District Review Report

Easthampton Public Schools

Review conducted June 10-13, 2013

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

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 printed on recycled paper

Easthampton 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 system wide functions using the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (ESE) six district standards: leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial and asset management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

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

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Easthampton Public Schools was conducted from June 10-13, 2013. The site visit included 32 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 85 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 3 elementary school teachers, 5 middle school teachers, and 13 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, expenditures, and student performance. The team observed

---

[1] Districts selected were in Level 3 in school year 2012-2013; all served one or more schools among the lowest 20 percent of schools statewide serving common grade levels pursuant to 603 CMR 2.05(2)(a). The districts with the lowest aggregate performance and least movement in Composite Performance Index (CPI) in their respective regions were selected for review from among those districts not exempt under Chapter 15, Section 55A. A district was exempt if another comprehensive review was completed or scheduled within nine months of the review window.

classroom instructional practice in 54 classrooms in 5 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

Note that any progress that has taken place since the time of the review is not reflected in this benchmarking report. Findings represent the conditions in place at the time of the site visit, and recommendations represent the team's suggestions to address the issues identified at that time.

District Profile

Easthampton has a mayor-town council form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. There are seven members of the school committee and they meet every other week.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2011. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the director of curriculum, the special education director, the business manager, and four principals. Central office positions have been mostly stable in recent years. The district has four principals leading five schools. There are also two assistant principals, one at the high school and one at the middle school. There were 118 teachers in the district in 2012-2013.

As of October 1, 2012, 1,593 students were enrolled in the district's 5 schools:

Table 1: Easthampton Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Center School	Elementary	K-4	196
Maple	Elementary	PK-4	264
Neil A. Pepin	Elementary	K-4	197
White Brook Middle School	Middle School	5-8	481
Easthampton High	High School	9-12	455
Totals	**5 schools**	**PK-12**	**1,593**
*As of October 1, 2012			

Between 2008 and 2012 overall student enrollment decreased by 6.5 percent.[2] 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), compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median district per pupil expenditures for 49 K-12 districts of similar size (1,000-1,999 students) in fiscal 2012: $11,148 compared with $11,883. In fiscal year 2011 district per-pupil expenditures had been higher than the median for the 47 districts then in this group: $12,432 as compared with

---

[2]District enrollment was 1,702 in 2008; 1,651 in 2009; 1,575 in 2010; and 1,567 in 2011; it rose slightly to 1,592 in 2012.

$11,722. See [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#). Actual net school spending has been above what was required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B2 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

Information about student performance includes: (1) the accountability and assistance level of the district, including the reason for the district's level classification; (2) the progress the district and its schools are making toward narrowing proficiency gaps as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI); (3) English language arts (ELA) performance and growth; (4) mathematics performance and growth; (5) science and technology/engineering (STE) performance; (6) annual dropout rates and cohort graduation rates; and (7) suspension rates. Data is reported for the district and for schools and student subgroups that have at least four years of sufficient data and are therefore eligible to be classified into an accountability and assistance level (1-5). "Sufficient data" means that at least 20 students in a district or school or at least 30 students in a subgroup were assessed on ELA and mathematics MCAS tests for the four years under review.

Four- and two-year trend data are provided when possible, in addition to areas in the district and/or its schools demonstrating potentially meaningful gains or declines over these periods. (A potentially meaningful change is one that is not likely to be random. As such, it's a starting point for further investigation.) Data on student performance is also available in Appendix B. In both this section and Appendix B, the data reported is the most recent available.

1. The district is Level 3 because the Easthampton High is Level 3.[3]

A. The Easthampton High School is among the lowest performing 20 percent of high schools.[4]

B. The district's five schools place between the 15th percentile and the 57th percentile based on each school's four-year (2009-2012) achievement and improvement trends relative to other schools serving the same or similar grades: Center School (49th percentile of elementary schools); Maple (38th percentile of elementary schools); Neil A. Pepin (57th percentile of elementary schools); White Brook Middle School (23rd percentile of middle schools); and Easthampton High (15th percentile of high schools).

2. The district is not sufficiently narrowing proficiency gaps.

A. The district as a whole is not considered to be making sufficient progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps. This is because the 2012 cumulative PPI for all students and for high needs[5] students is less than 75 for the district. The

---

[3] Due to the district's Level 3 classification, it received a concurrent determination of need for special education technical assistance or intervention of "Needs Technical Assistance (NTA)." This serves as an indication that while areas of the district's performance may be positive, one or more schools (or, in the case of a single school district, the district as a whole) may be experiencing poor outcomes for students with disabilities and/or are having compliance issues.

[4] A district is classified into the level of its lowest-performing school unless it has been placed in Level 4 or 5 by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education independent of the level of its schools.

[5] The high needs group is an unduplicated count of all students in a school or district belonging to at least one of the following individual subgroups: students with disabilities, English language learners (ELL) and Former ELL students, or low income students (eligible for free/reduced price school lunch).

district's cumulative PPI[6] [7] is 53 for all students and 44 for high needs students. The district's cumulative PPI for reportable subgroups are: 44 (low income students); 61 (ELL and former ELL students); 58 (students with disabilities); 83 (Asian students); 58 (Hispanic/Latino students); and 54 (White students).

3. The district's English language arts (ELA) performance is very low[8] relative to other districts and its growth[9] is moderate.[10]

A. The district met its annual proficiency gap narrowing targets for all students, high needs students, students with disabilities, Asian students, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students; the district did not meet its annual improvement targets for low income students and ELL and former ELL students.[11]

---

[6] The PPI combines multiple measures of performance data (achievement, improvement, and graduation and dropout rates) over multiple years into a single number. All districts, schools, and student subgroups receive an *annual PPI* based on improvement from one year to the next and a *cumulative PPI* between 0 and 100 based on four years of data. A district's, school's or subgroup's cumulative PPI is the average of its annual Progress and Performance Index scores over the four most recent MCAS administrations, weighting recent years the most (1-2-3-4). A cumulative PPI is calculated for a group if it has at least three annual PPIs. If a group is missing an annual PPI for one year, that year is left out of the weighting (e.g., 1-X-3-4). While a group's annual PPI can exceed 100 points, the cumulative PPI is always reported on a 100-point scale.

[7] The cumulative PPI is a *criterion-referenced* measure of a district or school's performance relative to its own targets, irrespective of the performance of other districts or schools. Conversely, school percentiles are *norm-referenced* because schools are being compared to other schools across the state that serve the same or similar grades.

[8] All districts, schools, and subgroups are expected to halve the gap between their level of performance in the year 2011 and 100 percent proficient by the 2016-17 school year in ELA, mathematics, and STE. The Composite Performance Index (CPI), a measure of the extent to which a group of students has progressed towards proficiency, is the state's measure of progress towards this goal. In this report the 2012 CPI is used to compare the performance of districts, schools, and grades in a particular subject for a given year. For districts, for each level of school, and for each grade the CPIs are ordered from lowest to highest and then divided into five equal groups (quintiles) with the corresponding descriptions: "very high", "high", "moderate", "low" or "very low." In their assignment to quintiles single-school districts are treated as schools rather than districts. Quintiles for grades are calculated two ways: using a ranking of all districts' CPIs for a particular grade, and using a ranking of all schools' CPIs for a particular grade. CPI figures derive from the MCAS Report on the Department's School and District Profiles website: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/mcas.aspx.

[9] Massachusetts uses student growth percentiles (SGP) to measure how much a student's or group of students' achievement has grown or changed over time. At the student level, student growth percentiles measure progress by comparing changes in a student's MCAS scores to changes in MCAS scores of other students with similar achievement profiles ("academic peers"). Growth at the district, school, and subgroup levels are reported as median SGPs - the middle score when the individual SGPs in a group are ranked from highest to lowest. Median SGPs are reported for ELA and mathematics. In contrast to the CPI, which describes a group's progress toward proficiency based on the group's current level of achievement, the median SGP describes a group's progress in terms of how the achievement of the students in the group changed relative to the prior year as compared to their academic peers. A group demonstrates "moderate" or "typical" growth if the group's median SGP is between the 41st and 60th percentiles.

[10] For ELA trends in the aggregate see Table B4a in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5a.

[11] A district, school, or subgroup is considered to have met its target when its CPI is within 1.5 CPI points of the target.

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

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

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

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

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful[12] gains in grades 3 and 10 and potentially meaningful declines in grade 7. These gains and declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

G. The 2012 performance of the Center School (K-4) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of the Maple School (PK-4) is low relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

I. The 2012 performance of the Neil A. Pepin School (K-4) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3, 4, and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

---

[12] The following changes in measures of achievement and growth, either positive or negative, are potentially meaningful, pending further inquiry: CPI (2.5 points); SGP (10 points); percent *Proficient* and *Advanced* (3 percentage points). Changes are more likely to be potentially meaningful for larger groups of students; higher performing groups tend to demonstrate fewer potentially meaningful changes than lower performing groups; and certain subjects and grade levels are more likely to demonstrate potentially meaningful changes than others. A consistent pattern of potentially meaningful change over several consecutive pairs of consecutive years is more likely to be meaningful than changes from one year to another, whether consecutive or not. In this report, a statement of potentially meaningful change is provided when a district, school, grade level, or subgroup demonstrates three or more instances of declines or gains of the amounts specified above in the CPI, SGP, and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* over the last four years, the most recent two years, or both. Any instance of decline of one of the amounts specified above (or more) prevents three or more instances of gain from being considered potentially meaningful, and vice versa.

J. The 2012 performance of the White Brook Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school did not demonstrate any potentially meaningful gains or declines. The school demonstrated variable performance on the percent of students scoring *Proficient* or *Advanced* and SGP.

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

4. The district's mathematics performance is very low relative to other districts and its growth is moderate.[13]

A. The district did not meet its annual improvement targets for all students, high needs students, low income students, ELL and former ELL students, students with disabilities, Asian students, Hispanic/Latino students, and White students.

