evidence, as well as both formative and summative evaluations.
 3. District leaders explained that although ESE-required trainings took place after, rather than before, the 2012-2013 adoption of the new educator evaluation system, they had been provided to all administrators and most teachers.
 4. District data indicated that evaluators used all available rating categories, which suggests a rigorous implementation.

Impact: The district's efforts to adopt and to implement Massachusetts' new educator evaluation system reflected a renewed commitment to comprehensive and systemic school improvement. The new system was designed to provide all educators with the meaningful and continuous support and feedback necessary to improve classroom competencies, to expand instructional practices, and to prioritize and promote student achievement. If the superintendent and his leadership team remain fully committed to the collaborative implementation of the new evaluation system and to providing needed and ongoing support structures and targeted training for both teachers and administrators, continuous and comprehensive improvements in learning opportunities and academic programs and outcomes for all students will likely result.

Student Support

6. The high school has developed a comprehensive and proactive system to address the social, emotional, and academic needs of adolescents. Furthermore, the district has a comprehensive crisis response plan to address any issue that may impede student learning.

- A.** High school administrators have instituted a range of systems and initiatives to support students in meeting the wide range of adolescent social, emotional, and academic needs.
 - 1. The high school had a clear protocol for identifying and implementing interventions for students who demonstrated social, emotional, or academic stresses. It also developed a process to encourage students to confidentially self-identify if they were in need of such support.
 - 2. Counselors were on retainer to meet with students at the high school on a regular basis; wait time was less than two weeks, and students were guaranteed long-term support with the counselors.
 - 3. Districtwide, protocols are in place for identifying students in need of cognitive testing. Special education staff met regularly to make sure that all such requests and suggested changes or modifications were taken care of in a timely fashion and that all parties concerned were aware of and had input into the decision-making process.
 - 4. The high school established a system for creating issue-related groups as identified by staff and the students themselves. Trained counselors met with students who had either self-identified or been encouraged by counselors to participate in such groups. During these sessions, the counselors supported students in exploring their concerns and helping each other cope with and move through specific crises.
 - 5. Each high school student was assigned to an advisor who met with a group of between 11 to 13 students throughout the year to discuss issues important to adolescents. Each group

represented the range of students by grade. Examples of topics discussed in these groups were dating violence, bullying, and social media.

6. In the spring of 2013, the high school began distributing a student survey during the fall and spring semesters in order to gather information about students' perceptions of their socio-emotional and physical safety within the school. This survey is analyzed by administrators, teachers, and support staff interested in identifying potential areas of growth, trends and problem areas.
 - a. As a result of concerns raised by students in the survey, staff and teachers were more visibly present in the hallways and other public spaces between class breaks. Staff monitored the gym and other athletic areas, including the bathrooms, to ensure that students felt safe but not intruded upon. Clear protocols were in place and communicated to all staff to help them know what to do in specific emergency situations.
 - b. In interviews high school students provided many examples of support by the school and the presence of a culture responsive to their needs. These ranged from their getting new uniforms for their school band to receiving encouragement by guidance staff to take challenging courses such as dual enrollment at Mount Holyoke College and American International College or online courses. They described approachable administrators who offered personal congratulations to students after performances. They mentioned the opportunity for easily accessible academic help from current and past teachers. They noted that rules were "definitely" fair and enforced and that there were quick responses to the infrequent ("two in three years") fights that arose. They commented that the school climate felt safe, that bullying was stopped if it were pointed out, and that students were suspended if there was cyber-bullying.
 - c. Students reported to the review team that they were proudest of their school, especially in students' "ability to get along." They also mentioned athletics, silver medals earned in music, and academics, noting that "teachers take it [academics] seriously." Their concerns were also typical of high school students elsewhere, such as parking, short lunch periods, and a desire to use their cell-phones for note-taking.
- B.** The high school was developing a comprehensive plan to address students at risk of dropping out, those who have dropped out, and those who were seeking more challenging or varied academic work than had been available to them during the school day.
 1. The school reached out to businesses and non-profit organizations to offer internships in which students could participate during or after the school day and for which they could receive academic credit.
 - a. These internships were guided by a program of study and tailored to meet individual students' needs. Administrators reported that these students were now more

committed to school and had developed strong relationships with the people with whom they were interning.

2. School leaders described a system of credit recovery now available to students who were close to graduation but who had been stymied in attaining the final few credits needed to graduate.
3. The school instituted an hour-long period between the end of school and the beginning of athletics to encourage students to complete their school work in a timely way.
4. The school actively pursued an early-college option with American International College (AIC) in Springfield and Fitchburg State. At no cost, students could take college courses taught at the high school by South Hadley teachers who had received adjunct status from AIC. These classes used AIC syllabi and followed AIC standards. Students could also take courses at Mt. Holyoke College at no cost.
5. The number of students enrolled in AP classes has expanded over five years. Participation increased from 31 percent in 2008 to 43 percent in 2012 and, according to U.S. News and World Report, to 52 percent in 2013.
6. The district, in response student and parent requests, has expanded its offerings in art as well as foreign languages, with the result that a number of these electives are now among the most highly-enrolled in the school.

C. The district has developed a comprehensive crisis response plan.

1. The district developed a detailed and comprehensive Crisis Response Plan and designated a Crisis Response Team consisting of the principal, dean of students, counselor, nurse, and senior custodian to be responsible for carrying out its directives.
2. The district established a clear Anti-Bullying Policy, following the work of a series of community-wide meetings and committees that worked to hear from a broad range of parties as they developed the plan.

Impact: By attending to the socio-emotional and academic needs of high school students, the district and the high school have created a climate of safety and support. Students described a culture of leader and teacher concern for their well being and success. The school had also begun initiatives designed to meet the needs of a wider range of student interests. These efforts could serve to lower the number of students who drop out of school, exercise school choice or enroll in charter schools because the schools did not meet their needs. The district's comprehensive crisis response plan and the anti-bullying policy developed with community input communicates to all students and their families that the district is prepared to effectively and competently address problems and issues that could impact students' ability to learn.

Financial and Asset Management

7. The school district has an effective financial and asset management system that is focused on student performance and achievement and includes broad stakeholder involvement.

- A.** The budget development process is transparent, comprehensive, complete, and includes broad stakeholder involvement.
 - 1. Budget documentation, including anticipated revenue, budget history, and five year financial trending, was on the district website and easily accessible.
 - 2. The budget process was clearly delineated and began with the principals who worked with their building leadership to identify budgetary needs with the focus on increasing student achievement. This same focus continued during the budget development with school committee members and ultimately guided the allocation of resources.
 - 3. The superintendent, with the support of the school committee, conducted over 20 outreach activities where the needs and goals of the district were described and community members were able to ask questions and receive answers.
 - 4. Municipal leadership described the school budget as transparent and that the school district was cooperative with the town. There was a written municipal agreement for expenditures made by the town on behalf of the school district, which was in the process of being reviewed.

- B.** The school district effectively used adequate resources to meet the needs of students and schools throughout the district.
 - 1. From 2009 to 2014 the district regularly exceeded the net school spending requirements by 13 to 19 percent. Furthermore, the community recently approved the construction of a new elementary school and ground breaking occurred during the review team's site visit.
 - 2. In 2013, the in-district per-pupil expenditure was 7 percent above the median of \$12,506 for 51 districts with enrollment between 1,000 and 1,999 students. The district had higher expenditures than the state average for instructional materials, equipment and technology in 2013: \$742, compared with the state average of \$410.
 - 3. The superintendent and principals reported that there were sufficient financial resources to maintain and improve educational programs and facilities. Furthermore the district used school choice and circuit breaker funds as a financial reserve. Town and school officials stated that there was a history of a strong working relationship and trust between the schools and town.
 - 4. School committee minutes reflected that targeted school improvement initiatives had been undertaken in reading and mathematics, as needed.

