

# Comprehensive District Review Report



Fairhaven Public Schools

Review conducted February 13–16, 2017

---

Office of District Reviews and Monitoring

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

## Organization of this Report

Executive Summary.....	1
Fairhaven Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Overview .....	5
Leadership and Governance .....	17
Curriculum and Instruction .....	21
Assessment .....	37
Human Resources and Professional Development.....	41
Student Support.....	49
Financial and Asset Management.....	55
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....	60
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....	62
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	72

## 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](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



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

Jeff Wulfson  
Acting Commissioner  
**Published August 2017**

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

© 2017 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper

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



## Executive Summary

---

For several years, the Fairhaven Public Schools' improvement agenda has prioritized establishing a positive school culture and climate as catalysts to improve academic achievement. The goal has been to establish common behavioral norms and expectations to build a respectful culture at each school, one that creates a climate conducive to the hard work of learning and teaching. This has also entailed affirming the belief on the part of all teachers that all students can learn at high levels, an effort that is ongoing. In addition, the district has increasingly integrated social-emotional learning into the school program. This is most noticeable at the elementary schools where teachers and leaders have adopted Responsive Classroom strategies into the rhythm of the school day. Each elementary school holds whole-school and classroom-based morning meetings each day and reinforces positive social-emotional behavior in lessons and in all aspects of school life.

At the same time, there has been tenuous oversight of a number of important systems and practices in the district. Curricular and instructional leadership are diffuse, curriculum is not fully documented, and alignment to standards is uneven. The district's vision of "powerful teaching and learning" has not been fully implemented, although reviewers noted a clear emphasis in the district to meet this goal.

### Strengths

District and school leaders, school committee members, and teachers have embraced a culture that fosters shared responsibility for student learning. This collective responsibility for student learning has been extended to town officials because of increased collaboration between district leaders and those who work in town government. The district's efforts to improve student achievement have also emphasized a positive school culture and climate.

School and district leaders have implemented several strategies to improve curriculum and instruction including changing schedules to enable teachers to plan together, participating in a reading grant program, and implementing a humanities program at the high school to create more synergy between the English and history departments.

The district is continuing to develop and expand the assessments used to measure student progress and provides time for teachers to review assessment results and to make changes to instruction to help struggling students. Professional development is school based, job embedded, and informed by assessment results. Common planning time and a multi-year mentoring program provide opportunities for teachers to grow professionally.

The district has implemented a consistent social-emotional support program at the elementary schools and has allocated resources across the district to support the social-emotional needs of all students.

Over the years, Fairhaven High School has enrolled many grade 8 students from neighboring Acushnet. The district has begun to formalize its relationship with the Acushnet schools by developing a tuition

agreement for Acushnet students attending Fairhaven High School. The agreement guarantees grade 8 students from Acushnet a seat at Fairhaven High School should they choose to attend and details the compensation that Acushnet provides to Fairhaven for educating its high-school students. At the time of the review in February 2017, Fairhaven and Acushnet were in the early stages of evaluating additional ways to consolidate their educational programs and services, such as the formation of a K–12 superintendency union or a 9–12 regional school district. (See the Financial and Asset Management Strength finding below.)<sup>1</sup>

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

The district does not have a comprehensive, actionable District Improvement Plan (DIP) with SMART goals.<sup>2</sup> Although the DIP and the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are linked and include achievement data, the documents have limited analysis of that data and generally do not use formative assessment results to measure progress toward goals.

The district does not have an aligned, complete curriculum or a shared instructional model of high-quality teaching. The district's science program has been limited for several years. In observed classrooms, the quality of instruction was generally stronger at the elementary and middle schools than at the high school. For example, a higher incidence of student engagement was observed at the elementary- and middle-school levels than at the high school; high-school students were not consistently challenged to use higher-order thinking skills.

While the district administers assessments at all levels and has allocated time for teachers to review how data should be used to modify instruction, it does not have a central data warehouse for teachers to store and access assessment results.

The district does not have a comprehensive, coordinated, and collaborative professional development program. Although the district has adopted an educator evaluation system that is closely aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework, it has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system.

While resources are allocated to support the social-emotional needs of students, the assessment of students' social-emotional needs and staff responses to those needs is not systematic across all schools. The district has not implemented a districtwide approach for addressing the needs of all struggling students across the district.

---

<sup>1</sup> In June 2017, Acushnet town meeting voters indefinitely postponed the formation of a committee to look into regionalization with Fairhaven. <http://www.southcoasttoday.com/news/20170605/town-meeting-school-regionalization-study-with-fairhaven-postponed-indefinitely>

<sup>2</sup> SMART goals are specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results- focused; and timed and tracked.

The district's budget document does not have a summary or narrative highlighting goals or priorities; it does not include all expenditures for education in the district. The district and the town do not have a signed, written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of schools.

## **Instruction**

The team observed 78 classes throughout the district: 26 at the high school, 16 at the middle school and 36 at the 2 elementary schools. The team observed 31 ELA classes, 29 mathematics classes, and 18 classes in other subject areas. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

In observed lessons at the elementary schools, observers saw multiple examples of students engaged in active learning or working with the teacher or another adult in small groups on tasks that were differentiated to meet their learning needs. Observers also saw evidence of the district's emphasis on educating the whole child by reinforcing positive social-emotional learning as well as academics, particularly in kindergarten through grade 5.