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

C. The district earned extra credit toward its annual PPI for increasing the percentage of students scoring *Advanced* 10 percent or more between 2011 and 2012 for ELL and former ELL students and students with disabilities. It earned extra credit for decreasing the percentage of students scoring *Warning/Failing* 10 percent or more over this period for ELL and former ELL students and Asian students.

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

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

F. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grades 7 and 10 and potentially meaningful declines in grades 4, 5, and 6. These gains and declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

G. The 2012 performance of the Center School (K-4) is moderate relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3 and potentially meaningful declines in grades 4 and overall. Most of the gains and declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

H. The 2012 performance of the Maple School (PK-4) is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is moderate. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially

---

[13] For mathematics trends in the aggregate, see Table B4b in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5b.

meaningful gains in grade 3 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

I. The 2012 performance of the Neil A. Pepin School (K-4) is high relative to other elementary schools and its growth is high. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 3 in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher and CPI. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance over both periods.

J. The 2012 performance of the White Brook Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools and its growth is low. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated potentially meaningful gains in grade 7 and potentially meaningful declines in grades 5, 6, and overall. Most of the gains were attributable to its performance between 2011 and 2012 and most of the declines to its performance over both periods.

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

5. The district's science and technology/engineering (STE) performance is very low relative to other districts.[14]

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

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

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

D. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the district demonstrated potentially meaningful declines in grade 10. These declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

E. The 2012 performance of the White Brook Middle School (5-8) is low relative to other middle schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated gains and declines in grades 5 and overall in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Higher. The gains were attributable to its performance over the period between 2009 and 2012 and the declines to its performance over 2011 and 2012.

F. The 2012 performance of the Easthampton High School (9-12) is low relative to other high schools. Between 2009 and 2012 and more recently between 2011 and 2012, the school demonstrated declines in grades 10 and overall in the

---

[14] For STE trends in the aggregate, see Table B4c in Appendix B; for selected subgroups, see Table B5c.

percentage of students scoring *Proficient* or Higher. Most of the declines were attributable to its performance over both periods.

6. In 2012, the district met its annual improvement target for all students for the five-year cohort graduation rate.[15] The district did not meet its annual improvement for all students for the four-year cohort graduation rate and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate. Over the most recent three-year period for which data is available,[16] the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate declined, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined. Over the most recent one-year period for which data is available, the four-year cohort graduation rate increased, the five-year cohort graduation rate declined, and the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined.[17]

A. Between 2009 and 2012 the four-year cohort graduation rate increased 4.2 percentage points, from 80.5% to 84.7%, an increase of 5.2 percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it increased 10.3 percentage points, from 74.4% to 84.7%, an increase of 13.8 percent.

B. Between 2008 and 2011 the five-year cohort graduation rate declined 10.4 percentage points, from 91.2% to 80.8%, a decrease of 11.4 percent. Between 2010 and 2011 it declined 4.2 percentage points, from 85.0% to 80.8%, a decrease of 4.9 percent.

C. Between 2009 and 2012 the annual grade 9-12 dropout rate declined 0.4 percentage points, from 2.0% to 1.6%, a decrease of 21.5% percent. Between 2011 and 2012 it declined 1.3 percentage points, from 2.9% to 1.6%, a decrease of 45.9 percent.

7. Some district suspension rates in 2011-2012 were significantly different from the statewide rates.[18]

A. The rate of in-school suspensions for Easthampton, 6.0 percent, was significantly different from the state rate of 3.4 percent.

B. There was a significant difference among racial/ethnic groups for in-school suspensions but not for out-of-school suspensions.[19] The in-school-suspension rate was 23.3 percent for African-American/Black students, 7.6 percent for Asian students, 7.3 percent for Hispanic/Latino students and 5.4 percent for White students.

---

[15] All groups (districts, schools, and subgroups) are expected to make steady progress toward a goal of 90 percent for the four-year cohort graduation rate and 95 percent for the five-year rate by the 2016-17 school year. For accountability determinations in any given year, the cohort graduation rate from the prior school year is used. For example, 2012 accountability determinations for the four-year rate use data from 2011; determinations for the five-year rate use data from 2010. Districts, schools, and subgroups are considered to be on target if they meet the state's federally-approved annual targets in a given year for either the four-or five-year cohort graduation rate, whichever is higher.

[16] Note that the 2012 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2011 five-year graduation rate will be used in the 2013 accountability determination; the 2011 four-year graduation and dropout rates and the 2010 five-year graduation rate were used in the 2012 determination. See previous footnote.

[17] For annual dropout rate trends from 2009 to 2012 see Table B6 in Appendix B. For cohort graduation rate trends for the last three years available, see Tables B7a and B7b.

[18] Statistical significance based on one sample T test. P≤ .05

8

C. There was a significant difference between the in-school suspension rates of high needs students and non high needs students (7.7 percent compared to 4.7 percent), and low income students and non low income students (9.2 percent compared to 4.3 percent).

D. There was a significant difference between the rates of out-of-school suspensions for high needs students and non high needs students (8.3 percent compared to 2.4 percent), low income students and non low income students (8.6 percent compared to 3.2 percent), and students with disabilities and students without disabilities (12.3 percent compared to 3.3 percent).

E. On average students in the Easthampton Public Schools missed 1.8 days per disciplinary action,[20] lower than the state average of 3.1.

---

[19] Statistical significance for racial/ethnic groups and other subgroups based on Chi Square. P≤ .05
[20] Disciplinary action refers to in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, permanent expulsion, removal by an impartial hearing officer to an alternative setting, or removal by school personnel to an alternative setting.

Strengths

Leadership and Governance

1. The district's planning documents delineate a clear direction for improving teaching and learning for all students.

    A. The Strategic Plan (2011-2014) is organized around the overarching categories of student achievement, educator excellence, and resource alignment.

        1. Under student achievement are listed entries relating to teaching and learning such as "Build a continuum of math instruction K-12," "Build a continuum of writing instruction K-12," "Vertically align the curriculum with the Common Core," and "Develop and implement common assessments."

        2. Under educator excellence are listed "Use data from formative and summative assessments to identify student needs and drive instructional practice," "Explore ways to enhance collaboration among all district educators to improve student achievement," and "Develop and implement a district-wide teacher and administrator evaluation system aligned with state evaluation standards."

        3. Based on a comprehensive review of district data these are appropriate goals for the school system to pursue. The emphasis on educator excellence mirrors ESE's goals for all districts in the state.

    B. The district has ensured that the individual school goals and plans have been aligned with the district initiatives and thus serve as the model for principal and teacher goals and the driver for district improvement.

        1. Each school plan includes a goal that addresses the need to use formative and summative assessments to inform instruction.

        2. In interviews, principals and teachers described the varying ways in which data was being used to improve student achievement. They agreed that they had included the development of data teams in their school plans as a result of the direction provided by the strategic plan.

        3. A review of the administrators' mid-cycle formative assessments showed that the superintendent tracks the principals' progress toward the fulfillment of the strategic goals through the evaluation process, citing specific evidence that indicates the progress on each goal.

        4. The superintendent has filled two key positions, curriculum director and special education director. They are charged with moving these initiatives forward throughout the district. Together these positions serve as the drivers for instructional change. In interviews with the review team principals and teachers acknowledged this.

Impact: Because the district has aligned its planning documents throughout every level of the school system, it has ensured that activities throughout the district have a common direction to support teaching and learning, thus accelerating progress toward its goals.

Human Resources and Professional Development

2. **The Easthampton Public Schools have collaboratively negotiated and successfully introduced educator evaluation policies, procedures, and practices that are fully aligned with Massachusetts' new educator evaluation regulations. Teachers and administrators confirmed that key components of the state's new model have been implemented and that initial experiences have been positive and productive.**

   A. The district has successfully adopted and transitioned to the new model, meeting its responsibilities as a Race to the Top (RTTT) school district.[21]

      1. A committee composed of the superintendent, administrators, teachers, and union representatives was formed during the 2011-2012 school year. It worked collaboratively during that year to develop a comprehensive educator evaluation system that was aligned with the requirements of the new Department of Education model. Agreement was subsequently reached between the Easthampton Educators Association and the district, and in June 2012 a new Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) was signed. A long-standing and highly regarded joint district committee known as the "Anchor Team," is subsequently monitoring implementation of the new evaluation system and can make recommendations for revisions or adjustments to procedures or policies, should they be judged necessary.

      2. Easthampton chose to fully adopt the new Massachusetts educator evaluation model, including all relevant policies, procedures, timetables, and instrumentation. This was affirmed in separate interviews with the superintendent, administrators, and teachers, as well as by review of the district's new CBA.

      3. The district sent its educator evaluation documents to ESE's Office of Educator Policy, Preparation, and Leadership for review on August 22, 2012.

      4. The district provided evaluators and teachers with the number of training hours required by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) before the start of the 2012-2013 school year. Interviewees said that additional, ongoing training was still needed.

      5. District leaders, principals, and teachers agreed that the district has taken very seriously its responsibility to fully implement the new evaluation system. All faculty and administrators have developed educator plans that include self assessments, SMART goals for both student learning and professional practice, and specific actions to be taken to meet those goals.

---

[21] All districts participating in the Race to the Top program were required to implement evaluation systems consistent with state regulations for the 2012-2013 school year. 603 CMR 35.11(1)(b).

6. Principals said that the superintendent was carefully monitoring the implementation of the new evaluation system and holding them accountable for its faithful application within their schools.

7. Appropriate instruments are being used, including those for goal setting, educator plan development, and formative and summative evaluations.   Administrators said that for the first year, at least, the ESE's model forms were being used. At the time of the review the district did not have an online system to support the new evaluation process and could produce only hard copies of documentation. Review team members were informed of the district's plans to acquire Teach Point as its electronic platform in 2013-2014.

8. In interviews with review team members, teachers and administrators said that classroom observations that include written feedback were being conducted with greater regularity in 2012-2013 and that formative evaluations of both faculty and administrators were being completed according to the terms and generally within the timelines specified in the CBA. Sample documents were provided by the district to confirm this. Summative evaluations had not yet been completed.