- C.** The district deliberately allocated resources to directly support district goals and promote student achievement.
 - 1. Student performance data and the cost effectiveness of programs were considered during the budget development process.
 - 2. The district reallocated excess funds at the end of the school year to support the initiatives and needs of school principals.
 - a. Resources have been used for technology and facilities needs and curriculum updates. Discussions between the superintendent and principals were part of the process for determining which initiatives would be funded.
 - 3. The business office and the instructional leadership team manage grants and other outside funding. All funds are reconciled with the town on a monthly basis and the district participates in cooperative purchasing.
 - 4. The superintendent has taken steps to analyze revenue data and expenditures because he was concerned about the long-term ability of the town to adequately fund the school district. The school district maintains a reserve fund from school choice and circuit breaker revenues to meet unforeseen needs.
- D.** The district was able to manage resources and allocation decisions in an ongoing way throughout the year through forecasting, financial tracking, controls and regular audits.
 - 1. Financial audits occur on an annual basis. Any findings or recommendations are addressed in a timely manner.
 - 2. Principals receive monthly reports regarding the financial status of the budget. Regular and accurate tracking of financial activities takes place.
 - 3. School committee members commented that they received financial statements on a regular basis.
 - 4. The business office, led by the school business official who is certified and a past president of MASBO, compiled standard operating practices and protocols that included purchasing, payroll, financial function codes, grant management process, fundraising, and facility usage.
- E.** The district has an effective capital planning and facility maintenance system that supports the DIP and ensures that facilities are safe, clean and supportive of teaching and learning.
 - 1. The school district has a documented five-year capital plan that was part of the municipal capital plan. There is also a townwide capital planning committee and funding has been provided for projects such as high school and middle school renovations, roofing, gym floor renovations, lighting upgrades, HVAC and other energy management projects. The funding

of the new elementary school was an example of a successful outcome of an effective capital plan.

2. The district has a documented maintenance management program that includes a listing of preventive maintenance (PM) activities, which take place on a scheduled basis.
3. School facilities were generally considered to be safe, clean and well maintained by school staff and elected officials.

Impact: Highly effective financial and asset management has helped to ensure that student achievement is the focus of the budgeting process. As a result, there have been adequate and sustainable resources available for teaching and learning and school facilities are safe, clean and well maintained.

Challenges and Areas for Growth

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

Leadership and Governance

8. The district does not have a clear, shared understanding of the characteristics of highly effective instructional practice.

- A.** Principals agreed that there are no "districtwide, explicit expectations" regarding instructional practices, but that there is "some progress" in establishing those expectations.
 1. Central office administrators expressed the view that there was an "implicit rather than explicit" level of knowledge and understanding on the part of teachers "in terms of knowing best instructional practices."
- B.** In discussing the alignment between the goals included in the DIP with those found in individual SIPs, administrators stated that, "rigor is the major goal and most come back to that goal."
 1. Although the 2013-2014 high school SIP has identified a goal "to increase academic rigor ... in order to increase student achievement," SIPs for the other three schools do not identify a similar goal related to academic rigor.
- C.** A clear, shared vision and expectations for best instructional practices did not emerge from interviews with teachers and administrators.
 1. Some administrators said that they expected teachers to use learning objectives, assessments, small groups, or consistency in academic lessons across a grade. In focus groups and interviews, teachers told the team that they used "a variety of practices," but

they did not provide examples of practices that were expected of all teachers at their school levels.

2. As discussed later in this report, the quality of instruction varied throughout the district, particularly in terms of planning lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations, the use of varied and appropriate instructional strategies matched to learning objectives or the learning needs of high needs students, the use of effective questioning techniques, and the use of technology to support instruction.

Impact: In the absence of an agreed-upon, systemwide understanding of and expectations for high quality instruction, the district cannot guarantee that all students are receiving high-quality instruction that can lead to academic improvement.

Curriculum and Instruction

The team observed 51 classes throughout the district: 16 at the high school, 19 at the middle school, and 16 at the two elementary schools. The team observed 22 ELA classes, 12 mathematics classes, and 16 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were one special education class, and one ELL class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented by indicator and school type in Appendix C.

9. The quality of instruction varied across the district, with clear and consistent evidence of high quality teaching, differentiation, and checking for understanding observed in a limited number of classrooms.

- A. The review team found inconsistent evidence of classroom instruction that provided an appropriate level of challenge for students.
 1. Clear and consistent evidence of lessons that reflected rigor and high expectations was observed overall in 35 percent of classrooms.
 2. Of the 51 classrooms observed, clear and consistent evidence of students engaging in challenging academic tasks was seen in 33 percent of classrooms.
 3. In 29 percent of observed classrooms teachers provided opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, or evaluation of concepts.
 4. Examples of lessons that challenged students included:
 - An elementary ELA class and a high school class where students were revising and editing their writing using a rubric

- An elementary ELA class where students were able to discuss and analyze their understanding using “turn and talk”
 - A middle school science class where students were asked to respond to questions about real-life applications of a science principle
 - A middle school ELA class where students explored their pre-conceived concept of myths by responding to questions about their prior readings
 - A high school class where students had access to supplementary information posted on the board to support their understanding
 - A classroom assignment where the teacher required the writing of a poem comparing two elements (comprehension and synthesis)
 - A classroom where the teacher probed in several ways to help a student justify that his answer was correct
 - A classroom where the teacher asked students to judge their own, as well as other’s persuasive essays.
5. In 65 percent of observed classes, the team found only partial or no evidence of examples of instruction that challenged students and set high expectations for learning. Some examples of lesson activities that set low expectations are described the following practices:
- A classroom where students spent time copying words from the board as part of their elementary writing lesson
 - Underused technology such as using a smart board as a projection screen rather than as an interactive teaching and learning tool
 - Teachers accepting one-word responses from students, expecting recall responses rather than application, analysis, or synthesis, and missing opportunities to ask students to engage in evaluation or other higher order thinking activities
 - Some occasions of inefficient use of class time, some student inattentiveness and lack of engagement, and an absence of bell-to-bell teaching in some classrooms
- B.** The team observed evidence of lessons meeting students’ diverse learning needs in 18 percent of all observed classes. Furthermore, teachers conducted frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and alter their instruction in only in 32 percent of observed classrooms.
1. Some examples of effective practices in meeting students’ diverse learning needs included:
- Teachers using kinesthetic, visual, and auditory methods in some elementary classes, including the use of music to engage some very active youngsters or to keep students focused during a writing activity
 - Teachers using manipulatives in an elementary mathematics class
 - A middle school classroom where the teacher provided different levels of complexity for student work by using five different book levels
 - Effective use of an additional adult in a high school classroom to break the class into groups for differentiation.

2. Some examples of lessons that did not meet students' diverse learning needs included:
 - Students in an elementary classroom who had finished with group work were not given challenging independent work to do
 - In many middle school classes all students were doing the same activity, regardless of different levels of knowledge, skills or understanding
 - In high school classes, students were all using the same review sheet, regardless of different levels of mastery
 - Ineffective use of a second adult in the classroom

Impact: Results of classroom observations illustrate that the district does not yet have a districtwide model of high-quality instructional practices that would enable the teachers to meet students' diverse learning needs, ensure an appropriate level of challenge for all students, and improve achievement for all students. In general, the observed instruction in the district reflects a need for shared knowledge and more frequent implementation of best instructional practices.

Assessment

10. Although data is collected and analyzed by building leaders, guidance staff, and curriculum facilitators at each school level, there is not yet a formalized and consistent improvement strategy focused on the analysis and communication of student achievement data.