In contrast to the elementary- and middle-school levels, in observed high-school lessons, classroom instruction was frequently teacher centered rather than student centered and students were not often given sufficient responsibility for their learning. Teachers' voices dominated lessons while students' voices were limited. With some notable exceptions in each content area, teachers in grades 9–12 often directed the class from the front of the room, for example, by reviewing homework assignments, factoring equations on the board, conducting question/answer sessions, or lecturing with PowerPoint presentations on an interactive white board. Teachers often asked closed questions that required students to recall information rather than to engage in more rigorous higher-order thinking that challenged assumptions or required students to explain their reasoning. In some instances, however, students engaged with each other in small groups to answer thoughtful questions about readings or to uncover and interpret patterns in scientific data.

## **Recommendations**

- District and school leaders should consider improving planning processes and documents by implementing common elements in the DIP and the SIPs, including a reflection on the previous year's goals (including an analysis of relevant data), SMART goals for improvement, action steps and timeline, and staff members responsible for each action step.
- The district should define, communicate, and support the implementation of a research-based, common instructional model for use in all schools.

- The district should design an ongoing curriculum review process and engage a vertical team of teachers to develop and implement a science curriculum.
- The district should develop an improved professional development model characterized by strong, collaborative leadership. It should develop a comprehensive PD plan that aligns with district, school, and teacher goals and priorities, as well as the identified needs of educators.
- The district should implement all components of the state educator evaluation framework with a focus on improving the efficacy and consistency of supervisory and evaluative practices.
- The DIP should articulate a vision to support struggling students K–12 and include academic and social-emotional SMART goals in the DIP and SIPs.
- The district should consider reallocating resources to develop a data management and assessment system that teachers can use to more effectively identify and monitor struggling students.
- The district should collaborate with the town to develop a budget document that is clear, comprehensive and meets all statutory requirements and best practices and should develop a written agreement describing how municipal indirect expenditures are provided to the district by the town.

# Fairhaven Public Schools Comprehensive District Review

## Overview

---

### **Purpose**

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

Districts reviewed in the 2016–2017 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE’s framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

### **Methodology**

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

### **Site Visit**

The site visit to the Fairhaven was conducted from February 13–16, 2017. The site visit included 40 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 75 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers’ association representatives. The review team conducted 3 focus groups with 1 elementary-school teacher, 4 middle-school teachers, and 16 high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 78 classrooms in 4 schools. The team collected data using ESE’s Instructional Inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

## District Profile

Fairhaven serves students in pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Through an agreement with the Acushnet Public Schools, Fairhaven guarantees grade 8 students from Acushnet seats in the district, if they choose to attend (see the Financial and Asset Management Strength finding below). Fairhaven has a town meeting form of government and the chair of the school committee is elected. The six members of the school committee meet approximately twice monthly.

The superintendent has been in the position since July 1, 2005. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the director of finance and technology, the director of special education, the assistant to the superintendent K–5/the principal of Wood Elementary School, the assistant to the superintendent 6–12/the principal of Fairhaven High School, the principal of Hastings Middle School, and the principal of East Fairhaven Elementary School. Central office positions increased in the 2015–2016 school year. The district has four principals leading four schools. There are four other school administrators, four assistant principals. In the 2016–2017 school year, there were 144 teachers in the district.

In the 2016–2017 school year, 2,024 students were enrolled in the district’s 4 schools:

**Table 1: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2016–2017**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
East Fairhaven Elementary	ES	Pre-K–5	436
Leroy Wood Elementary	ES	K–5	514
Elizabeth Hastings Middle	MS	6–8	458
Fairhaven High	HS	9–12	616
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4 schools</b>	<b>Pre-K-12</b>	<b>2,024</b>
*As of October 1, 2016			

Between 2012 and 2017 overall student enrollment increased by 3.1 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from economically disadvantaged families, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 51 K–12 districts of similar size (1,000–1,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: \$11,215 as compared with \$13,140 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.



## Student Performance

Fairhaven is a Level 2 district because East Fairhaven, Wood, and Hastings Middle are in Level 2 for not meeting their gap narrowing targets for all students and/or high needs students.

**Table 2: Fairhaven Public Schools  
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016**

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Accountability Level
		2013	2014	2015	2016			
East Fairhaven	All	40	55	0	25	36	21	2
	High Needs	56	35	0	35	38		
Wood	All	90	50	0	75	70	61	2
	High Needs	113	88	88	80	87		
Hastings Middle	All	35	60	0	70	62	28	2
	High Needs	35	50	50	40	45		
Fairhaven High	All	68	89	68	93	82	52	1
	High Needs	39	96	96	75	82		
District	All	54	75	0	64	66	--	2
	High Needs	25	71	71	46	57		

**Between 2015 and 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 5 percentage points in ELA and by 8 percentage points in math.**

- The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 5 percentage points in ELA and by 5 percentage points in math.
- The percentage of students from economically disadvantaged families meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 3 percentage points in ELA and by 5 percentage points in math.
- The percentage of ELL and former ELL students meeting or exceeding expectations improved in ELA by 1 percentage point and declined by 1 percentage point in math.
- The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations declined by 2 percentage points in ELA and improved by 1 percentage point in math.