9. Principals said they were spending more time in classrooms, that the quality and quantity of conversations with their teachers about teaching and learning had noticeably improved, and that teachers had been reflective, receptive, and actively engaged in the process. This was confirmed by teacher focus groups.

B. At the time of the review the district did not have common assessments to measure student growth and progress in all schools, grades, and content areas.

1. Interviewees said that efforts to develop common assessments were underway in several schools, acknowledging the need to develop a comprehensive district assessment system with a balanced and coordinated battery of formative and summative student assessments to generate reliable data to measure student learning. Such a system is also necessary to determine educator effectiveness, as the district continues with the development and implementation of district-determined measures used to inform educators Student Impact Ratings.

Impact: The new evaluation system is enhancing professional dialogue, reflection, and focus on practice. It is thereby promoting the overall growth of faculty and moving student learning to the center of professional attention. Easthampton is creating a vehicle with the capacity to significantly improve the quality of teaching and learning across the district. Ultimately, if the new system is fully and faithfully implemented, the enhanced competencies and practices of the professional staff will result in substantially improved learning opportunities and outcomes for students.

Financial and Asset Management

3. **Easthampton significantly improved learning opportunities for students when it opened a new high school to students in April 2013.**

   A. A committee entitled Committee for Better Schools, made up of teachers, parents and community members, worked successfully to win passage of an $18.1 million debt exclusion for the new high school.

   1. The project broke ground on May 27, 2011.

2. The building project was on time and under budget: the $44 million project came in at $39.2 million. The move into the new building took place during spring break in April 2013.

B. The new high school includes state-of-the-art technology, well-equipped science labs, appropriately sized classrooms, spaces for small-group learning, and facilities that expand the possible course offerings in areas such as drama and dance.

C. School committee members said that they hoped and expected that the new high school would help decrease the number of students being educated in other districts under the school choice program.[22]

Impact: The high school project garnered overwhelming community support for the debt exclusion to build the new high school. This has led to a new level of community pride and an exemplary environment for student learning.

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

4. **Though the superintendent meets monthly with the teachers' association president, principals discuss district issues with the superintendent at leadership team meetings, and school committee members reported favorably on the information they receive from the superintendent, principals and school committee members both indicated that communication could be improved.**

    A. Principals described discussions with the superintendent at leadership team meetings about the budget or district issues. From their description, the superintendent is open to disagreement: one principal described being opposed to a particular district plan and said that the superintendent had listened and that they had had several conversations.

        1. However, two principals indicated that it is not always clear who is going to make the decision about a district issue—that "the articulation of the process could be a little better."

        2. One principal said that they "don't always all understand what goes into the decision" about budget cuts.

        3. Principals also referred to budget cuts being written up in the newspaper before they had had a chance to talk about possible cuts.

---

[22] In 2011-2012 233 students resident in the district were being educated in out-of-district public schools, and 57 were being educated in charter schools, while 159 were being educated in private and parochial schools and 23 were being home-schooled. The enrollment of the Easthampton Public Schools that year was 1,515.

B. School committee members said in general that they get sufficient information from the superintendent and that it is usually timely.

1. They mentioned, however, that sometimes the information came "later than it should to be able to vote with confidence"—for example, in the case of grade level reorganization and course approvals.

2. According to at least one member, in the recent instance of a change in the service delivery model for special education, the committee was given a brief presentation on special education but it was not substantial enough for that member to be able to support the change fully.

Impact: The positive step of having leadership team discussions of district issues leads to administrators wanting

- to have timely information in all instances so as to be able to always play an active role in those discussions, and

- to know how the decision was ultimately made.

Similarly, providing appropriate information to the school committee leads members to want to have adequate information sufficiently in advance in all cases.

Meeting the challenge of building on the current strength of valuing input and discussion to achieve the next level of transparency, knowledge, and informed discussion will lead to improved collaborative decision-making.

Curriculum and Instruction

5. **Classroom observations showed that effective instructional practices have not been consistently developed and implemented districtwide.**

   The team observed 54 classes throughout the district: 15 classes at Easthampton High School, 15 classes at White Brook Middle School, and 24 classes at the district's three elementary schools, Maple, Center, and Pepin. The team observed 22 ELA classes, 14 mathematics classes, and 18 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education classes, one ELL class, and one career/technical education 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. See Appendix C for data on the team's classroom observations.

   Although at all levels in observed classes there were examples of effective instructional practices, these instances of high-quality instruction were not observed consistently. Clear and consistent evidence of effective instructional practices was observed in a higher proportion of the high school classes visited than of the classes visited at the other levels: for 15 of the 24 characteristics of standards-based teaching in the inventory, the high school level was the level with the highest proportion of clear and convincing evidence of the characteristic (with the high school being tied with another level for highest proportion of clear and convincing evidence for another 4 characteristics). See Appendix C.

A. Instructional practices that support a strong learning environment were not consistently in place in observed classes across the district.

1. There was a range in establishing and maintaining classroom procedures to create a safe physical environment in the district. While the review team saw partial or clear and consistent evidence of this characteristic in 96 percent of observed elementary classes and in 100 percent of observed high school classes, it observed partial or clear and consistent evidence in 80 percent of observed middle school classes.

   a. In one middle school classroom, a review team member observed a classroom with 20 students who were left unsupervised until another teacher noticed the review team member; in another, students seemed unclear about classroom procedures and said "We don't know what to do."

   b. There were also contrasting examples of strong practice with respect to procedures at the middle school. In one grade 5 math class classroom rules were posted, procedures were followed, and transitions from one activity to the next were seamless; in a grade 6 ELA class, the teacher quickly relocated 17 students to another learning space "without losing a minute of instruction."

2. The review team was more likely to observe lessons reflecting rigor and high expectations at the high school level than at the middle and elementary levels. At the high school the review team found partial or clear and consistent evidence of rigor and high expectations in 100 percent of observed classes; at the elementary level it was 84 percent of classrooms, and in the middle school, 74 percent of classrooms.

3. Districtwide in observed classes there was a range in the availability of classroom resources to meet the needs of diverse learners**.**

   a. The review team found partial or clear and consistent evidence that multiple resources were available in 86 percent of high school classrooms, in 79 percent of classes at the elementary level, and in only 47 percent of middle school classes visited. In one grade 6 classroom, for example, resources were not available to support the lesson presented; one observer noted that there were "no maps, no anchor charts or exemplars for students to follow."

B. In observed classes teaching practices that include the use of varied questioning techniques, varied strategies to ensure access of all students to the lesson, and frequent checks for understanding were insufficiently developed districtwide.

1. While there were examples of varied questioning techniques at all levels, the review team more typically observed lower-order questions with short recall answers. Review team members observed partial or clear and consistent evidence of varied questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses and promote deeper understanding in 80 percent of high school classes, 71 percent of elementary classes, and 66 percent of middle school classes visited.

2. Appropriate and varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs were not consistently implemented at all levels. Partial or clear and consistent evidence of this characteristic was seen in 87 percent of middle school classes, 73 percent of high school classes, and 58 percent of elementary classes visited.

3. The practice of conducting frequent checks for understanding was not conducted consistently across the district in observed classrooms. There was partial or clear and consistent evidence of this characteristic in 80 percent of high school classes, 71 percent of elementary classes, and 71 percent of middle school classes visited.

   a. In a high school math class where the teacher lectured and seldom asked questions, most of the students did not participate, so the teacher did not have an opportunity to determine whether they understood the lecture.

   b. By contrast, in a grade 2 ELA class a review team member observed the teacher using effective questioning techniques both in large-group and in one-on-one instruction.

C. Instructional practices that encourage student engagement were observed to be inconsistently in place at all levels in the district.

   1. There was partial or clear and consistent evidence of students articulating their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs, or in groups in 80 percent of high school classes, 74 percent of middle school classes, and 62 percent of elementary classes visited.

   2. The review team found partial or clear and consistent evidence of students responding to teacher questions by elaborating further on content and ideas in 87 percent of high school classes, 60 percent of middle school classes, and 55 percent of elementary classes.

Impact: Only when effective instructional practices have been rigorously introduced and are carefully monitored do they become consistent. Without districtwide attention to monitoring instruction to identify ineffective instructional practices and target improvement of those practices, the district cannot guarantee that all students are receiving high-quality instruction that can lead to academic improvement.

6. **At the time of the review the district had nearly finished developing a cohesive and usable set of curriculum materials for ELA and math aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, but written and updated curriculum documentation for all content areas K-12 was not complete.**

   A. The district began the process of curriculum review during the 2011-2012 school year.

      1. The district's Strategic Plan, 2011-2014, outlines the districtwide curriculum initiatives, as follows: "Build a continuum of math instruction K-12"; "Build a continuum of writing instruction K-12"; and "Vertically align the curriculum K-12 with the Common Core."

      2. Interviews and a review of documents showed that curriculum work began during the 2011-2012 school year with the formation of vertical curriculum teams in math, ELA, social studies, and science in which the focus was on the 2011 frameworks and understanding the standards from grade to grade. These meetings did not result in curriculum documents.

      3. Interviews and a review of district documents showed that teachers worked on the ELA and math curricula during the summer of 2012; however, not all grades were represented. As a result, the written ELA and math curricula were in various degrees of completion as the 2012-2013 school year began.

a. A review of district curriculum documents and interviews with teachers and school leaders showed that units are being written with Understanding by Design (UBD) components.

b. A small number of the units use a narrative approach but contain all the UBD components: essential questions, enduring understandings, performance assessment tasks, knowledge, skills, vocabulary, standards, instructional activities, formative assessments, readings, and other resources.

B. Curriculum work on ELA and math continued during the 2012-2013 school year.

1. The ELA and math curriculum teams have ongoing support from the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) literacy and math specialists. The specialists attend curriculum team meetings and provide support in curriculum alignment and development, including the use of Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) assessments. The DSAC has provided professional development to the district on the common core state standards and on creating performance tasks for curriculum units.

2. Interviews with teachers and school leaders showed that additional curriculum work, writing curriculum units and assessments, takes place during monthly middle school curriculum meetings.