- A. K-8 curriculum facilitators (CF) and grade 9-12 department chairs assist classroom teachers in the analysis of data to determine student needs, types of interventions, and student growth. However, some CFs told the review team that their role regarding data is not clearly defined.
 1. CFs said that MAP results provide reports and analyses that they can use in discussions with teachers.
 2. K-8 CFs said that they rarely meet together as a team for vertical coordination. They noted that in the past there were vertical meetings held twice each year.
- B. Building leaders and guidance staff described meetings with teachers within their buildings where student performance was reviewed and discussed among other curricular and school related topics.
 1. Data analysis strategies and practices used at these meetings varied across schools and were more formalized at the middle and high school levels. For example, the high school and middle school used similar protocols to guide teacher discussions. Steps included asking the team members for initial impressions about the data, making inferences, noting "problems

of practice” that the data might be indicating, developing an action plan to address the problem of practice, and devising a plan to evaluate the action.

2. Guidance staff reported using Edwin and DART data from grade 4 and above to identify struggling students, but told the team that few teachers were trained in the use of Edwin.
 3. In the middle school, the principal reviewed the data and assigned students for interventions. In the elementary schools, Student Support Teams (SSTs) reviewed the data and determined which students were to receive interventions.
 4. At the elementary levels, one principal reported that because there were as many as seven teachers at a grade level, releasing teachers for data meetings across grade levels during the school day was not feasible.
- C.** CFs reported that data is not routinely disaggregated or analyzed by subgroups, although the review team found evidence of this type of analysis at the middle school.
- D.** Data is recorded on spreadsheets at the building level and maintained there.
1. The district employs a district management and curriculum support specialist whose current responsibilities are “to maintain the IPASS system and its components as the main source of data for system software and to provide districtwide support to school personnel when using identified data programs.”
 2. Each school records data on its own spreadsheet and maintains its own MAP data. Principals at the elementary level reported that teachers access student data through cumulative records and literacy data sheets. They also maintain their own student data for Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), which is not entered on a systemwide database. Middle school CF’s noted that the middle school does not have the technology to enable teachers to access data easily.
 3. The director of curriculum and grants reported that the IPASS system might have the capability of serving as a districtwide data base but that they have not taken the time needed to investigate this further. CF’s reported that IPASS provided them with access to student grades, but not test results.
- E.** There is no formalized or organized structure, such as a data team, at the district or school levels, to analyze student performance districtwide or across schools at the same level, to guide teacher practice, to evaluate program quality. There is no structure to implement and monitor district systems for the use of data.

Impact: The district has taken some steps to develop a culture for using assessments to improve student achievement; but, it has not yet established a districtwide system to formally monitor and track student performance results. It is not yet able to effectively use data for educator and school

improvement. Because the collection and analysis of student performance data generally remains in each building, the district is not yet able to track each student's progress through the grades or to effectively evaluate the effectiveness of programs at grade levels, or school levels, or districtwide. The adoption of MAP tests in grades 2-8 is a first step in developing the capacity to enable all stakeholders to make use of student performance data to improve programs and instruction.

11. The district is using student performance data mainly to identify individual student needs and match them with interventions rather than to inform instructional practice. Training for teachers and sufficient meeting time for teacher discussions of data linked to instruction are limited and district expectations regarding the use of student achievement data to improve instruction are not yet explicit.

- A. Leaders reported that teachers were at different levels of readiness to use data.
 - 1. For example, they said that some teachers at the secondary level felt overwhelmed by data and were not yet able to use it effectively.
 - 2. At the middle school, some found data useful but there was a need for PD to learn to use it more effectively.
 - 3. Some leaders at the elementary level reported that while there was a "wealth of information it doesn't always match what teachers see in classrooms." In some cases teachers believed that their professional judgment carried less weight than assessment data.
- B. In nearly every discussion with leaders and teachers, the lack of time for teachers to participate in training on data analysis and to implement data analysis protocols was noted.
 - 1. One leader recognized that the district had "great information," but time was needed to analyze it and to develop action plans.
- C. As noted earlier, there are no formal building or district-based data teams in the district although data discussions do take place in many regularly scheduled staff, department, and monthly grade level meetings. Nevertheless, most identified the purpose of these discussions was to identify those students who needed interventions. The use of data analysis to refine and identify effective instructional practices did not appear to be common practices.
- D. TELL MASS Survey results for 2014 presented a more positive picture of teacher opinions about the use of data in their schools to improve curriculum and instruction. The majority of district teachers (83.9 percent) agreed that they used assessment data to inform their instruction, and 81.4 percent agreed that local assessment data was available in time to impact instructional practices.

Impact: According to interviews, the analysis of student performance data remains focused on the students and types of interventions needed to support their academic achievement. Although this is an important strategy, without also making an explicit link between the analysis of student performance and its relationship to effective instructional practice, it will be difficult for the district to make effective or sustainable progress in improving performance at all levels and for all students.

Human Resources and Professional Development

12. The effectiveness of professional development in the district has been limited by an absence of K-12 vertical coordination, adequate allocated time, appropriate and formal teacher collaboration in the PD process, and a clear and sustained alignment with well-defined district priorities. There is evidence, however, that these practices are beginning to change and improve.

- A.** Traditionally, the district's professional development (PD) has had a site-based focus. Building principals, individual teachers, and SHEA would often determine how to allocate PD time and resources. Programming was frequently short-term, narrowly focused, and not clearly or consistently related to student learning needs or core district goals and objectives.
1. Reviewers found little evidence that data from multiple sources and/or other pertinent academic information had been used in a systematic way to inform decisions about PD needs, goals, or services.
 2. TELL Mass survey results from 2014 revealed that over 60 percent of teachers believed that district PD programs have not been sufficiently differentiated to meet the needs of individual teachers, nor had follow-up from PD typically been provided to staff. In interviews, staff members confirmed these views.
 3. Many teachers expressed the belief that PD neither adequately deepened their content knowledge nor enhanced their ability to implement instruction that met students' diverse learning needs. These opinions were also reflected in the district's 2014 TELL MASS Survey results.
 - a. Slightly fewer than half of the teachers agreed that the district provided supports (e.g., instructional coaching or professional learning communities) that translated to improvements in teachers' instructional practices.
 - b. More than half, or 60.2 percent, of teachers agreed that they worked in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices, a result that is much lower than the state average of 75.7 percent.

- c. Slightly fewer than half of teachers agreed that district professional development enhanced teachers' ability to implement instructional strategies that met students' diverse learning needs.
- B.** PD in the district has not been a genuinely collaborative endeavor in which teachers and administrators worked together formally and closely to design, plan, coordinate, and assess PD programs, activities, and services across the district.
 - 1. According to the district's collective bargaining agreement, "a PD committee will be formed with equal membership of unit A members and administrators. This committee shall review and make recommendations to the school committee as to the district's PD plan...and follow up with an evaluation of the workshop or in service program." Interviewees acknowledged that this committee had not functioned for a number of years and that the PD program had instead been overseen by the assistant superintendent and other school and district administrators.
 - 2. According to interviewees, PD programming has not been consistently evaluated to ensure that it has met its objectives, nor have results been communicated to teachers.
- C.** The amount of time currently included in the district calendar for PD activities is very limited. Consequently, the opportunities and structures needed to support regular, frequent, and sustained faculty collaboration are not adequate to meet the challenges imposed by district goals and initiatives as well as by state mandates.
 - 1. At present the district PD calendar provides only two full-day and two early release PD days each year. Furthermore, every school has a different bell schedule and dismissal time, making vertical or horizontal collaboration during the two early release days difficult, if not impossible.
 - 2. With the exception of the middle school, none of the district's schools provides its faculty with teaching schedules embedded with regular and/or frequent common planning and meeting time. As a result, opportunities for grade-level or subject-level meetings within, between, and among schools are limited.
 - a. In interviews, both teachers and administrators said there was not enough time for collaboration among educators. According to the 2014 TELL Mass survey results, 68 percent of South Hadley teachers who responded agreed or strongly agreed that teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.
- D.** Review team members found evidence that district policies and practices related to PD are beginning to be revised and improved in order to better meet the integrated needs and goals of both the faculty and the school district.
 - 1. The superintendent and school committee have developed a new and comprehensive, data-based District Improvement Plan (DIP) which clearly identifies district needs, goals, and

priorities. Among the strategic goals articulated in that plan are the development of a district PD plan and a PD planning process that will ensure that all district-sponsored PD is clearly linked to well defined improvement initiatives and priorities.