**Table 3: Fairhaven Public Schools  
ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (Grades 3–8) 2015–2016**

Group	ELA			Math		
	2015	2016	Change	2015	2016	Change
All students	51%	56%	5	39%	47%	8
High Needs	30%	35%	5	25%	30%	5
Economically Disadvantaged	36%	39%	3	28%	33%	5
ELL and former ELL students	44%	45%	1	61%	60%	-1
Students with disabilities	10%	8%	-2	9%	10%	1

Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science declined by 4 percentage points for all students, and by 10 and 6 percentage points for high needs students and students with disabilities, respectively. In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 10 percentage points below the 2016 state rate for the district as a whole and 8 to 13 percentage points below the 2016 state rate for high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

**Table 4: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Subgroup 2013–2016**

Group		2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State (2016)
All students	District	48%	54%	47%	44%	-4	-10
	State	53%	55%	54%	54%	1	
High Needs	District	30%	35%	30%	20%	-10	-11
	State	31%	33%	31%	31%	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	36%	24%	--	-8
	State	--	--	34%	32%	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	19%	18%	19%	19%	0	
Students with disabilities	District	14%	17%	10%	8%	-6	-13
	State	21%	21%	22%	21%	0	

The district did not reach its 2016 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for all students and each group that makes up the high needs population.

**Table 5: Fairhaven Public Schools  
2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup**

Group	ELA			Math			Science		
	2016 CPI	2016 Target	Rating	2016 CPI	2016 Target	Rating	2016 CPI	2016 Target	Rating
All students	86.5	94.5	Improved Below Target	80.0	88.5	Improved Below Target	74.2	89.2	Declined
High Needs	75.2	90.6	Improved Below Target	67.2	83.8	No Change	59.4	84.1	Declined
Economically Disadvantaged <sup>3</sup>	78.0	80.1	No Change	69.1	73.9	No Change	61.4	71.7	Declined
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	59.9	83.3	Improved Below Target	52.9	76.2	No Change	52.0	79.4	No Change

<sup>3</sup> The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

In 2016, students' growth in ELA and math was on target for all students, and low in ELA and moderate in math compared with their academic peers across the state. Students' growth in ELA and math was low compared with their academic peers statewide for high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

**Table 6: Fairhaven Public Schools  
2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

Group	2016 Median ELA SGP			2016 Median Math SGP		
	District	CPI Rating	Growth Level	District	CPI Rating	Growth Level
All students	40.0	On Target	Low	48.0	On Target	Moderate
High Needs	36.0	On Target	Low	40.0	Below Target	Low
Econ. Disad.	37.5	On Target	Low	39.5	Below Target	Low
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	25.0	Below Target	Low	38.0	Below Target	Low

In 2016, the district's out-of-school suspension rates were lower than the state rates and the in-school suspension rates were more than twice the state rates for all students, high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

**Table 7: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016**

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)
High Needs	ISS	6.2%	6.3%	3.7%	7.5%	2.9%
	OSS	6.0%	5.2%	4.5%	3.0%	4.9%
Economically disadvantaged*	ISS	6.6%	7.0%	3.6%	7.0%	3.2%
	OSS	6.8%	5.9%	4.1%	3.0%	5.6%
ELLs	ISS	--	--	--	--	1.9%
	OSS	--	--	--	--	4.0%
Students with disabilities	ISS	7.7%	7.7%	4.3%	11.6%	3.5%
	OSS	7.7%	7.0%	5.5%	5.0%	5.9%
All Students	ISS	4.2%	4.0%	2.6%	4.7%	1.9%
	OSS	3.6%	3.5%	2.6%	1.7%	2.9%

\* Suspension rates for students from low-income families used for 2013 and 2014

Between 2013 and 2016, the district's four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.0 percentage points for all students and by 0.2 to 4.9 percentage points for high needs students, students from low-income families, and students with disabilities. The district reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Students from low-income families did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

**Table 8: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2013–2016**

Group	Number Included (2016)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2013–2016		Change 2015–2016		State (2016)
		2013	2014	2015	2016	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	92	82.7	78.1	79.7	84.8	2.1	2.5%	5.1	6.4%	79.1
Low income	83	84.1	76.2	84.6	84.3	0.2	0.2%	-0.3	-0.4%	78.4
ELLs	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	64.1
SWD	26	64.3	76.5	64.5	69.2	4.9	7.6%	4.7	7.3%	71.8
All students	182	89.8	85.9	92.0	91.8	2.0	2.2%	-0.2	-0.2%	87.5

Between 2012 and 2015, the district's five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 6.2 percentage points for all students, and by 2.7 and 6.8 percentage points for high needs students and students from low-income families, respectively, and declined by 8.6 percentage points for students with disabilities. The district reached the five-year cohort graduation target for all students.<sup>5</sup>

**Table 9: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012–2015**

Group	Number Included (2015)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
		2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	64	77.0	85.2	82.2	79.7	2.7	3.5%	-2.5	-3.0%	82.0
Low income	52	77.8	85.5	79.4	84.6	6.8	8.7%	5.2	6.5%	81.6
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	70.2
SWD	31	73.1	71.4	82.4	64.5	-8.6	-11.8%	-17.9	-21.7%	74.5
All students	174	85.8	91.5	88.7	92.0	6.2	7.2%	3.3	3.7%	89.4

In 2016, Fairhaven's drop-out rate for all students was below the 2016 state rate for all students, and above the 2016 state rate for high needs students, students from economically disadvantaged families, and students with disabilities.