C. At the time of the site visit, a cohesive and usable set of ELA (2-10) and math (K-10) curriculum materials aligned to the 2011 frameworks was nearing completion.

1. Interviews with teachers and a review of these materials showed that they were complete and aligned to the district's scope and sequence for ELA in grades 1-10 and for math in grades 2-10. Teachers said that in 2012-2013, for the first time, the fifth grade was all on the same page with common assessments, common materials, and consistent units.

2. A review of ELA curriculum units and interviews showed that ELA curriculum documentation was nearing completion with a number of units to be completed during summer 2013. Interviews with teachers and a review of math curriculum units showed that units in grades 2-10 had been completed. Some units had been piloted and revised. The elementary math specialist said that units for K-2 would be completed during summer 2013.

3. The review team was told that the ELA and math curricula for grades 11 and 12 would be revised and aligned to the 2011 frameworks during summer 2013.

D. More curriculum work remains to be completed to create cohesive, aligned curriculum documents in all content areas.

1. The high school does not have course syllabi, but uses "curriculum summaries" instead. A review of the documents showed dates that ranged from 1999 to 2009 and material that reflected the former state standards.

2. District documents and interviews showed that the district planned to revise and update the science curriculum during the 2013-2014 school year to reflect the "next generation" science standards.

a. The science curriculum does not have a scope and sequence districtwide, but there are essential questions and enduring understandings. In interviews the review team was told that science materials were not consistent across the three elementary schools, resulting in an absence of horizontal alignment.

b. Interviewees told the review team that at the middle school science instruction was based on the former standards with teachers collaborating to approximate consistency. The middle school did not have a written science curriculum.

Impact: When curriculum is not developed to the point that all content areas have written and consistent plans for instruction including curriculum guides with common components, access to high quality curriculum cannot be guaranteed for all students.

Assessment

7. **The basic elements of a complete assessment system are partially in place or in a preliminary form.**

    A. A limited number of formative assessments are in place with plans for development of common assessments.

    1. In the lower grades:

        a. In kindergarten through grade six, the district administers Fountas & Pinnell's Benchmark Assessment System three times a year. This assessment is appropriate for the reading workshop model in place in those grades. However, the assessment is administered individually and so is time intensive, and interviewees said that it was used primarily to determine students' reading level.b. In math K-6, the district in 2012-2013 used the assessments that accompany the units in its new math series, *Math Expressions*. In addition, K-4 students take district-developed middle-of-year and end-of-year math assessments.

        b. Finally, the district administers writing benchmarks three times per year in kindergarten through grade 4, with a plan to adopt a formal writing program at this level in 2013-2014 using Lucy Calkins'materials. This will provide teachers with a structure for addressing their students' writing needs as matched to the standards.

    2. Students in grades 5-8 write to a district-developed writing benchmark three times per year. Interviewees said that the district needed a system of benchmark assessments in math in grades 7 and 8. In an attempt to address this need, the district agreed to participate in a pilot of ESE's Edwin Teaching and Learning system, which has enabled administrators to assemble benchmark math assessments that can be reported online.[23] Some teachers, but not all, had taken advantage of these assessments. Use of Edwin assessments was in the pilot stage.

---

[23] For more information on Edwin Teaching and Learning, see http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/tls/.

3. The high school administers common final exams in US History I and II, Algebra I and Algebra II, Geometry, Pre-calculus, and Biology. In addition, in ELA in grades 9 and 10, students are given a common final essay. Because these assessments take place at the end of a course, they do not function as formative assessments providing teachers with information on student progress during the course.

B. Analysis of data from formative assessments is limited.

1. Results from math assessments K-6 and from Title I testing are recorded by hand on a chart and stored in a binder.

2. Time for data analysis is limited by the district not having common planning time at the elementary, middle, or high school levels.

3. Principals and teachers reported a need for more training in data analysis.

4. In 2012-2013 at the request of the superintendent each School Improvement Plan included a goal to establish a school data team. However, only one school successfully established a data team during 2012-2013.

C. Data dissemination is limited by the format and systems in place for analysis.

1. Paper and pencil summary sheets of classroom assessment results do not lend themselves to wide sharing with other teachers and administrators.

2. Individual binders with collected data are also not conducive to wide dissemination.

Impact:

- The limited amount of formative assessment data means that teachers have little information about their students' overall or individual progress while teaching is underway. Teachers do not have the data that would enable them to adjust their instruction based on what they know about where students are. Without this data, teachers are considerably less able to tailor their instruction to the needs of their students and so enhance their opportunities to learn.

- With insufficient training in data analysis and few opportunities to practice their data analysis skills in grade-level team meetings or on data teams, teachers do not develop or refine these important skills.

- And with benchmark assessment data residing mainly in binders, administrators do not have at hand essential information for adjusting programs and prioritizing goals to improve teaching and learning in their schools.

Human Resources and Professional Development

8. **Although the district has a professional development committee and its professional development program is designed to be collaborative, there is not enough time for professional development and its effectiveness is constrained by the limited and unclear role of the committee, inadequate communication, and the absence of sustained commitment to well-defined district priorities.**

   A. The district's professional development (PD) model is designed to be a collaborative endeavor in which teachers and administrators work together formally in planning and implementing activities, programs, and support structures to enhance the professional competencies of staff and advance district goals and priorities.

      1. Article 16 of the Easthampton collective bargaining agreement (CBA) speaks to the creation of a "Joint Professional Development Committee, consisting of representatives selected by the Association and by the Superintendent on behalf of the School Committee." The CBA further states that the committee should "act in an advisory capacity to the Superintendent regarding all professional development programs undertaken by the district, including but not limited to, the scheduling and content of professional development days, the creation of the district professional development plan, and the establishment of the professional development budget."

   B. Although the district PD committee endeavors to meet its responsibilities under the contract, it has an inefficient and unclear organizational structure and there are few resources for PD, including inadequate school-based and job-embedded common planning and meeting time. The result is PD that is "scattered."

      1. Members of the PD committee said that limited financial resources often prevented them from providing the range and type of PD services and programming needed.

      2. The district PD calendar currently includes five full PD days and four early release days. Interviewees said that three of the five full PD days are scheduled in August and are used for a variety of orientation purposes not directly related to district PD goals. And because of staggered dismissal times and related logistical issues, it is not practical for teachers to meet with staff from other schools on the four early release days, precluding opportunities for vertical articulation, all-staff meetings, and curriculum coordination.

      3. Teachers said that daily or regularly scheduled common planning/meeting time was not provided for staff in the elementary, middle, or high schools. Because connected, frequent, and ongoing PD opportunities are not embedded in school master schedules or in the district calendar, interviewees said that it was very difficult for teachers to meet regularly and engage with their colleagues in meaningful, productive, and sustained grade level or departmental collaborations. This was reflected in data from the 2012 TELL Mass survey in which 52 percent of Easthampton teachers who responded to the survey indicated that they did not have time available to collaborate with colleagues.

      4. Teachers at all levels said that PD programming appeared disconnected and disjointed without focus or a long-term commitment to mastery. They described PD as "scattered" with little follow-up, said that things often "get dropped," and expressed the desire to "finish what we started."

5. Although teachers representing all the district's schools serve as members of the district's PD committee and receive stipends for doing so, their specific responsibilities in determining, designing, and delivering PD programs and services are unclear. Teachers said that they did not have a written description or clear and consistent understanding of their role as committee members. In focus groups teachers expressed the opinion that teachers seemed to have little input into PD and said that they "do not know who is driving PD." This was confirmed by data from the 2012 TELL Mass survey in which 73 percent of Easthampton teachers who responded to the survey reported having a small or no role in determining the content of in-service PD programs.

6. Teachers also identified ineffective communication as a concern with PD programming, indicating that information about PD schedules, assignments, and activities was not provided in a timely manner. The absence of a comprehensive PD Plan for the 2012-2013 school year exacerbated these concerns. In the 2012 TELL Mass survey 48 percent of district staff members who responded to the survey disagreed with the statement that PD was evaluated and that results were communicated to teachers.

7. The professional development committee meets formally only twice each year, in the early fall and late spring. Because the committee does not meet regularly, committee members are unable to participate actively in planning, organizing, or coordinating PD activities, nor can they monitor and evaluate programs in a timely manner. As a result, as administrators told the review team, most of this work is actually done by the district's PD coordinator.

8. Although each school in the district has representatives who serve on the PD committee, they serve without formal requirements, mechanisms, or consistent expectations for communicating the goals or facilitating the specific objectives of the district's PD program within their individual schools.

Impact: The district currently has limited capacity to provide the structures and sustained programs needed to facilitate the professional growth of educators. Because its capacity to significantly improve staff's professional competencies and practices is limited, the PD program cannot systematically and effectively advance the district's educational priorities and improve students' educational opportunities and academic achievement.

Student Support

9. **The district does not have an effective K-12 system of tiered academic and behavioral supports to make sure that student needs are diagnosed and addressed.**

   A. District leaders said that staff did not have an understanding of specifically designed curriculum or researched instructional practices to meet the diverse learning needs of students.

   1. In classroom observations the review team found clear and consistent evidence of the use of appropriate and varied strategies matched to learning objectives and content in only 35 percent of observed classes across grades. Similarly, the use of appropriate and varied strategies to meet diverse learning needs was clearly and consistently implemented in only 31 percent of observed classrooms.

2. Interviewees differed in their descriptions of what constituted tiered support in the district. In a focus group at the high school, teachers did not identify any research-based instructional practice as an appropriate Tier I intervention. Other interviewees said that Tier I behavior supports were positive behavior reinforcement or the CPR/Developmental Design program offered at the middle school. One interviewee described Tier II as additional supports from specialists and pullout programs such as the middle school SHAPE program. Other interviewees described Tier II behavior supports as support groups and weekly meetings with the school adjustment counselor, and other behavior modification programs. Tier III was characterized as behavior programs.

3. Staff who responded to the 2012 TELL Mass survey reported having fewer than 10 hours of professional development in the past two years in the following areas: differentiating instruction (59 percent of respondents); using data to drive instructional decision making (50 percent of respondents); teaching students with disabilities (87 percent of respondents); teaching gifted and talented students (95 percent of respondents); teaching English language learners (70 percent of respondents); and methods of teaching (54 percent of respondents).