2. In interviews, district administrators, school principals, and the superintendent indicated that there is an increasing emphasis on the alignment of individual School Improvement Plans (SIPs) with the goals and objectives contained in the DIP.
3. One of the goals contained in the superintendent's 2012-2013 Entry Plan was the "re-examination of the district's PD planning process and offerings to ensure that PD is linked to student achievement and that planning for professional practice goals is embedded in the new teacher evaluation system."
4. The district is currently in the process of reestablishing its PD committee. Reviewers were informed that the curriculum director will lead this committee, which will be composed of teacher representatives from each of the four schools and an equal number of administrators.

Impact: The district's PD programming has not been focused on a clearly defined district improvement agenda. In addition, it has not benefited from a collaborative and inclusive leadership structure, adequate embedded and regularly scheduled common planning time and meeting opportunities for staff in all buildings, grade levels, and subject areas. Nor has it been informed by the systematic use of data relevant to student achievement, staff needs, and the efficacy of instructional practices and programs. As a result, the effectiveness of district PD programming has been limited.

There appears to be a growing awareness within the district, however, of the need to develop a PD program that systematically and comprehensively addresses these identified deficiencies and thereby has the capacity to significantly improve educator practices and student learning outcomes. If the district remains committed to creating the conditions and structures essential for success, it can develop a PD program that is capable of systematically advancing district goals and priorities, promoting a shared culture of sustained professional growth for both teachers and administrators, and ultimately creating greatly expanded educational opportunities and improved academic experiences and outcomes for all students.

13. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its new educator evaluation system and in the quality of feedback provided to teachers.

- A. Interviewees expressed a divergence of opinions about the overall effectiveness of the new evaluation system.
 1. In general, administrators expressed support, citing an increased focus on the classroom and in meaningful conversations with faculty about teaching and learning.
 2. Among teachers, however, there was less consensus.

- a. While some stated that the new system was producing positive results, others indicated that they were not seeing an increase in administrative visibility in classrooms, nor in the frequency or quality of feedback from school administrators.
 - b. A number of teachers noted that the overall effectiveness of the educator evaluation system depended largely upon the leadership of the individual school in which they worked.
3. Administrators and teachers agreed that the required paperwork was “burdensome and labor-intensive,” and said that this was exacerbated by the absence of an appropriate software program to expedite the process and to efficiently manage the volume of documents and data being generated.
 4. According to 2014 TELL Mass survey results, only 57 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the procedures for teacher evaluation were consistent. In their review of personnel folders, the review team noted that although teacher evaluations were both timely and descriptive, they typically contained few specific evidence-based comments or concrete recommendations that could contribute in a meaningful way to improved classroom instruction, an enhanced repertoire of student-centered pedagogical practices, or overall professional growth.
- B.** Although review team members were able to review formative and summative teacher evaluations, they were unable to review other supportive documents that are integral to the new educator evaluation system.
- C.** Because of the shortened and accelerated nature of the implementation process last year, some teachers did not receive all the formal training in the new educator evaluation system required by ESE. In interviews, many teachers reported that they wanted and needed additional targeted training to help them better understand and benefit from the new evaluative system.

Impact: Without consistency in implementation and in the quality of feedback to teachers, and without centralized recordkeeping systems and sufficient targeted training for both teachers and administrators, the desired goal of creating a culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation will be difficult for the district to achieve.

Student Support

14. The district did not demonstrate sufficient systems and practices to ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program. Key instructional strategies for guaranteeing access and equity for all students, including students with high needs, were not widely observed at all school levels.

- A. The fastest growing segment of the student population is the increase in the proportion of high needs students in the district.
 - 1. Specifically the percentage of students who are from low income families has increased from 20.7 percent in 2009 to 31.9 percent in 2013.
 - 2. The rate of increase of the proportion of ELLs during the same time period was slower, from 0.5 percent in 2009 to 1.4 percent in 2013.
 - 3. The population of students with IEPs has declined from 16.0 percent in 2009 to 13.0 percent in 2013.
- B. The review team’s observations indicated a need for differentiated instruction in most classrooms.
 - 1. In 94 percent of observed high school classrooms and 72 percent of middle school classrooms there was an absence of appropriate modifications for ELL and special needs students such as explicit language objectives, presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity and differentiation of content, process and/or product. In contrast, at the elementary level these practices were not observed in 25 percent of classrooms.
 - 2. Formative assessments to check for student understanding and modification of lessons were least present at the middle and high schools, with observers seeing no evidence of the practice in 38 percent of high school classrooms and in 37 percent of middle school classrooms. At the elementary level this practice was either partially or consistently observed in 93 percent of classrooms.
- C. In interviews, all staff expressed a lack of familiarity with the concepts of tiered instruction and differentiated instruction: instructional strategies that help ensure access and equity to high quality learning and address students’ diverse learning needs.
 - 1. Teachers and administrators have not received support or professional development in learning how to differentiate their instruction in order to support the broad range of students found in every classroom. A number of teachers at the elementary level noted that such PD had been offered in the past but not within the last few years.
 - 2. In interviews and focus groups, secondary teachers were unfamiliar with specific ways to use differentiation and tiered instruction in their classrooms. One teacher commented, “You

would not see tiered instruction in all classes because kids are in different classes, broken up. You would see it in the lower levels.”

3. Professional development on tiered instruction was planned to be offered in the district in the summer but attendance would be voluntary.
 4. The district has few instructional coaches to provide embedded classroom support to teachers to successfully use tiered instruction and differentiated instruction with a broad range of students.
 5. Teachers’ technology use to support or differentiate instruction was observed infrequently across the district. There was no technology used by teachers to support and enhance learning in 50 percent of observed high school classrooms, 28 percent of middle school classrooms, and 73 percent of elementary classrooms.
 6. Feedback provided by school administrators to teachers in their teacher evaluations did not include attention to whether or not the strategies identified above were used in the classrooms and specific ways they might be used to benefit all students.
- D.** The district uses data from summative assessments such as MCAS and MAP tests to create a system of leveled classrooms for students rather than examining how to improve instruction in all classrooms to support all students.
1. The district does not have a practice of disaggregating achievement and other data to analyze which groups of students are placed in which levels and to discern any patterns within the placements that might indicate a need for teachers to consider changing or refining their instructional practice or further refining curriculum and instructional materials.
 2. The district does not have a cohesive and well-developed system of formative assessments or a set of clearly defined instructional strategies to assess student understanding in real time so that teachers can modify their instruction during a lesson or a unit.
 3. While the high school noted the gap in student achievement between students from low income families and those not from low income families and identified students from low income families as an important challenge to overcome in its SIP, no specific instructional strategies or practices to address this challenge in classrooms had yet been defined.

Impact: Without a districtwide vision and system for tiered instruction and with classroom practices that are not sufficiently differentiated, it is less likely that high need students, or even all students, will be able to perform to the best of their ability. Nor will the district be able to make progress in closing its achievement gaps. While there is a desire to ensure equity and access, these efforts are hampered due to insufficient knowledge and practices at the district and school levels.

Financial and Asset Management

15. The district has insufficient technology network bandwidth to support future educational needs.

- A.** One district goal for FY15 is to investigate the Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) initiative and to determine the feasibility and cost for the program.
 - 1. The district acknowledged that there were bandwidth issues and that the PARCC assessment was expected to use most available bandwidth.
 - a. Administrators reported that the bandwidth at the schools is more than sufficient for PARCC testing and that a caching system can be utilized to support next generation assessments.
 - 2. The technology budget is funded at \$100,000 per year for infrastructure and equipment.