<sup>5</sup> The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Students from low-income families did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

**Table 10: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016**

Group	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)
High Needs	3.8%	5.1%	2.9%	5.3%	3.7%
Econ. Disad. <sup>6</sup>	4.6%	5.6%	1.7%	6.1%	4.1%
ELLs	--	--	--	--	6.6%
SWD	3.6%	3.3%	6.2%	4.8%	3.1%
All students	1.9%	3.1%	1.2%	1.7%	1.9%

## Grade and School Results

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students declined by 3.6 points, from 90.1 in 2013 to 86.5 in 2016, and declined in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 7<sup>th</sup> grades.

- ELA CPI improved by 0.7 point in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade and by 1.0 point in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - ELA CPI in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade was 97.2 in 2016, 0.5 points above the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.
- ELA CPI declined by 4.8 points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, by 3.6 points in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, by 4.5 points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, by 1.8 points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 10.8 points in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Table 11: Fairhaven Public Schools  
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016**

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	144	90.3	90.8	79.9	85.5	--	-4.8	5.6
4	151	85.6	88.4	75.8	82.0	--	-3.6	6.2
5	157	89.1	85.5	85.2	84.6	--	-4.5	-0.6
6	137	89.1	86.3	77.6	87.3	--	-1.8	9.7
7	140	90.3	92.7	86.8	79.5	--	-10.8	-7.3
8	148	88.8	91.3	91.0	89.5	--	0.7	-1.5
10	150	96.2	97.7	97.1	97.2	96.7	1.0	0.1
All	1,035	90.1	90.5	84.8	86.5	87.2	-3.6	1.7

In 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA ranged from 54 percent to 60 percent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, from 48 percent to 67 percent in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, and from 36 percent to 72 percent in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade at East Fairhaven and Wood. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA was 66 percent, 46 percent, and 50 percent in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively, at Hastings Middle. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA was 94 percent in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at Fairhaven High.

<sup>6</sup> Drop-out rates for students from low-income families used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 drop-out rates for students from economically disadvantaged families.

**Table 12: Fairhaven Public Schools  
ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016<sup>7</sup>**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
East Fairhaven	54%	48%	36%	--	--	--	--	46%
Wood	60%	67%	72%	--	--	--	--	67%
Hastings Middle	--	--	--	66%	46%	50%	--	54%
Fairhaven High	--	--	--	--	--	--	94%	94%
District	58%	59%	56%	66%	45%	50%	90%	--

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI declined by 7.7 and 6.2 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 4.6 points at Hastings Middle, and improved by 1.5 points at Fairhaven High.**

- ELA CPI for high needs students declined by 11.5 and 10.8 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 10.9 points at Hastings Middle, and improved by 4.6 points at Fairhaven High.
- ELA CPI for students with disabilities declined by 6.6 and 12.7 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 17.8 points at Hastings Middle, and improved by 9.9 points at Fairhaven High.

**Table 13: Fairhaven Public Schools  
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013–2016**

School	2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend
East Fairhaven	86.5	85.3	79.7	78.8	-7.7
High Needs	79.4	79.1	68.1	67.9	-11.5
Econ. Disad.	--	--	73.0	69.0	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	59.8	64.3	53.4	53.2	-6.6
Wood	94.0	91.5	81.2	87.8	-6.2
High Needs	89.9	86.4	69.8	79.1	-10.8
Econ. Disad.	--	--	72.7	82.5	--
ELLs	--	--	72.5	70.5	--
SWD	77.5	76.9	57.1	64.8	-12.7
Hastings Middle	90.3	90.9	85.2	85.7	-4.6
High Needs	82.8	84.5	73.2	71.9	-10.9
Econ. Disad.	--	--	78.5	76.4	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	66.2	70.1	53.2	48.4	-17.8
Fairhaven High	96.6	97.8	97.1	98.1	1.5
High Needs	89.0	94.4	93.4	93.6	4.6
Econ. Disad.	--	--	96.3	96.9	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	80.7	84.8	82.9	90.6	9.9

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI declined by 3.5 points for all students, from 83.5 in 2013 to 80.0 in 2016, and declined in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.**

<sup>7</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

- Math CPI declined by 8.5 points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, by 7.3 points in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, by 9.7 points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 4.4 points in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.
- Math CPI improved by 4.6 points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, by 0.5 point in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 3.0 points in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - Math CPI in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade was 93.3 in 2016, 3.6 points above the 2016 state CPI of 89.7.