4. Interviewees pointed to Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS/Mathematics) as the only technology-assisted instructional program identified by the district to support specifically designed or differentiated instruction.

B. District administrators said that without knowledge of how tiered instruction might function in the district, teachers tend to refer students for special education services. They said that 23 percent of students in the district had been identified for special education. According to ESE data, students with disabilities represented 21 percent of the district's enrollment in 2011-2012 and 19 percent in 2012-2013, compared to 17 percent both years statewide; these figures did not include students attending out-of-district programs.

1. The Report on Current Status of Inclusion produced by the director of special education states that of those receiving special education services, 30 percent receive instruction in inclusionary settings. According to 2011-2012 ESE data, 65.5 percent of students with IEPs were served in full inclusion and 19.1 percent in partial inclusion.

2. The Report also states that the district does not have commonly shared understandings of inclusion, effective instructional practices, differentiation, and co-teaching to support a range of learners.

3. A district administrator said that there was a need to "set up an environment that says all students can learn."

Impact: Without clearly defined and understood tiered systems of support and the appropriate accompanying professional development, teachers are unable to provide tiered academic and behavioral interventions and supports for all learners. As a result, students do not have consistent access to programs and services to meet the range of their academic and behavioral needs.

Financial and Asset Management

10. While the district's budget process yields a document that provides some useful information to decision makers, including high-level summary explanation of its vision and goals, enrollment and financial data, and historical analysis, those decision makers expressed a need for more detail in a more understandable format.

A. School committee members told the review team that they would like budget information to be provided to them in "different, easier to understand ways" and that they were asking the superintendent for more information.

1. The fiscal year 2014 budget document includes useful detail, including an overview of the budget proposal, data (both historical and current) and some supporting explanation of enrollment, revenues, and expenditures. However, it does not have some attributes conducive to making sound budget decisions and obtaining solid support for the budget:

   a. The budget document does not include several types of information commonly accepted as standard practice, including staffing data, an organizational chart, and a budget calendar.

   b. Expenditures are organized according to the ESE Chart of Accounts. It is a common approach to organize financial data in this way for accounting and compliance purposes, but it is not as well-suited to making budget decisions, where organization by goal/objective, school, and/or program is preferable.

   c. Some high level narrative is included, and some explanation of revenues and expenditures (i.e. choice and charter details). The document clearly states that the district is presenting a level services budget, where additional costs are built in to support the same level of staffing and services as the previous year, and describes the broad potential consequences of *level funding*, where service cuts would need to be made, as they were in fiscal years 2012 and 2013. However, the budget document does not have more specific justification of budget increases and decreases by area of spending in the expenditure detail.

Impact: The budget document is a primary vehicle for communicating district goals, and the resource plan to achieve them, to the public. When it lacks sufficient detail, not only is district leadership operating without all the information needed to make optimal budget decisions (especially critical in a district like Easthampton where there have been budget cuts in recent years), but also district leadership has a more difficult time garnering support for the resource decisions needed to support student improvement goals.

Easthampton Public Schools District Review Recommendations

The priorities identified by the review team at the time of its site visit and embodied in the recommendations that follow may no longer be current, and the district may have identified new priorities in line with its current needs.

Leadership and Governance

1. **The superintendent should take steps to further improve communication with her leadership team and with the school committee.**

    A. The superintendent should make sure that in meeting with her leadership team she articulates the process for making the decision on particular issues, and that she follows up soon afterward, if the team was not all involved at the end of the process, to inform the team and explain the decision.

    B. School committee members should receive well in advance of a meeting the pertinent information both about decisions made by district administrators that are likely to lead to public discussion and about decisions the committee will be required to make. As well as having ample information in advance, the school committee should have ample time to deliberate publicly before a required vote.

Benefits:

- When administrators know the process by which a decision is to be made and understand the basis for the decision, the decision will receive more support from them and it will be more likely that they feel that their input has been considered.

- When the school committee has ample information sufficiently in advance of when it is needed and has ample time to deliberate, the quality of the committee's decisions and the quality of the committee's communication with the public will be improved.

Curriculum and Instruction

2. **To ensure consistent implementation of effective instructional practices at all levels, the review team recommends**

    - **the development of common understanding of effective instruction;**

    - **the strengthening of instructional leadership;**

    - **increased high-quality supervision and feedback;**

    - **more structured opportunities for teachers to plan, share and reflect on instruction; and**

    - **professional development targeted at improving instructional practice districtwide.**

A. District leaders should consider the assistance of the Berkshire District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) to help create a strategic plan for targeted instructional improvement; such a plan will help create common understanding districtwide of what effective instruction looks like.

B. The district should consider providing opportunities for district leaders, principals, assistant principals, the math specialist, high school department chairs, and middle and elementary level team leaders to do shared observations across the district to align effective instructional practices districtwide.

C. The district should enhance the instructional leadership role of principals and assistant principals.

1. Principals and assistant principals might identify and share exemplars of effective instructional practices that are already in place in the district.

2. Principals at all levels might encourage teachers to participate in peer observations of targeted instructional practices to align instruction across the district.

D. The district should take the steps necessary to provide common planning time at all levels to allow time for teachers to plan, share, and reflect on instruction.

E. Professional development should address instructional strategies that meet the needs of all learners, techniques to check for understanding, and collaborative and student-centered learning.

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 of the Guide, *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 a Standards-Based Mathematics Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/mathclass_char.doc) and *An Effective Standards-Based Science and Technology/Engineering Classroom* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/scitechclass_char.pdf) are references for mathematics and science and technology/engineering 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.

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

Benefits: By developing a common understanding of effective instructional practices, the district will address the variation in practices that currently exists across the district. With strong instructional leadership districtwide, the district can monitor targeted instructional practices and give teachers constructive feedback on instruction. When teachers have opportunities during the school day to observe their peers and to plan and share effective instructional practices, instructional coherence across the district is more likely to take place. These steps will lead to higher quality teaching and learning.

Assessment

3. **The district should develop a complete assessment system to drive the improvement of student achievement.**

    A. To create a powerful system for collection and dissemination of data, the district should develop a comprehensive set of benchmark assessments.

        1. DSAC staff can provide background and guidance around developing benchmark assessments.

        2. Teachers should have time during the school day to develop these instruments and, once they are developed, to analyze the resulting data and discuss the use of the data to modify instruction. The district should take the steps necessary to adjust teacher schedules across the district to accommodate common planning time.

    B. With periodic data on student progress in hand, administrators and teachers should increase their capacity to analyze the data.

        1. The district should provide professional development to all staff on data analysis.

        2. District and school administrators should model the importance of data analysis through meetings about data with the faculty as a whole, with grade-level teams and departments, and with individual teachers.

        3. The district should ensure that in addition to a district data team every school has a data team. District and school data teams should provide the lead for staff by analyzing and communicating some of the larger issues revealed by the data.

    C. Instructional decisions at the district, school, and classroom levels should be made on the basis of data analysis.

Recommended resources:

- 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.

- *Professional Learning Communities Guidance* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/PLCguidance.pdf) and *Professional Learning Communities Stages at a Glance* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/PLCstages.pdf) are reference tools to frame the work of developing and strengthening instructional teams at the school level.

Benefits:

- Teachers will have access to information about their students' strengths and needs.

- Administrators will have knowledge of student progress at the district, school, and classroom levels.

- Administrators and teachers will be equipped to make data-based decisions to improve student achievement.

- Administrators and teachers will have data to help evaluate the results of previous programmatic and instructional decisions.

Human Resources and Professional Development

4. **The district should increase the time available for professional development; improve the functioning of the professional development committee and make it more collaborative; and make sure that professional development is sustained, focused on district priorities and needs, and evaluated.**

   The development of a broad knowledge base and deep understanding of research-based practices and educational initiatives requires a long-term prioritization of time and resources.

Time for professional development

   A. Substantially more time for collaboration and ongoing PD should be embedded within the district calendar and school master schedules.

      1. The district should consider whether it is making optimal use of the five full PD days, with three of the five at the time of the review team's visit scheduled in August and used for orientation.

      2. Adequate, regular common planning time should be scheduled for all grade levels and subject areas.

      3. The district should investigate ways to eliminate the logistical difficulties hindering teachers from meeting with staff from other schools on early release days.

         a. It should consider replacing its current early release day PD schedule with a "delayed opening" model, which might be a way to eliminate most of the current logistical difficulties and create greatly expanded opportunities for teachers from across the district to meet and collaborate both vertically and horizontally.

Professional development committee

   B. In place of the present practice of meeting only twice a year, the district's PD committee should meet regularly throughout the school year. This would enable the entire committee to plan, coordinate, and evaluate PD programming in a much more direct and timely manner, making the process a truly collaborative endeavor for teachers and administrators.

C. The role of teachers who serve on the PD committee should be clearly defined and should be expanded to include specific responsibilities within the individual school they represent. For example, if all of the teacher representatives on the PD committee present PD information and updates at faculty meetings and meet regularly with school principals, PD plans and goals will be better communicated and coordinated, and the committee will have a better means of receiving input from teachers and from the school level.

Content of professional development

D. PD should be focused on well-defined district priorities and sustained enough to accomplish them; it should also be sufficiently flexible and differentiated to accommodate the varied needs, responsibilities, and expertise of the professional staff.

1. The implementation of skills and strategies learned through PD should be monitored and PD should be evaluated, with broad communication of the results of the evaluation.

2. In evaluating the effectiveness of PD, the district should make use of information gained from the new educator evaluation system.

E. The district is encouraged to provide teachers and administrators with the ongoing PD needed to properly support the implementation of the new evaluation system, including the implementation in 2014-2015 of appropriate and comprehensive district-determined common assessments to reliably inform ratings of educator impact (Student Impact Ratings), in addition to accurately determining the academic achievement and progress of all students.