Impact: Without investment in sufficient technology network bandwidth, the district will not be able to meet the needs of teaching, learning, testing, and data-driven decision-making now and in the future.

16. Documentation of completed preventive maintenance activities is incomplete.

- A.** School officials discovered that the playgrounds were not being inspected as they had anticipated.
- B.** The new elementary school, when completed, will require preventive maintenance activities to be undertaken in order for the building to operate efficiently and to meet warranty expectations.

Impact: The lack of documentation for preventive maintenance activities may impede the district's ability to prolong the effective use of the district's capital and major facility assets, and to ensure that educational and program facilities are clean, safe, secure, well-lit, well-maintained, and conducive to student learning.

South Hadley Public Schools District Review Recommendations

Curriculum and Instruction

- 1. The district should identify a model of instruction that is based on best practice research and on high expectations for all students. This model should be developed in collaboration with teachers and clearly communicated to all stakeholders.**
 - A.** The district should convene a representative group of teachers and administrators to define the elements of high-quality, rigorous instruction.
 1. Principals' current instructional leadership roles and teamwork will be an asset for this process.
 2. As part of this effort, the district should explore the possible links between the instruction currently delivered (as measured by information from the instructional inventory of classroom observations in Appendix C, as well as other sources) and student achievement data and trends (including MCAS, SAT, and behavioral data).
 3. The district should clearly articulate expectations for classroom practice.
 - a. The district's expectations should include strategies that: demonstrate rigor and high expectations; provide students with challenging academic tasks; require students to engage in higher order thinking; and address students' diverse strengths and needs.
 4. Building on previous curriculum development work, curriculum materials should be reviewed and updated as needed to ensure that they reflect the district's instructional expectations.
 - B.** Once a model of instructional practice is identified and defined, district administrators should develop a plan for sharing instructional expectations with staff.
 1. Professional development should be designed to support continuous growth in educators' capacity to implement the district's instructional model.
 - a. The district should consider the use of instructional coaches, similar to those used in literacy, to provide embedded professional development to improve instruction at each school level.
 2. The district should provide support for district and school-based administrators to become proficient in their roles as instructional leaders, as noted below. Teacher-leaders, and where possible, classroom teachers, should be included in this work.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner.

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- *Characteristics of an Effective Standards-Based K-12 Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/Standards-BasedClassroom.pdf>) and *Characteristics of a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/news07/mathclass_char.pdf) are references for instructional planning and observation, intended to support activities that advance standards-based educational practice, including formal study, dialogue and discussion, classroom observations, and other professional development activities.

Benefits: A shared definition of effective instruction provides a common language for all educators in the district, which facilitates meaningful dialogue about classroom practice. When the district adopts a set of best instructional practices, and when these practices are consistently evident in all classroom instruction every day, students throughout the district will have more frequent access to high-quality teaching and meaningful learning. Professional development that is embedded in practice, such as instructional coaches to model and practice with teachers, can support continual improvement in the implementation of effective instruction.

Leadership and Governance

2. The district's definition of effective instruction (see recommendation above) should include explicit expectations and support for instructional leadership, and should be integrated into existing plans and initiatives.

- A.** The district's work to develop an instructional model should include articulating a shared view of instructional leadership.
 1. Principals and other leaders should be provided with explicit expectations for their roles in promoting and supporting high-quality teaching and learning.

- B.** The district should provide ongoing professional development to ensure that instructional leaders continually develop their ability to provide effective guidance and useful feedback to teachers in implementing good instruction.
1. Central office personnel, principals, assistant principals, deans, department chairs, and curriculum facilitators should participate alongside teachers in professional development activities, to ensure consistency in their understanding of effective instruction.
 2. Instructional leaders should also receive ongoing professional development focused on identifying excellent instruction and providing feedback to teachers about ways to improve.
 - a. This should complement and enhance the professional development provided as part of the educator evaluation system.
- C.** The district should ensure that planning related to instruction is reflected in the DIP and SIPs.

Recommended resource:

- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.

Benefits: By establishing and communicating clear expectations for leaders, and by providing the necessary professional development and support for these expectations to be met, the district will ensure that instructional leadership extends from the superintendent's office to individual classrooms. This will build the capacity of principals and other leaders to strengthen instruction and improve student achievement.

Assessment

3. The district should consider ways to analyze data more purposefully and systematically to improve teaching and learning.

- A.** Although the district engages in several types of discussions about student achievement data, it should consider establishing formal data teams at the district and school levels.
1. A district data team, consisting of a representative group of district and school leaders and teachers, can provide ongoing, district-level analysis of student performance and other data.
 2. Similarly, formal school data teams can be a mechanism for analyzing school-level data.

3. District and school data teams should be responsible for establishing and communicating protocols for teachers' data analysis and use, including using data to inform instruction.
 - a. The work of the data teams can help to clarify roles related to data analysis, including those of curriculum facilitators.
 4. Data teams should also be charged with using a range of data to evaluate program quality.
 5. Data teams or another group should review district curriculum documents to ensure that there is a balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments to help teachers obtain ongoing student performance data to inform their daily instruction.
- B.** The district should review its data collection and dissemination practices to ensure accurate, high quality, and easily accessible information for all leaders and teachers.
1. The district should investigate whether its current student information management program has the capacity to also serve as the districtwide tool for recording, disaggregating, and reporting all student performance data. Currently, schools at each level maintain their own spreadsheets to record data and this information is passed along when students transition.
- C.** In collaboration with the teachers' association, the district should find ways to add regular and frequent collaboration time to teachers' schedules to allow sufficient time for data analysis that informs curriculum and daily instruction.
- D.** Professional development should be provided to all educators to build data literacy and analysis skills.
1. In addition to identifying students in need of additional support, leaders and teachers need to learn how to use various sources of student data to target their instruction to students' strengths and needs.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.
- The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.

Benefits: By implementing these recommendations the district will clarify expectations related to the use of student performance data to guide instruction and plan interventions. Leaders and teachers at each level will receive support as they use common protocols for recording, analyzing, and using data. Districtwide data analysis will identify the areas of instruction and program delivery needing improvement in order to raise student achievement and will support consistency across schools in the use of data, including vertical coordination.

Human Resources and Professional Development

4. The district is encouraged to continue and expand its efforts to improve its professional development (PD) program by aligning all programming to well defined district priorities, creating a fully collaborative leadership structure for PD planning, and providing substantially increased opportunities for frequent and regularly scheduled common planning and meeting time.

- A.** The district's PD program should be directed by a joint committee of administrators and teacher representatives to create a well-defined, unified, and collaborative leadership structure. This will enable the district to use data and educator input to plan and implement comprehensive and integrated K-12 PD programs and services.
 - 1. The district's newly reestablished PD committee could be assigned this role.
- B.** The PD program should be carefully linked with district goals and priorities as articulated in the DIP and SIPs.
 - 1. The focus of PD, including embedded PD such as team meetings, should include strategies and skills related to the district's instructional model (see recommendations #1 and #2 above).
- C.** Significantly more time dedicated to PD programs and activities should be embedded within the district calendar and in the master schedules of every school.
 - 1. District leaders, in collaboration with the teachers' association, should investigate and work to eliminate current impediments to regularly scheduled and/or frequent common planning and meeting times in all grade levels, subject areas, and schools.
 - 2. Opportunities for staff collaboration include professional learning communities, common planning time, and instructional coaching.

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.

- The *PLC Expansion Project* website (<http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/>) is designed to support schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.
- *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.