**Table 14: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016**

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	145	90.9	92.2	82.2	82.4	--	-8.5	0.2
4	151	85.2	85.2	68.6	77.9	--	-7.3	9.3
5	157	88.0	83.4	81.2	78.3	--	-9.7	-2.9
6	137	75.8	82.3	74.2	80.4	--	4.6	6.2
7	138	73.2	71.8	75.3	73.7	--	0.5	-1.6
8	147	78.1	75.9	72.0	73.7	--	-4.4	1.7
10	150	90.3	93.4	95.0	93.3	89.7	3.0	-1.7
All	1,032	83.5	84.0	78.6	80.0	81.5	-3.5	0.4

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math ranged from 34 percent to 58 percent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, from 37 percent to 57 percent in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, and from 29 percent to 51 percent in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade at East Fairhaven and Wood. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math was 50 percent, 47 percent, and 47 percent in the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, respectively, at Hastings Middle. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in math was 90 percent in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at Fairhaven High.

**Table 15: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015–2016<sup>8</sup>**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
East Fairhaven	34%	37%	29%	--	--	--	--	33%
Wood	58%	57%	51%	--	--	--	--	55%
Hastings Middle	--	--	--	50%	47%	47%	--	48%
Fairhaven High	--	--	--	--	--	--	90%	90%--
District	49%	48%	41%	51%	46%	46%	87%	--

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI declined by 8.3 and 10.7 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 1.0 point at Hastings Middle, and improved by 3.4 points at Fairhaven High.

- ELA CPI for high needs students declined by 12.6 and 19.8 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 6.9 points at Hastings Middle, and improved by 11.0 points at Fairhaven High.

<sup>8</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

- ELA CPI for students with disabilities declined by 6.0 and 40.9 points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 9.7 points at Hastings Middle, and improved by 18.8 points at Fairhaven High.

**Table 16: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013–2016**

School	2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend
East Fairhaven	83.3	84.2	78.6	75.0	-8.3
High Needs	78.4	78.3	71.2	65.8	-12.6
Econ. Disad.	--	--	75.5	63.3	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	64.3	68.1	62.1	58.3	-6.0
Wood	93.5	89.8	76.1	82.8	-10.7
High Needs	93.2	85.9	65.8	73.4	-19.8
Econ. Disad.	--	--	67.4	78.7	--
ELLs	--	--	85.0	84.1	--
SWD	92.5	83.0	51.3	51.6	-40.9
Hastings Middle	77.1	77.3	74.1	76.1	-1.0
High Needs	66.6	65.8	61.3	59.7	-6.9
Econ. Disad.	--	--	64.4	62.4	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	48.0	48.0	44.4	38.3	-9.7
Fairhaven High	91.7	94.1	95.4	95.1	3.4
High Needs	76.1	85.3	91.5	87.1	11.0
Econ. Disad.	--	--	95.1	94.8	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	60.9	64.6	77.8	79.7	18.8

Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 4 percentage points in the district as whole, from 48 percent in 2013 to 44 percent in 2016, 10 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.

- 5<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates decreased by 21 percentage points from 41 percent in 2013 to 20 percent in 2016, 27 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates improved by 10 percentage points from 31 percent in 2013 to 41 percent in 2016, equal to the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
- 10<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates improved by 6 percentage points from 69 percent in 2013 to 75 percent in 2016, 2 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.



**Table 17: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013–2016**

Grade	Number	2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	159	41%	45%	37%	20%	47%	-21%	-17%
8	152	31%	39%	34%	41%	41%	10%	7%
10	134	69%	73%	69%	75%	73%	6%	6%
All	445	48%	54%	47%	44%	54%	-4%	-3%

In 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade was 18 percent at East Fairhaven and 22 percent at Wood, compared with the 2016 state rate of 47 percent. Science proficiency was 42 percent in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade at Hastings Middle, above the 2016 state rate of 41 percent. Science proficiency was 78 percent in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade at Fairhaven High, 5 percentage points above the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

**Table 18: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015–2016**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
East Fairhaven	--	--	18%	--	--	--	--	18%
Wood	--	--	22%	--	--	--	--	22%
Hastings Middle	--	--	--	--	--	42%	--	42%
Fairhaven High	--	--	--	--	--	--	78%	78%
District	--	--	20%	--	--	41%	75%	44%
State	--	--	47%	--	--	41%	73%	54%

Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 27 and 36 percentage points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and improved by 9 and 7 percentage points at Hastings Middle and Fairhaven High, respectively.

- Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 24 and 48 percentage points at East Fairhaven and Wood, respectively, and by 1 and 2 percentage points at Hastings Middle and Fairhaven High, respectively.
- Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined by 9 percentage points at East Fairhaven, by 6 percentage points at Hastings Middle, and by 4 percentage points at Fairhaven High.