Involvement of exemplary staff in instructional leadership

F. Under the new educator evaluation regulations, "Educators whose summative performance rating is exemplary and whose impact on student learning is rated moderate or high shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement." 603 CMR 35.08(7). The district is encouraged to support teacher growth by creating or expanding opportunities for exemplary staff to be assigned responsibilities for instructional leadership, such as modeling best classroom practice and serving as data coaches, as mentors, and as trainers/facilitators to support the new educator evaluation system.

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.

- *Issue Brief: Collaborative Planning in Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time (ELT) Schools* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2013-06ELTcollabplanning.pdf) describes key themes identified by schools about the implementation of common planning time, including scheduling common planning time, determining groupings of teachers, and ways to make common planning time useful.

- ESE's *Mathematics Learning Community* materials (http://www.doe.mass.edu/STEM/mlc/default.html) are designed to support job-embedded professional development for K-8 mathematics teachers. Their focus is to develop teachers' content knowledge through examining students' work in professional learning communities.

- The *Teacher Education Materials Project Database* (http://www.te-mat.org/default.aspx) is a website that was developed to support professional development providers as they design and implement programs for pre-service and in-service K - 12 mathematics and science teachers.

- *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.

- *Quick Reference Guide: District-Determined Measures* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/QRG-Measures.pdf) provides an overview of district-determined measures (DDMs), including the role of DDMs, an implementation timeline, suggested district planning activities, and supports provided by ESE.

Benefits: Increasing the time available for professional development, improving the planning and coordination of professional development and making it more collaborative, tying professional development to district priorities and staff needs, and evaluating the professional development provided will all help accelerate the improvement of professional practice throughout the district, increasing student learning.

Student Support

5. **The district should redesign and strengthen its system of tiered supports, aligning it more closely to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Tiered System of Support model.**

   A. The district should implement the theory of action stated in the Easthampton Public Schools Strategic Plan (2011-2014): "If we effectively use resources, promote teacher excellence, align district curriculum, utilize diverse instructional strategies, and monitor student progress then we will dramatically improve student achievement and close the achievement gap."

   B. In redesigning its tiered supports, the district and the working group recommended below should examine the model for tiered supports made available by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE). The Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) provides a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures, and supports in the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

   C. The district leadership should identify a working group representative of key stakeholders, including central office administrators, school principals, teacher leaders, ELL and Title I teachers, pupil personnel staff, and parents/guardians, to conduct an assessment of current practice with respect to tiered instruction and design a more comprehensive continuum of supports.

      1. In its strategic planning process, the district should include a goal to implement the vision for a tiered system created by the working group and develop an action plan to accomplish the goal. The plan should

cover the development, evaluation, and refinement of tiered supports; it should include specific activities, timelines, persons responsible, and metrics to measure the success of the action plan. As it has in the past (see Leadership and Governance Strength finding), the district should make sure that school goals and plans are aligned with this district initiative.

2. The district should make sure that in planning professional development, the professional development committee plans for the professional development needed for staff to implement the new system of tiered supports effectively (see previous recommendation).

3. The district should make sure that its expectations for a K-12 tiered system of supports are communicated to all stakeholders.

D. The district should examine the reason for the apparent discrepancies between the percentage of students with disabilities served in inclusionary settings determined by the Report on Current Status of Inclusion and the percentages published by ESE using district-reported data (see Student Support finding, #9.B.1). As the district improves its capacity to serve students with disabilities in the general education classroom, consideration should be given to whether more students with disabilities should be in inclusionary settings.

E. The district should avail itself of ESE resources and support to inform the redesign and development of a program of tiered supports with attention to the Behavioral Health and Public Schools Framework.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Blueprint* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/blueprint/) is a tool 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. The *MTSS Self-Assessment* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/sa/) accompanies the MTSS blueprint for schools/districts to use to assess their current status in each of the core components.

- The *Behavioral Health and Public Schools Framework* (http://bhps321.org/viewframework.asp) is a guidance document to help schools establish supportive environments with collaborative services that will enable all students – including those with behavioral health needs – to achieve at their highest potential.

- *Addressing Students' Social, Emotional, and Health Needs* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/StudentsNeeds.pdf) provides guidance and promising practices to help schools create a safe school environment and make effective use of a system for addressing the social, emotional, and health needs of its students that reflects the behavioral health and public schools framework.

Benefits: Implementing these recommendations will help the district:

- Build structures that promote staff effectiveness and a collaborative environment that is responsive to the needs of students and families;

- Strengthen its ongoing initiatives to create appropriate assessments and expand its system of support for students;

- Provide students with equitable access to a continuum of programming and services; and

- Better prepare students for success in college and career.

Financial and Asset Management

6. **The district should add information to its budget document and organize it in ways that aid in making budget decisions.**

    A. The budget document is the tool that defines the financial condition of the school district. The district should add information to the current document, including, but not limited to: staffing data, an organizational chart, and a budget calendar, and specific justification of budget increases and decreases by area of spending in the expenditure detail. To make the budget document more useful in making budget decisions, the district should also organize expenditures by goal/objective, school, and/or program.

    B. The school committee, superintendent, business manager, and principals should review the current budget document to determine the best format for a comprehensive, transparent, and site-based budget that will facilitate informed budget decisions. Details that they would consider helpful can be included in the budget document itself or provided as supplemental materials.

        1. Several school districts in Massachusetts have been awarded the Association of School Business Officials (ASBO) Meritorious Budget Award. These budgets could be used as models for developing a comprehensive and transparent budget. See http://www.asbointl.org/learning-career-development/awards-scholarships/meritorious-budget-award-pathway-to-the-mba-/recipients

Recommended resource:

- *Smart School Budgeting* (http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf) is The Rennie Center's summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.

Benefits: The Easthampton Public Schools will have a budget document that is clear and includes a level of detail that helps stakeholders understand district resource decisions and participate in budget discussions.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from June 10-13, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Magdalene Giffune, leadership and governance

2. Suzanne Kelly, curriculum and instruction

3. Patricia Williams, assessment, review team coordinator

4. Dr. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development

5. Dr. Marilynne Smith Quarcoo, student support

6. Dr. Joel Lovering, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

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

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, director of curriculum, director of special education, business manager, and technology coordinator.

The team visited the following schools: Center Elementary (K-4), Maple Elementary (PK-4), Pepin Elementary (K-4), White Brook Middle School (grades 5-8), and Easthampton High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted 3 focus groups with 3 elementary school teachers,5 middle school teachers, and 13 high school teachers. The team observed classes in the district: 15 at the high school, 15 at the middle school, and 24 at the 3 elementary schools.

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

o Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.

o Data on the district's staffing and finances.

o 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).

o 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.

o All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 06/10/2013	Tuesday 06/11/2013	Wednesday 06/12/2013	Thursday 06/13/2013
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; document reviews; interview with teachers' association.	Interviews with district staff, principals, and teachers; teacher and student focus groups; parent focus group; and visits to Pepin Elementary and Easthampton High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to the Maple and Pepin elementary schools and Easthampton High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to White Brook Middle School and the Center School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Expenditures, Performance

Table B1a: Easthampton Public Schools
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Asian	69	4.3%	56,517	5.9%
Afr. Amer./Black	28	1.8%	81,806	8.6%
Hispanic/ Latino	124	7.8%	156,976	16.4%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp. /Lat.	6	0.4%	26,012	2.7%
Nat. Haw. Or Pacif. Isl.	--	--	1,020	0.1%
White	1,366	85.8%	630,150	66.0%
All students	**1,593**	**100.0%**	**954,773**	**100.0%**

Note: As of October 1, 2012

Table B1b: Easthampton Public Schools
2012-2013 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations

Student Group	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	306	42.9%	18.8%	163,921	35.5%	17.0%
Low income	521	73.1%	32.7%	353,420	76.5%	37.0%
ELL and Former ELL	49	6.9%	3.1%	95,865	20.7%	10.0%
All high needs students	713	--	43.9%	**462,272**	--	**47.9%**

Notes: As of October 1, 2012. 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 1,624; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 965,602.

Table B2: Easthampton Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013

	FY11		FY12		FY13
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated
Expenditures					
From local appropriations for schools:					
By school committee	14,682,726	15,110,438	14,718,000	14,610,348	14,956,891
By municipality	5,226,251	4,804,358	5,265,097	5,164,132	5,383,290
Total from local appropriations	19,908,977	19,914,796	19,983,097	19,774,480	20,340,181
From revolving funds and grants	---	3,363,032	---	2,010,307	---
Total expenditures	---	23,277,828	---	21,784,787	---
Chapter 70 aid to education program					
Chapter 70 state aid*	---	7,528,257	---	7,568,672	7,641,192
Required local contribution	---	9,949,274	---	10,194,026	10,521,254
Required net school spending**	---	17,477,531	---	17,762,698	18,162,446
Actual net school spending	---	18,578,991	---	18,473,318	18,780,635
Over/under required ($)	---	1,101,460	---	710,620	618,189
Over/under required (%)	---	6.3	---	4.0	3.4

*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 April 14, 2014

Table B3: Easthampton Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2010–2012

Expenditure Category	2010	2011	2012
Administration	$507.57	$479.16	$506.49
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$650.36	$705.22	$623.10
Teachers	$4,955.52	$5,177.82	$4,926.78
Other teaching services	$685.81	$851.09	$698.85
Professional development	$42.53	$122.02	$27.06
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$281.77	$249.34	$149.79
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$447.73	$452.84	$532.00
Pupil services	$625.68	$1,130.45	$682.11
Operations and maintenance	$989.04	$1,066.95	$897.44
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$2,033.54	$2,197.11	$2,104.81
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$11,220	$12,432	$11,148