Benefits: The creation of a collaborative and unified PD leadership structure will help ensure that all resources, including personnel, time, money, and support structures, are concentrated and deployed across the district in a more coordinated and systematic manner. This will help ensure that all PD programming is carefully aligned with, and supportive of, district priorities and initiatives. The increased involvement and formal collaboration of teachers in the oversight of the PD process will promote a culture of professional growth and continuous improvement and help to ensure that PD addresses teachers' needs and supports classroom practice.

Providing increased common planning and meeting time for faculty could produce a considerable range of benefits for the district, including expanded opportunities for vertical and horizontal articulation and coordination of curriculum, instructional improvement, data analysis, and the development of high-quality assessments, including DDMs. Ultimately, significant improvements in student learning experiences and opportunities, as well as academic outcomes, would be the likely result.

5. To improve the implementation of the new educator evaluation system and enhance its overall effectiveness, the district should: address inconsistencies in policies, practices, and procedures; provide additional targeted training for both teachers and administrators; and prioritize the development or acquisition of a system with the capacity to properly support the new evaluation program.

- A.** The district should consider the formation of a joint committee, composed equally of administrators and teacher representatives, that would meet regularly and serve as a formal mechanism to monitor the overall implementation of the new educator evaluation system, to proactively identify problems, and to collaboratively develop appropriate and timely solutions.
 1. In particular, the joint committee should focus on opportunities to maximize the efficiency of the new evaluation system by reviewing the amount of documentation the district is requiring of educators and evaluators.
- B.** Additional and ongoing training for both teachers and administrators should be provided to further support and promote the new state educator evaluation system.
 1. All administrators should receive targeted training to strengthen their ability to observe and analyze classroom instruction and to provide specific evidence-based feedback to staff that can significantly improve teaching.

- C. The district should prioritize the acquisition or development of a software program with the capacity to properly support the new evaluation model.

Recommended resources:

- ESE’s *Evidence Collection Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/resources/implementation/CollectionToolkit.pdf>) is designed to support districts to establish clear and consistent expectations for educator collection of evidence and promote a meaningful process for the collection, analysis, and sharing of high quality artifacts.
- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eeval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>) describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
- *The Relationship between High Quality Professional Development and Educator Evaluation* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-aDxtEDncg&list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqt9EmOcWkDEHPKBqRvurebm&index=1>) is a video presentation that includes examples from real districts.

Benefits: Improved district monitoring and communication systems will enable the superintendent, his administrative team, and all key stakeholders to more effectively oversee and ensure full and consistent implementation of the new educator evaluation system. Additional and ongoing training will enhance the likelihood that the professional skills and judgment and the overall effectiveness of both teachers and administrators will continue to improve and that an authentic and collaborative culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation will result. Appropriate software will enable administrators to carefully monitor consistency of implementation by providing convenient, real time access to all evaluative documents and data in both aggregated and disaggregated formats.

Student Support

6. **The district should provide in-depth and comprehensive professional development to administrators and teachers in providing differentiated instruction and support for all students.**
 - A. As the district further develops and refines its professional development and support, it should do so with the goal of ensuring that differentiated instruction is thoughtfully implemented in every classroom.
 1. Professional development should include a focus on ways to continually target instruction based on data from formative assessment and real-time checks for understanding.

- a. Ongoing data analysis should result in instruction that is differentiated based on students' strengths, needs, interests, and learning styles, and should inform appropriate accommodations and modifications for students with disabilities and ELLs.
 2. Teachers should receive frequent and useful feedback and support from principals and other instructional leaders that is focused on differentiation and data-informed instruction.
- B.** Administrators, including the director of special education, can play a leadership role in the district's work to define a clear instructional model (see Curriculum and Instruction recommendation above), and to ensure that the model incorporates differentiated instruction and a tiered system of support.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

MTSS Self-Assessment Overview (includes links to the MTSS Self-Assessment tool and *How to Complete the MTSS Self-Assessment*): <http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/>

Benefits: By training educators to effectively teach students with high needs within regular education classrooms, the district can expect significant improvement in achievement for all students. Using data to target instruction will increase the likelihood that all student subgroups receive the types of instruction and support they need to achieve at high levels. This can transform district culture and promote access and equity for all students.

Financial and Asset Management

7. The district should continue its effective finance and asset management practices. It is also recommended that the district conduct a review of its technology plan and identify preventive maintenance activities.

- A.** As stated in the Strength findings above, the district has implemented strong financial practices overall.
- B.** The district is encouraged to review its technology plan and develop a new technology implementation plan and budget to ensure sufficient bandwidth to support current and future needs.
- C.** It is recommended that the district implement a maintenance management process that will identify preventive maintenance activities.

1. It should document the completion of those activities along with other important data points such as type of work, location performed, time required to complete the work, cost, problems detected, work performed and qualifications of the technician performing the work.
2. Documentation is especially important for those preventive maintenance activities that directly relate to student, staff and public safety such as inspections of playgrounds, chemical storage, bleacher and stadiums, walkways, auditorium/theatre, athletic fields, parking lots and common areas.

Recommended resources:

- *Planning Guide for Maintaining School Facilities* (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003347>), from the National Center for Education Statistics, is intended to help school districts plan for efficient and effective operations. It addresses various topics, including conducting a facilities audit, planning and evaluating maintenance, and managing staff and contractors.
- *The Massachusetts School Checklist* (<http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/gov/departments/dph/programs/environmental-health/exposure-topics/iaq/iaq-methods/the-mass-school-checklist.html>) is a list of the most important environmental health and safety issues for schools to address. It includes regulations and industry standards/guidelines related to elements on the checklist, as well as additional resources.

Benefits: An implementation plan and budget will enable the district to more fully utilize existing software capabilities such as IPASS and be positioned for instructional initiatives such as Bring Your Own Device (BYOD). By identifying and documenting preventative maintenance activities, the district will ensure that educational and program facilities are well-managed and conducive to student learning.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from May 27 to May 30, 2014, by the following team of independent ESE consultants:

1. Owen Conway, leadership and governance
2. Mary Eirich, curriculum and instruction
3. Christine Brandt, assessment, review team coordinator
4. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development
5. Sara Freedman, student support
6. Roger Young, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: school business administrator, payroll coordinator, accounts coordinator, administrative assistant to the school business administrator, director of facilities, and human resources, the town accountant, the assistant town accountant and the town manager.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the School Committee: the chair and two members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: the president, the vice-president, the secretary, the treasurer, and the grievance chair.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the director of curriculum and grants, the director of student services and the supervisor of student services.

The team visited the following schools: South Hadley High School (grades 8-12), Michael E. Smith Middle School (grades 5-8,) Mosier (grades 2-4), and Plains (grades PK-1).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with four principals and focus group[s] with seven elementary school, nine middle school teachers, and seven high school teachers.

The team observed 51 classes in the district: 16 at the high school, 19 at the middle school, and 16 at the two 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 5/27/2014	Tuesday 5/28/2014	Wednesday 5/29/2014	Thursday 5/30/2014
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers’ association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to the high school, middle school, and elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; student focus group; interviews with school committee members; visits to the high school, middle school, and elementary schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to the high school, middle school, and elementary schools for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, and Expenditures

**Table B1a: South Hadley Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	29	1.5%	82990	8.7%
Asian	34	1.8%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic	169	8.7%	162647	17.0%
Native American	4	0.2%	2209	0.2%
White	1605	82.8%	620628	64.9%
Native Hawaiian	3	0.2%	1007	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	95	4.9%	27803	2.9%
All Students	1939	100.0%	955739	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2013

**Table B1b: South Hadley Public Schools
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	256	33.5%	13.1%	164336	34.8%	17.0%
Low Income	624	81.6%	32.2%	365885	77.5%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	32	4.2%	1.7%	75947	16.1%	7.9%
All high needs students	765	100.0%	39.2%	472001	100.0%	48.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2013. 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 1,954; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,360.