**Table 19: Fairhaven Public Schools**  
**Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016**

<b>School</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>4-Year Trend</b>
<b>East Fairhaven</b>	45%	35%	38%	18%	-27%
High Needs	35%	16%	20%	11%	-24%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	20%	13%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	9%	0%	--	0%	-9%
<b>Wood</b>	58%	57%	37%	22%	-36%
High Needs	60%	46%	18%	12%	-48%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	19%	17%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	--	--	0%	0%	--
<b>Hastings Middle</b>	33%	43%	35%	42%	9%
High Needs	22%	29%	22%	21%	-1%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	24%	27%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	6%	7%	12%	0%	-6%
<b>Fairhaven High</b>	71%	74%	69%	78%	7%
High Needs	41%	53%	49%	39%	-2%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	63%	47%	--
ELLs	--	--	--	--	--
SWD	25%	33%	11%	29%	4%

## Leadership and Governance

---

### ***Contextual Background***

The district is in transition at several levels. Leaders are emphasizing the idea that all district students can learn at high levels and are allocating more financial resources to support teaching and learning for all students. At the school level, leaders are focusing on school culture and students' social-emotional development as well as tending to effective teaching and learning to improve academic outcomes for all students.

A key strategy of change in the district is to attract, develop, and retain effective school leaders who foster teacher leadership, staff involvement, and a commitment to improving teaching and learning. The superintendent continues to increase the coherence among schools, using planning processes and central-office reorganization to transform the organization from a district of individual schools into a unified school district. The central office is re-directing funds and re-allocating job tasks to create a position of assistant superintendent to focus on improving teaching and learning in all schools.

The relationship between district personnel and town administrators has improved.

### ***Strength Finding***

- 1. The superintendent, school committee, administrative council leaders, and school staff members model and promote a culture of collaboration and joint responsibility for student learning in the district and the broader community.**
  - A.** As they carry out their responsibilities, the superintendent and school committee members model collaboration for district and community stakeholders.
    1. Interviews and a review of videos of school committee meetings indicated that the superintendent and school committee members have a collaborative working relationship.
    2. Describing their relationships, the superintendent and school committee members cited trust and positive and open communications; consistently following a chain of command for addressing issues; and clear roles for policy (the school committee) and administration (the superintendent).
  - B.** The superintendent delegates educational and operational leadership to principals and program leaders.
    1. Principals told the team that the superintendent delegates to them decisions in major management areas such as planning, hiring, school budgeting, and discipline. Principals stated: "We have our hand in everything [in our schools]."
    2. Using a team approach, the administrative council (the superintendent, four principals, the director of student support, and the director of technology and finance) meets bi-weekly to

plan, coordinate, and evaluate educational programs and day-to-day management of the schools.

- C. At the school level, teachers and support staff have several formal, scheduled activities and voluntary options for collaborating on developing and improving their schools' instructional and social-emotional strategies. These activities provide opportunities for teacher leaders.
  - 1. Examples of scheduled team-based activities include: Collaborative Planning Time at the elementary level; B Days and D Days meetings at the middle school; and a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at the high school.
  - 2. Examples of voluntary team-based activities include: hiring committees; the school council; the middle school academic advisory council; the instructional leadership team; the instructional rounds team; summer curriculum teams; the social-emotional learning team; and elementary-school teams for ELA, math, and science.
  - 3. In addition to participating in teams, teachers work in teacher-leader positions such as: high school supervisor, teacher coach, mentor, and club advisor.
- D. School district personnel have increased collaboration with their colleagues in town government. The superintendent, school committee members, and town officials said that they welcomed the positive working relationships between the school department and the town administration.
- E. The district's highly-collaborative culture promotes a collective responsibility for fostering students' academic performance and personal well-being.
  - 1. Interviews with staff, parents, and students highlighted the district's positive "can-do" spirit. This was aptly described by a teacher who stated that although Fairhaven is a small town and does not have the resources of neighboring cities "We will achieve great things."
  - 2. The close working relationships between school support staff, parents, teachers, community agencies, and students represents how district staff share responsibility for teaching and learning.
    - a. School support staff said that they were always looking at how to can get students where they needed to be, for example, by re-aligning schedules by cross-teaming, and by going out of their way to help students.
    - b. Support staff noted that the district's many student-support activities communicate to students "subtle messages about people not giving up on you."
    - c. Counselors maintain intervention logs which detail the collaborative supports that district staff and agency professionals have provided students over time.
  - 3. An example of the district's strong belief in and practice of shared responsibility is the scholarship fund that the Fairhaven Education Association has established. Teachers' association members have contributed a total of \$5,000 for college scholarships for graduating Fairhaven High School seniors.

- F. Parents expressed the view that district staff—principals, teachers and support staff—have reached out to them to partner in their children’s educational experiences. Parents indicated that district teachers have gone of their way to support their children by tutoring, by identifying online resources in ELA and math that parents and students could review at home, and by providing many social-emotional supports and interventions.
- G. High-school students expressed appreciation for the dedicated support that their teachers have provided to them and their classmates. High-school students said that their teachers were friendly and encouraged them to do the best that they can do. Furthermore, their teachers provided special attention for selecting courses and extra tutoring help before school.

**Impact:** By promoting a shared responsibility for teaching and learning in the district, district staff, town officials, community agencies, and parents likely increase staff morale, public confidence in the school district, and ultimately students’ achievement.

### ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

**1. The district does not have a comprehensive, actionable District Improvement Plan. Although School Improvement Plans are linked to the District Improvement Plan, they do not consistently include essential components to guide efforts to attain strategic goals.**

- A. The district does not have a District Improvement Plan (DIP) with SMART goals<sup>9</sup> and other essential components to guide efforts to attain strategic goals.
  - 1. Although the district has highlighted priorities in the DIP, it has not designated staff with primary responsibilities for planning and implementing priorities. The district has not established timelines for completing priorities and has not identified specific performance goals based on achievement data and measureable evidence to indicate that priorities have been met.
- B. A document review indicated that although the School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are linked to the DIP, they do not consistently include goals, timelines, and benchmarks.

**Impact:** Without a DIP with SMART goals and without SIPs with SMART goals aligned with those in the DIP, administrators, staff, parents, town officials, and community members do not know the direction in which the district is heading or the plans for achieving strategic goals. Without clearly articulate SMART goals, it is challenging to gauge progress and adjust systems and practices accordingly.

---

<sup>9</sup> SMART goals are specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results- focused; and timed and tracked.

## ***Recommendations***

- 1. When developing the DIP and/or the SIPs, district and school leaders should consider improving planning processes and documents in the following ways.**
  - A.** The district should consider using a common template for its 2017–2018 DIP and 2017–2018 SIPs.
    1. The district’s DIP and the SIPs should include the following elements that are currently part of the schools’ SIP template: Reflection (status of previous year’s goals), Improvement goals, Action Steps, Responsible Staff, and Benchmarks.
      - a. The DIP and the SIPs should include benchmarks that more frequently gauge and monitor continuous progress towards goals, identify adjustments in action steps, and track the effectiveness of district and school initiatives.
    2. The superintendent and district staff should add a section for timelines to complete action steps.

**Benefits:** By implementing these recommendations, district staff will improve the clarity and coherence of district and school plans.

### **Recommended resources:**

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

## Curriculum and Instruction

---

### ***Contextual Background***

Curricular and instructional leadership in the district has been in transition in recent years. In 2014–2015, the superintendent asked the principals of Wood Elementary School and Fairhaven High School to provide informal curricular and instructional guidance and support to the principals of the East Fairhaven Elementary School and the Hastings Middle School—the lowest performing schools in the district. In 2016–2017, in addition to their own school leadership roles, the two principals have assumed formal responsibility for curricular and instructional leadership: the principal of the Wood Elementary School for pre-kindergarten through grade 5, and the principal of Fairhaven High School for grades 6–12. In a recent decision to restructure the district’s administration for the 2017–2018 school year, the high-school principal has been appointed to the new position of assistant superintendent. In that role, she will have districtwide responsibility for curricular and instructional leadership.

The diffuse leadership of curriculum and instruction has meant that the district has not aligned curriculum maps with the 2017 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. The district has not established a systematic process to review and revise curriculum and does not have a common template to document curriculum. Some curriculum maps are incomplete and the science curriculum is in the early stages of alignment with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework.

The elementary schools have organized instruction around a model of whole-group followed by small-group differentiated instruction to meet students’ needs in ELA and math. This was confirmed in observed classrooms where review team members saw multiple examples of small groups for literacy instruction and students working in pairs and trios on related ELA tasks. In contrast, the observers did not find evidence of a research-based instructional model in observed middle- or high-school lessons. While documents and leaders offered a vision of “powerful teaching and learning in Fairhaven,” leaders and teachers did not express a shared view of the district’s expectations for effective instruction. Although the district has made progress in several aspects of the academic program as well as school culture in recent years, there is much work to do to ensure that all children have the opportunity to learn at high levels.

### ***Strength Findings***

- 1. School leaders have implemented strategies to improve curriculum and instruction at each school level.**
  - A.** Administrators told the review team that at the two elementary schools, volunteer ten-person teams of teachers, paraprofessionals, and school adjustment counselors, collaborate to bring cohesion to the K–5 ELA and math programs and the initiative for social-emotional learning. A new science team has self-organized in 2016–2017.

1. Teams meet about six times a year to discuss current issues and to reinforce the “one voice, one message” across both elementary schools. A principal or assistant principal leads each team. Team members disseminate information to grade-level teams.
  2. At the time of the review in February 2017, the ELA team was reviewing assessments, discussing writing feedback, and supporting the implementation and pacing of *Reading Street*, the literacy program introduced in September 2016.
  3. The math team was helping to implement and to correlate pacing for *Go Math*, the math program introduced in 2015.
  4. The social-emotional learning (SEL) team has led two professional development sessions to unify Responsive Classroom strategies at both elementary schools.
  5. Without a formal elementary science program, a group of teachers volunteered in 2016–2017 to start a science team. The team has begun to develop units, lessons, and projects for grades 4 and 5 mainly based on *Reading Street* selections on science topics.
- B.** Teachers and administrators told the review team that in 2016–2017, the elementary and middle schools were completing a multi-year grant-funded initiative to work with the Bay State Reading Institute (BSRI).
1. BSRI has provided consultants for instructional support for K–8 teachers such as help with developing common assessments, implementing close-reading strategies, and using data to monitor progress and to group students for instruction.
- C.** Teachers and principals said that teachers have weekly common planning time at each school level to collaborate on instructional improvement, to co-plan lessons and assessments, to review assessment data, and to work on curriculum.
1. At the elementary level, a 55-minute “collaboration time” once every five days provides grade-level teacher teams with common planning time. The principal or the assistant principal leads the team meeting and both try to attend each week. Teams typically do not have a formal agenda. They review student achievement data, monitor students’ progress in ELA and math, co-plan lessons, ensure horizontal alignment, and solve problems about grade-level issues, such as writing goals.
  2. At the middle school, grade-level teacher teams meet twice a cycle. B-Day meetings address Tier 1 (general education) issues such as professional development, instructional practices, and curriculum planning. D-Day meetings focus on Tier 2 instruction.
    - a. Teacher teams meet with the principal, guidance counselor, and sometimes a special educator to discuss student needs and to develop action plans for struggling students.