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

Table B4a: Easthampton Public Schools
English Language Arts Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	124	81.3	84.3	79.9	87.5	6.2	7.6	Yes	Moderate
	P+	124	49%	57%	52%	64%	15	12		--
4	CPI	116	77.3	80.9	78.7	77.6	0.3	-1.1	--	Low
	P+	116	43%	47%	49%	51%	8	2		--
	SGP	106	55.0	58.0	54.0	59.0	4.0	5.0		Moderate
5	CPI	144	79.8	81.9	76.8	78.8	-1.0	2.0	--	Very Low
	P+	144	51%	53%	48%	49%	-2	1		--
	SGP	130	25.5	45.0	28.0	41.0	15.5	13.0		Moderate
6	CPI	122	82.1	81.3	86.0	78.9	-3.2	-7.1	--	Very Low
	P+	122	56%	57%	67%	54%	-2	-13		--
	SGP	111	37.0	35.0	41.0	49.0	12.0	8.0		Moderate
7	CPI	117	83.5	89.9	85.0	83.3	-0.2	-1.7	Yes	Very Low
	P+	117	55%	72%	65%	57%	2	-8		--
	SGP	107	40.0	53.0	47.0	29.0	-11.0	-18.0		Low
8	CPI	123	89.0	91.3	94.6	90.9	1.9	-3.7	--	Low
	P+	123	70%	74%	84%	80%	10	-4		--
	SGP	115	43.5	53.5	57.0	53.0	9.5	-4.0		Moderate
10	CPI	112	90.0	88.3	89.3	94.6	4.6	5.3	Yes	Very Low
	P+	112	74%	69%	74%	84%	10	10		--
	SGP	100	40.0	35.0	46.0	37.5	-2.5	-8.5		Low
All	**CPI**	**858**	**83.2**	**85.4**	**84.1**	**84.3**	**1.1**	**0.2**	**--**	**Very Low**
	P+	**858**	**57%**	**61%**	**62%**	**62%**	**5**	**0**		**--**
	SGP	**669**	**41.0**	**45.0**	**46.0**	**46.0**	**5.0**	**0.0**		**Moderate**

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 8 in the Student Performance section above. The "2012 Performance" column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Table B4b: Easthampton Public Schools
Mathematics Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI, SGP)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
3	CPI	125	81.9	80.4	83.9	84.0	2.1	0.1	--	Moderate
	P+	125	54%	59%	57%	64%	10	7		--
4	CPI	116	85.3	87.0	85.1	82.1	-3.2	-3	Yes	Moderate
	P+	116	56%	57%	57%	55%	-1	-2		--
	SGP	107	73.0	72.0	74.0	60.0	-13.0	-14.0		Moderate
5	CPI	145	71.1	67.7	68.9	64.3	-6.8	-4.6	Yes	Very Low
	P+	145	35%	37%	42%	31%	-4	-11		--
	SGP	130	30.0	19.0	15.0	10.0	-20.0	-5.0		Very Low
6	CPI	122	78.1	73.0	74.8	73.2	-4.9	-1.6	Yes	Very Low
	P+	122	55%	45%	46%	43%	-12	-3		--
	SGP	110	51.0	33.5	41.0	36.0	-15.0	-5.0		Low
7	CPI	117	67.5	77.6	62.3	66.9	-0.6	4.6	Yes	Very Low
	P+	117	37%	51%	31%	36%	-1	5		--
	SGP	107	57.0	51.0	38.0	49.0	-8.0	11.0		Moderate
8	CPI	122	73.0	69.0	77.2	73.2	0.2	-4.0	--	Low
	P+	122	44%	42%	55%	43%	-1	-12		--
	SGP	114	63.0	46.0	61.0	57.5	-5.5	-3.5		Moderate
10	CPI	112	84.0	78.1	83.5	84.8	0.8	1.3	Yes	Very Low
	P+	112	66%	58%	66%	70%	4	4		--
	SGP	99	24.0	27.0	30.5	37.0	13.0	6.5		Low
All	CPI	859	77.1	76.0	76.4	75.1	-2.0	-1.3	--	Very Low
	P+	859	49%	50%	50%	48%	-1	-2		--
	SGP	667	52.5	40.0	44.0	41.0	-11.5	-3.0		Moderate

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 8 in the Student Performance section above. The "2012 Performance" column also gives the level of the median SGP. Median SGPs from 0 to 20 are considered to be Very Low; from 21 to 40, Low; from 41 to 60, Moderate; from 61 to 80, High; and from 81 to 100, Very High.

Table B4c: Easthampton Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2009-2012

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines			2012 Performance (CPI)
			2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend	Potentially Meaningful?	
5	CPI	145	72.0	72.2	77.0	71.4	-0.6	-5.6	--	Very Low
	P+	145	32%	35%	49%	35%	3	-14		--
8	CPI	122	68.3	66.3	72.8	67.4	-0.9	-5.4	--	Low
	P+	122	30%	29%	34%	34%	4	0		--
10	CPI	106	86.3	84.4	84.1	83.7	-2.6	-0.4	Yes	Very Low
	P+	106	66%	69%	65%	60%	-6	-5		--
All	**CPI**	**373**	**74.9**	**73.6**	**77.6**	**73.6**	**-1.3**	**-4.0**	--	**Very Low**
	P+	**373**	**41%**	**43%**	**48%**	**42%**	**1**	**-6**		**--**

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in STE MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. The "2012 Performance" column shows the quintile into which the CPI for the grade (or all grades) falls in a ranking of all Massachusetts districts' CPIs for that grade (or all grades). See footnote 8 in the Student Performance section above.

Table B5a: Easthampton Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
								4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
				2009	2010	2011	2012		
High needs	District	CPI	407	73.8	76.5	73.0	75.0	1.2	2
		P+	407	37%	43%	40%	43%	6	3
		SGP	292	38.5	46.0	42.0	47.0	8.5	5
	State	CPI	235,216	75.3	76.1	77.0	76.5	1.2	-0.5
		P+	235,216	44%	45%	48%	48%	4	0
		SGP	177,719	45.0	45.0	46.0	46.0	1	0
Low income	District	CPI	310	76.8	78.6	76.8	76.6	-0.2	-0.2
		P+	310	43%	48%	47%	48%	5	1
		SGP	231	40.0	46.0	40.0	46.0	6.0	6.0
	State	CPI	180,261	75.5	76.5	77.1	76.7	1.2	-0.4
		P+	180,261	45%	47%	49%	50%	5	1
		SGP	137,185	45.0	46.0	46.0	45.0	0.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	197	63.6	65.4	56.7	63.6	0.0	6.9
		P+	197	16%	19%	11%	21%	5	10
		SGP	134	31.5	45.0	42.0	47.5	16.0	5.5
	State	CPI	91,757	67.8	67.3	68.3	67.3	-0.5	-1.0
		P+	91,757	28%	28%	30%	31%	3	1
		SGP	66,785	40.0	41.0	42.0	43.0	3.0	1.0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	36	75.8	78.6	63.7	64.6	-11.2	0.9
		P+	36	39%	40%	26%	28%	-11	2
		SGP	21	0.0	0.0	16.0	57.0	57.0	41.0
	State	CPI	45,367	64.8	66.1	66.2	66.2	1.4	0.0
		P+	45,367	30%	32%	33%	34%	4	1
		SGP	29,933	51.0	51.0	50.0	51.0	0.0	1.0
All students	**District**	**CPI**	**858**	**83.2**	**85.4**	**84.1**	**84.3**	**1.1**	**0.2**
		P+	**858**	**57%**	**61%**	**62%**	**62%**	**5**	**0**
		SGP	**669**	**41.0**	**45.0**	**46.0**	**46.0**	**5.0**	**0.0**
	State	**CPI**	**497,549**	**86.5**	**86.9**	**87.2**	**86.7**	**0.2**	**-0.5**
		P+	**497,549**	**67%**	**68%**	**69%**	**69%**	**2**	**0**
		SGP	**395,772**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**50.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B5b: Easthampton Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	409	67.6	64.6	64.2	64.4	-3.2	0.2
		P+	409	31%	30%	30%	31%	0	1
		SGP	292	47.0	37.0	39.0	46.0	-1.0	7.0
	State	CPI	235,552	64.5	66.7	67.1	67.0	2.5	-0.1
		P+	235,552	32%	36%	37%	37%	5	0
		SGP	178,144	45.0	46.0	46.0	46.0	1.0	0.0
Low income	District	CPI	312	70.5	66.3	68.0	66.1	-4.4	-1.9
		P+	312	38%	35%	34%	34%	-4	0
		SGP	231	46.5	37.0	41.5	46.0	-0.5	4.5
	State	CPI	180,433	64.5	67.1	67.3	67.3	2.8	0.0
		P+	180,433	33%	37%	38%	38%	5	0
		SGP	137,529	44.0	47.0	46.0	45.0	1.0	-1.0
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	197	58.6	53.0	49.0	51.3	-7.3	2.3
		P+	197	12%	13%	11%	17%	5	6
		SGP	132	47.0	23.0	31.5	30.5	-16.5	-1.0
	State	CPI	91,876	56.9	57.5	57.7	56.9	0.0	-0.8
		P+	91,876	20%	21%	22%	21%	1	-1
		SGP	66,876	43.0	43.0	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	36	73.5	60.7	65.9	65.3	-8.2	-0.6
		P+	36	42%	29%	30%	33%	-9	3
		SGP	22	0.0	70.0	41.0	60.0	60.0	19.0
	State	CPI	45,695	59.2	61.5	62.0	61.6	2.4	-0.4
		P+	45,695	29%	31%	32%	32%	3	0
		SGP	30,189	49.0	54.0	52.0	52.0	3.0	0.0
All students	District	CPI	859	77.1	76.0	76.4	75.1	-2.0	-1.3
		P+	859	49%	50%	50%	48%	-1	-2
		SGP	667	52.5	40.0	44.0	41.0	-11.5	-3.0
	State	CPI	497,984	78.5	79.9	79.9	79.9	1.4	0.0
		P+	497,984	56%	58%	58%	59%	3	1
		SGP	396,357	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculation. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B5c: Easthampton Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2009-2012