**Table B2a: South Hadley Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	138	88.8	88	86.3	82.6	83.3	-6.2	-3.7
	P+	138	66.0%	67.0%	64.0%	54.0%	57.0%	-12.0%	-10.0%
4	CPI	145	85.5	83.7	86.8	83.1	78.9	-2.4	-3.7
	P+	145	63.0%	61.0%	70.0%	64.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-6.0%
	SGP	133	58	57	65	63	49	5	-2
5	CPI	157	84.8	89.9	83.9	87.7	84.7	2.9	3.8
	P+	157	64.0%	72.0%	63.0%	69.0%	66.0%	5.0%	6.0%
	SGP	146	41.5	39	40	51	52	9.5	11
6	CPI	158	84.5	84.6	85.5	85.3	85.1	0.8	-0.2
	P+	158	65.0%	66.0%	67.0%	68.0%	67.0%	3.0%	1.0%
	SGP	150	40.5	35	33.5	44	52	3.5	10.5
7	CPI	130	82.3	87.7	87.2	90.4	88.4	8.1	3.2
	P+	130	63.0%	70.0%	69.0%	74.0%	72.0%	11.0%	5.0%
	SGP	124	31	40	38	31.5	48	0.5	-6.5
8	CPI	152	90.7	88.4	89.9	88.5	90.1	-2.2	-1.4
	P+	152	80.0%	73.0%	77.0%	74.0%	78.0%	-6.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	144	52	52.5	46	41	50	-11	-5
10	CPI	148	93.1	95.4	97.7	96.8	96.9	3.7	-0.9
	P+	148	82.0%	87.0%	94.0%	93.0%	91.0%	11.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	136	49.5	60	66	67	57	17.5	1
All	CPI	1028	87.2	88.2	88.3	87.8	86.8	0.6	-0.5
	P+	1028	69.0%	71.0%	72.0%	71.0%	69.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	833	46	48	47	50	51	4	3

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	137	88.4	90.6	85.4	87.2	84.3	-1.2	1.8
	P+	137	74.0%	73.0%	72.0%	71.0%	66.0%	-3.0%	-1.0%
4	CPI	143	80.6	80.6	84.7	80.1	80.2	-0.5	-4.6
	P+	143	50.0%	52.0%	60.0%	52.0%	52.0%	2.0%	-8.0%
	SGP	131	53	51	55	53	54	0	-2
5	CPI	156	73	80.9	78.3	87	80.6	14	8.7
	P+	156	48.0%	61.0%	57.0%	71.0%	61.0%	23.0%	14.0%
	SGP	145	25	35	29.5	59	54	34	29.5
6	CPI	158	75.6	74.8	80	81	80.3	5.4	1
	P+	158	52.0%	51.0%	56.0%	59.0%	61.0%	7.0%	3.0%
	SGP	149	33	38	34	50	50	17	16
7	CPI	130	69.8	70.3	74.7	77.9	74.4	8.1	3.2
	P+	130	46.0%	48.0%	51.0%	55.0%	52.0%	9.0%	4.0%
	SGP	124	58	53	54	51	46	-7	-3
8	CPI	151	74.6	68	73.5	70.5	76	-4.1	-3
	P+	151	54.0%	44.0%	51.0%	47.0%	55.0%	-7.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	144	51	45	52	42.5	50	-8.5	-9.5
10	CPI	146	93.3	92.4	92.5	91.6	90.2	-1.7	-0.9
	P+	146	84.0%	82.0%	82.0%	80.0%	80.0%	-4.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	137	55	59	51.5	50	51	-5	-1.5
All	CPI	1021	79.2	79.5	81.3	82.2	80.8	3	0.9
	P+	1021	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	62.0%	61.0%	4.0%	1.0%
	SGP	830	46	46.5	45	51	51	5	6

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	156	79.7	79	83.3	83.2	78.5	3.5	-0.1
	P+	156	52.0%	51.0%	59.0%	60.0%	51.0%	8.0%	1.0%
8	CPI	152	74.3	65.6	73.2	73.4	71	-0.9	0.2
	P+	152	42.0%	30.0%	46.0%	40.0%	39.0%	-2.0%	-6.0%
10	CPI	139	86.6	90	90.5	87.9	88	1.3	-2.6
	P+	139	67.0%	73.0%	78.0%	66.0%	71.0%	-1.0%	-12.0%
All	CPI	447	80.2	77.7	82.4	81.3	79	1.1	-1.1
	P+	447	54.0%	51.0%	61.0%	55.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-6.0%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	400	74.8	77.3	79.3	77.6	2.8	-1.7
		P+	400	46.0%	49.0%	54.0%	52.0%	6.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	298	40	46	43.5	46	6	2.5
	State	CPI	237163	76.1	77	76.5	76.8	0.7	0.3
		P+	237163	45.0%	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	180087	45	46	46	47	2	1
Low Income	District	CPI	341	77.3	78.4	80.9	79	1.7	-1.9
		P+	341	50.0%	52.0%	58.0%	56.0%	6.0%	-2.0%
		SGP	257	40	42.5	45	46	6	1
	State	CPI	184999	76.5	77.1	76.7	77.2	0.7	0.5
		P+	184999	47.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	141671	46	46	45	47	1	2
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	134	59	63.8	62.9	56.3	-2.7	-6.6
		P+	134	20.0%	27.0%	25.0%	21.0%	1.0%	-4.0%
		SGP	97	37	49.5	33	40	3	7
	State	CPI	88956	67.3	68.3	67.3	66.8	-0.5	-0.5
		P+	88956	28.0%	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	64773	41	42	43	43	2	0
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	46676	66.1	66.2	66.2	67.4	1.3	1.2
		P+	46676	32.0%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	31672	51	50	51	53	2	2
All students	District	CPI	1028	87.2	88.2	88.3	87.8	0.6	-0.5
		P+	1028	69.0%	71.0%	72.0%	71.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	833	46	48	47	50	4	3
	State	CPI	496175	86.9	87.2	86.7	86.8	-0.1	0.1
		P+	496175	68.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	395568	50	50	50	51	1	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: South Hadley Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	396	62.2	64.9	67.1	69.8	7.6	2.7
		P+	396	31.0%	35.0%	37.0%	41.0%	10.0%	4.0%
		SGP	298	38	44	39	43	5	4
	State	CPI	237745	66.7	67.1	67	68.6	1.9	1.6
		P+	237745	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	180866	46	46	46	46	0	0
Low Income	District	CPI	338	65.4	65.9	68.4	70.7	5.3	2.3
		P+	338	36.0%	36.0%	39.0%	43.0%	7.0%	4.0%
		SGP	258	35	45	39	43	8	4
	State	CPI	185392	67.1	67.3	67.3	69	1.9	1.7
		P+	185392	37.0%	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	142354	47	46	45	46	-1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	131	46	50.3	49.6	51.7	5.7	2.1
		P+	131	11.0%	19.0%	13.0%	15.0%	4.0%	2.0%
		SGP	95	40.5	40	36	34	-6.5	-2
	State	CPI	89193	57.5	57.7	56.9	57.4	-0.1	0.5
		P+	89193	21.0%	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	65068	43	43	43	42	-1	-1
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		SGP	0	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	47046	61.5	62	61.6	63.9	2.4	2.3
		P+	47046	31.0%	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	31986	54	52	52	53	-1	1
All students	District	CPI	1021	79.2	79.5	81.3	82.2	3	0.9
		P+	1021	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	62.0%	4.0%	1.0%
		SGP	830	46	46.5	45	51	5	6
	State	CPI	497090	79.9	79.9	79.9	80.8	0.9	0.9
		P+	497090	58.0%	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	396691	50	50	50	51	1	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: South Hadley Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	159	67.4	65.1	70.5	70	2.6	-0.5
		P+	159	32.0%	32.0%	43.0%	34.0%	2.0%	-9.0%
	State	CPI	96902	64.3	63.8	65	66.4	2.1	1.4
		P+	96902	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	134	69.7	67.3	71	72.6	2.9	1.6
		P+	134	36.0%	35.0%	43.0%	37.0%	1.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	75485	63.6	62.8	64.5	66.1	2.5	1.6
		P+	75485	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	4.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	62	53.6	51.4	51.7	57.3	3.7	5.6
		P+	62	16.0%	15.0%	22.0%	16.0%	0.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	37049	59	59.2	58.7	59.8	0.8	1.1
		P+	37049	19.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.0%	0.0%
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
		P+	3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	State	CPI	16179	51.8	50.3	51.4	54	2.2	2.6
		P+	16179	16.0%	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	3.0%	2.0%
All students	District	CPI	447	80.2	77.7	82.4	81.3	1.1	-1.1
		P+	447	54.0%	51.0%	61.0%	55.0%	1.0%	-6.0%
	State	CPI	209573	78.3	77.6	78.6	79	0.7	0.4
		P+	209573	52.0%	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-1.0%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013**