Group and Measure			Number Included (2012)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2009	2010	2011	2012	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High needs	District	CPI	174	66.1	62.9	65.8	61.5	-4.6	-4.3
		P+	174	25%	27%	28%	23%	-2	-5
	State	CPI	96,996	62.1	64.3	63.8	65.0	2.9	1.2
		P+	96,996	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Low income	District	CPI	134	68.4	64.9	69.4	60.6	-7.8	-8.8
		P+	134	32%	30%	34%	22%	-10	-12
	State	CPI	74,300	61.1	63.6	62.8	64.5	3.4	1.7
		P+	74,300	25%	28%	28%	31%	6	3
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	88	54.5	54.9	52.8	55.1	0.6	2.3
		P+	88	7%	18%	6%	17%	10	11
	State	CPI	38,590	58.1	59.0	59.2	58.7	0.6	-0.5
		P+	38,590	18%	19%	20%	20%	2	0
English language learners & Former ELL	District	CPI	11	0.0	43.8	0.0	59.1	59.1	59.1
		P+	11	0%	0%	0%	27%	27	27
	State	CPI	15,271	50.8	51.8	50.3	51.4	0.6	1.1
		P+	15,271	15%	16%	15%	17%	2	2
All students	**District**	**CPI**	**373**	**74.9**	**73.6**	**77.6**	**73.6**	**-1.3**	**-4.0**
		P+	**373**	**41%**	**43%**	**48%**	**42%**	**1**	**-6**
	State	**CPI**	**211,464**	**76.8**	**78.3**	**77.6**	**78.6**	**1.8**	**1.0**
		P+	**211,464**	**50%**	**52%**	**52%**	**54%**	**4**	**2**

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for STE. State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

Table B6: Easthampton Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2009-2012

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**Percentage Points**	**Percent**	**Percentage Points**	**Percent**	
All students	2.0%	2.9%	2.9%	1.6%	-0.4	-21.5%	-1.3	-45.9%	2.5%

Notes: The annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Dropouts are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a GED by the following October 1. Dropout rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B7a: Easthampton Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	58	73.0%	62.5%	61.5%	77.6%	4.6	6.3%	16.1	26.2%	74.1%
Low income	46	71.4%	61.9%	58.8%	73.9%	2.5	3.5%	15.1	25.7%	72.4%
Students w/ disabilities	24	56.7%	50.0%	42.9%	79.2%	22.5	39.7%	36.3	84.6%	68.6%
English language learners (ELL) & Former ELL	--	--	--	66.7%	--	--	--	--	--	61.1%
All students	**111**	**80.5%**	**81.1%**	**74.4%**	**84.7%**	**4.2**	**5.2%**	**10.3**	**13.8%**	**84.7%**

Notes: The four-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in four years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year four years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B7b: Easthampton Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2008-2011

Group	Number Included (2011)	School Year Ending				Change 2008-2011		Change 2010-2011		State (2011)
		2008	2009	2010	2011	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
High needs	65	80.0%	75.7%	67.9%	73.8%	-6.2	-7.8%	5.9	8.7%	76.5%
Low income	51	86.2%	73.2%	69.0%	72.5%	-13.7	-15.9%	3.5	5.1%	75.0%
Students w/ disabilities	28	60.0%	63.3%	57.1%	53.6%	-6.4	-10.7%	-3.5	-6.1%	70.8%
English language learners (ELL) & Former ELL	6	--	--	--	66.7%	--	--	--	--	64.2%
All students	125	91.2%	81.8%	85.0%	80.8%	-10.4	-11.4%	-4.2	-4.9%	86.3%

Notes: The five-year cohort graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who graduate in five years or less by the number of students in the cohort entering their freshman year five years earlier, minus transfers out and plus transfers in. Non-graduates include students still enrolled in high school, students who earned a GED or received a certificate of attainment rather than a diploma, and students who dropped out. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers. Graduation rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B8: Easthampton Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2009-2012

	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All Students	94.4%	94.5%	95.4%	95.5%	1.1	1.2%	0.1	0.1%	94.9%

Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student's attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Table B9: Easthampton Public Schools
Suspension Rates, 2009-2012

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
	2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
In-School Suspension Rate	4.0%	5.5%	1.5%	6.0%	2.0	50.0%	4.5	300%	3.4%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	7.1%	6.4%	4.3%	5.0%	-2.1	-29.6%	0.7	16.3%	5.4%

Note: This table reflects information reported by school districts at the end of the school year indicated. Suspension rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	By Grade Span	Evidence			Overall results for all district schools		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent			
		(0)	**(1)**	**(2)**		**#**	**%**
1. Interactions between teacher & students & among students are positive & respectful.	**ES**	0%	25%	75%	**(0)**	1	2%
	MS	7%	33%	60%	**(1)**	11	20%
	HS	0%	0%	100%	**(2)**	42	78%
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated. Disruptions, if present, are managed effectively & equitably.	**ES**	8%	21%	71%	**(0)**	2	4%
	MS	0%	40%	60%	**(1)**	13	24%
	HS	0%	13%	87%	**(2)**	39	72%
3. Classroom procedures are established & maintained to create a safe physical environment & promote smooth transitions among all classroom activities.	**ES**	4%	29%	67%	**(0)**	4	7%
	MS	20%	13%	67%	**(1)**	10	19%
	HS	0%	7%	93%	**(2)**	40	74%
4. Lesson reflects rigor & high expectations.	**ES**	17%	42%	42%	**(0)**	8	15%
	MS	27%	27%	47%	**(1)**	19	35%
	HS	0%	33%	67%	**(2)**	27	50%
5. Classroom rituals, routines & appropriate interactions create a safe intellectual environment in which students take academic risks & most behaviors that interfere with learning are prevented.	**ES**	13%	25%	63%	**(0)**	8	16%
	MS	50%	10%	40%	**(1)**	8	16%
	HS	0%	7%	93%	**(2)**	33	67%
6. Multiple resources are available to meet students' diverse learning needs.	**ES**	21%	21%	58%	**(0)**	15	28%
	MS	53%	20%	27%	**(1)**	13	24%
	HS	13%	33%	53%	**(2)**	26	48%
7. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment & provides all students with access to learning activities.	**ES**	4%	25%	71%	**(0)**	2	4%
	MS	7%	40%	53%	**(1)**	17	31%
	HS	0%	33%	67%	**(2)**	35	65%

Teaching	By Grade Span	Evidence None (0)	Partial (1)	Clear & Consistent (2)	Overall results for all district schools		
						#	%
8. Demonstrates knowledge of subject & content.	ES	13%	38%	50%	(0)	7	13%
	MS	20%	20%	60%	(1)	12	22%
	HS	7%	0%	93%	(2)	35	65%
9. Communicates clear grade-appropriate learning objectives aligned to state standards. Applicable ELL language objectives are evident.	ES	33%	17%	50%	(0)	15	28%
	MS	40%	7%	53%	(1)	8	15%
	HS	7%	20%	73%	(2)	31	57%
10. Uses appropriate & varied strategies matched to learning objectives & content.	ES	33%	33%	33%	(0)	16	30%
	MS	47%	13%	40%	(1)	19	35%
	HS	7%	60%	33%	(2)	19	35%
11. Requires inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, &/or evaluation of concepts individually, in pairs or in groups to demonstrate higher-order thinking. (circle observed skills)	ES	33%	38%	29%	(0)	14	26%
	MS	20%	33%	47%	(1)	17	31%
	HS	20%	20%	60%	(2)	23	43%
12. Uses varied questioning techniques that require/seek thoughtful responses & promote deeper understanding.	ES	29%	38%	33%	(0)	15	28%
	MS	33%	33%	33%	(1)	19	35%
	HS	20%	33%	47%	(2)	20	37%
13. Implements appropriate & varied strategies that meet students' diverse learning needs.	ES	42%	25%	33%	(0)	16	30%
	MS	13%	60%	27%	(1)	21	39%
	HS	27%	40%	33%	(2)	17	31%
14. Paces lesson to engage all students & promote understanding.	ES	8%	38%	54%	(0)	6	11%
	MS	20%	40%	40%	(1)	21	39%
	HS	7%	40%	53%	(2)	27	50%
15. Conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding & inform instruction.	ES	29%	42%	29%	(0)	15	28%
	MS	33%	40%	27%	(1)	21	39%
	HS	20%	33%	47%	(2)	18	33%
16. Makes use of technology to enhance learning.	ES	75%	17%	8%	(0)	27	50%
	MS	47%	27%	27%	(1)	12	22%
	HS	13%	27%	60%	(2)	15	28%

Learning	By Grade Span	Evidence			Overall results for all district schools		
		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent			
		(0)	(1)	(2)		#	%
17. Students are engaged in productive learning routines.	ES	13%	38%	50%	(0)	6	11%
	MS	20%	27%	53%	(1)	20	37%
	HS	0%	47%	53%	(2)	28	52%
18. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	17%	38%	46%	(0)	7	13%
	MS	20%	33%	47%	(1)	21	39%
	HS	0%	47%	53%	(2)	26	48%
19. Students assume responsibility for their own learning.	ES	25%	38%	38%	(0)	12	22%
	MS	20%	27%	53%	(1)	18	33%
	HS	20%	33%	47%	(2)	24	44%
20. Students articulate their thinking or reasoning verbally or in writing either individually, in pairs or in groups.	ES	38%	33%	29%	(0)	16	30%
	MS	27%	27%	47%	(1)	17	31%
	HS	20%	33%	47%	(2)	21	39%
21. Students' responses to questions elaborate about content & ideas (not expected for all responses).	ES	46%	42%	13%	(0)	19	35%
	MS	40%	20%	40%	(1)	19	35%
	HS	13%	40%	47%	(2)	16	30%
22. Students make connections to prior knowledge, real world experiences & other subject matter.	ES	29%	46%	25%	(0)	18	33%
	MS	47%	20%	33%	(1)	17	31%
	HS	27%	20%	53%	(2)	19	35%
23. Students use technology as a tool for learning &/or understanding.	ES	100%	0%	0%	(0)	42	78%
	MS	73%	7%	20%	(1)	4	7%
	HS	47%	20%	33%	(2)	8	15%
24. Student work demonstrates high quality & can serve as exemplars.	ES	54%	13%	33%	(0)	31	57%
	MS	73%	27%	0%	(1)	14	26%
	HS	47%	47%	7%	(2)	9	17%