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	2.8	2.0	0.8	1.0	-1.8	-64.3%	0.2	25.0%	2.2

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	60	71.6%	72.6%	79.7%	76.7%	5.1	7.1%	-3.0	-3.8%	74.7%
Low income	45	63.3%	71.4%	85.0%	77.8%	14.5	22.9%	-7.2	-8.5%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	26	76.2%	61.3%	64.3%	61.5%	-14.7	-19.3%	-2.8	-4.4%	67.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	152	83.3%	86.1%	90.0%	88.8%	5.5	6.6%	-1.2	-1.3%	85.0%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	79	78.2%	78.4%	77.4%	83.5%	5.3	6.8%	6.1	7.9%	78.9%
Low income	60	75.6%	73.5%	77.6%	86.7%	11.1	14.7%	9.1	11.7%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	28	75.5%	78.6%	67.7%	75.0%	-0.5	-0.7%	7.3	10.8%	73.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	68.5%
All students	180	87.4%	86.6%	88.4%	91.7%	4.3	4.9%	3.3	3.7%	87.5%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	94.4%	94.9%	95.3%	95.2%	0.8	0.8%	-0.1	-0.1%	94.8%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	8.8%	7.3%	7.2%	5.7%	-3.1	-35.2%	-1.5	-20.8%	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	6.5%	6.0%	5.7%	3.1%	-3.4	-52.3%	-2.6	-45.6%	4.3%

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: South Hadley Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

	FY11		FY12		FY13	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$19,054,853	\$18,844,126	\$19,392,563	\$19,347,284	\$20,074,976	\$19,689,735
By municipality	\$7,921,071	\$7,837,605	\$7,787,406	\$7,859,989	\$7,807,915	\$7,958,897
Total from local appropriations	\$26,975,924	\$26,681,731	\$27,179,969	\$27,207,273	\$27,882,891	\$27,648,632
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$4,376,791	--	\$3,869,357	--	\$3,806,230
Total expenditures	--	\$31,058,522	--	\$31,076,630	--	\$31,454,862
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$7,506,322	--	\$7,546,619	--	\$7,627,179
Required local contribution	--	\$11,597,234	--	\$11,810,114	--	\$12,212,647
Required net school spending**	--	\$19,103,556	--	\$19,356,733	--	\$19,839,826
Actual net school spending	--	\$22,238,665	--	\$23,055,541	--	\$23,434,943
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$3,135,109	--	\$3,698,808	--	\$3,595,117
Over/under required (%)	--	16.4	--	19.1	--	18.1

*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.

**Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Sources: FY11, FY12 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved October 15, 2014

**Table B9: South Hadley Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010-2013**

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012	2013
Administration	\$491	\$506	\$513	\$546
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$609	\$631	\$679	\$705
Teachers	\$4,938	\$5,121	\$5,250	\$5,251
Other teaching services	\$1,121	\$1,124	\$1,218	\$1,190
Professional development	\$353	\$411	\$409	\$300
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$498	\$396	\$561	\$742
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$331	\$355	\$363	\$386
Pupil services	\$966	\$1,019	\$1,055	\$1,200
Operations and maintenance	\$981	\$1,062	\$1,060	\$1,043
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,801	\$1,967	\$1,994	\$2,025
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$12,090	\$12,593	\$13,102	\$13,388

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.	ES	0	1	15	#	0	5	46
	MS	0	1	18	%	0%	10%	90%
	HS	0	3	13	---	---	---	---
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	ES	0	1	15	#	13	4	34
	MS	8	1	10	%	25%	8%	67%
	HS	5	2	9	---	---	---	---
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	0	3	13	#	0	11	40
	MS	0	1	18	%	0%	22%	78%
	HS	0	7	9	---	---	---	---
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	ES	0	2	14	#	4	7	40
	MS	2	1	16	%	8%	14%	78%
	HS	2	4	10	---	---	---	---
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	1	4	11	#	12	13	26
	MS	4	6	9	%	24%	25%	51%
	HS	7	3	6	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	1	1	14	#	1	3	46
	MS	0	2	16	%	2%	6%	92%
	HS	0	0	16	---	--	---	---
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	2	6	7	#	12	20	17
	MS	5	7	6	%	24%	41%	35%
	HS	5	7	4	---	---	---	---
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	ES	8	4	4	#	20	17	14
	MS	2	9	8	%	39%	33%	27%
	HS	10	4	2	---	---	---	---
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	ES	4	5	7	#	14	20	16
	MS	4	7	7	%	28%	40%	32%
	HS	6	8	2	---	---	---	---
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	4	6	6	#	32	9	9
	MS	13	3	2	%	64%	18%	18%
	HS	15	0	1	---	---	---	---
11. The teacher provides multiple 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	3	8	4	#	18	17	14
	MS	5	7	6	%	37%	35%	29%
	HS	10	2	4	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Teaching (continued)	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	3	5	7	#	11	14	24
	MS	3	3	12	%	22%	29%	49%
	HS	5	6	5	---	---	---	---
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a learning environment where students can take risks--- for instance, where they can make predictions, make judgments and investigate.	ES	2	5	8	#	13	15	21
	MS	5	4	9	%	27%	31%	43%
	HS	6	6	4	---	---	---	---
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	0	6	9	#	4	21	24
	MS	1	7	10	%	8%	43%	49%
	HS	3	8	5	---	---	---	---
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	1	8	6	#	14	20	16
	MS	7	5	7	%	28%	40%	32%
	HS	6	7	3	---	---	---	---
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	11	2	2	#	24	14	11
	MS	5	6	7	%	49%	29%	22%
	HS	8	6	2	---	---	---	---

(Please see next page)

Learning	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	1	8	5	#	11	21	16
	MS	5	7	6	%	23%	44%	33%
	HS	5	6	5	---	---	---	---
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	ES	0	6	9	#	13	14	21
	MS	7	3	7	%	27%	29%	44%
	HS	6	5	5	---	---	---	---
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom’s Taxonomy).	ES	1	6	7	#	17	12	18
	MS	7	3	7	%	36%	26%	38%
	HS	9	3	4	---	---	---	---
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	5	1	9	#	22	7	20
	MS	10	1	7	%	45%	14%	41%
	HS	7	5	4	---	---	---	---
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	2	3	10	#	11	13	25
	MS	3	6	9	%	22%	27%	51%
	HS	6	4	6	---	---	---	---
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	14	0	1	#	39	4	6
	MS	12	3	3	%	80%	8%	12%
	HS	13	1	2	---	---	---	---
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	0	3	12	#	9	9	31
	MS	5	3	10	%	18%	18%	63%
	HS	4	3	9	---	---	---	---
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	3	6	3	#	18	18	8
	MS	9	6	1	%	41%	41%	18%
	HS	6	6	4	---	---	---	---