- b. Teachers told the team that D-Day meetings also address other issues such as identifying students to receive Pride Cards for their contributions to the school.
  - 3. At the high school, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) meet by content area once every seven days. Teachers collaborate to plan instruction, to analyze assessment data, to revise curriculum, and to review student work such as essays from document-based questions. At the time of the review in February 2017, PLCs were revising schoolwide writing rubrics to reflect improvements in student writing.
    - a. In an innovative practice, the English and history departments share a common PLC and have developed a humanities initiative that aligns periods of literature with the timeline that students study in history classes (see the finding below about the district's humanities initiative).
- D. Interviews and a document review indicated that instructional rounds take place twice a year to review challenges of practice identified by each school and to set priorities and action steps for improvement.
  - 1. An elementary principal told the team that she learned to conduct instructional rounds at the Harvard Principals' Center and then brought the practice to Fairhaven about four years ago. She has trained about 50 Fairhaven teachers to participate on "i-teams" of 12–16 teachers to conduct highly structured rounds in the fall and spring. Each team observes every classroom at a school (except their own); team members collect evidence and data to understand an issue that the school has identified. Once the observations are complete, the team debriefs and synthesizes its ideas and notes. The team then shares insights with the school's instructional leadership team (ILT) and sets priorities and action steps.
  - 6. The schools have identified a number of "problems of practice" over time for i-teams to investigate. For example, at the high school teams have explored the multiple ways in which teachers use formative assessments and students' opportunities to engage in higher-order thinking skills when using digital formats. At the middle school, an i-team looked at how teachers use strategies to promote student engagement and higher-level thinking. At the Wood Elementary School, teams investigated the strengths and challenges of Responsive Classroom principles and practices and more recently how well students use critical thinking in problem solving and collaboration.
  - 7. A document review indicated that teachers who participated in instructional rounds have provided testimonials on how the experience has made them more reflective and motivated them to improve their own practice.
- E. At the two elementary schools, principals and assistant principals conduct informal "leadership walkthroughs" to review specific instructional practices and then share their observations and provide feedback at faculty meetings.

1. At one elementary school, informal leadership walkthroughs take place about once a month. The principal and assistant principal identify a practice to observe, such as small-group learning, and spend a short time in every classroom understanding the practice. Sharing feedback from walkthroughs in faculty meetings has encouraged improvements, for example, in the ways in which paraprofessionals are deployed at the school.
2. At the other elementary school, informal walkthroughs take place in a less structured format.
3. The superintendent also joins principals for informal walkthroughs to observe lessons and practices at each school.

**Impact:** By developing strategies and allocating resources to support improvements to curriculum and instruction, the district is providing Fairhaven's students with access to a more coherent and cohesive learning experience.

**2. The high school's humanities initiative in English and history classes engages students in grades 10–12 in higher-level interdisciplinary ideas, conceptual knowledge, and writing.**

- A. Interviews and a document review indicated that the humanities initiative came out of the high school principal's goal to create synergy between the English and history departments—the two content areas that engage students the most in reading, crafting ideas and opinions, and writing about them, as outlined in the Massachusetts ELA/literacy standards.
  1. Interviewees said that a key principle for success was to reinforce a shared belief among teachers and content supervisors that all students can learn at high levels.
  2. To facilitate an interdisciplinary humanities concept, the English and history departments were assigned the same time slot for Professional Learning Community meetings to encourage inter-departmental collaboration, co-planning, and creativity.
- B. Interviewees stated that teachers and supervisors joined forces to realign curriculum by re-sequencing courses, topics, and readings in both departments. This work is ongoing.
  1. Sophomore students now study U.S. History from the French and Indian War through the colonial period and revolution through reconstruction. At the same time, in English class, they read American and British literature that explores themes such as the social contract, the Mayflower Compact, power and leadership, issues of class and social inequality, civil war, and identity.
  2. Juniors study U.S. History from the industrial revolution through both world wars, civil rights, and through the 1990s. In English class, they read, discuss, and write about the transcendentalists and self-reliance; struggles over power, gender, and racism; greed and the American dream in the 21<sup>st</sup> century; and innovation and childhood development and happiness, among other topics.
  3. In the second semester of senior year, grade 12 students can elect a senior seminar.

- a. In one seminar, “Who We Are and Why Does It Matter?” students explore the past to the present through literature/social studies projects on two cultures in addition to American culture. A second elective, “Where Are We Going and Why Does It Matter?” offers seniors the opportunity to think about the potential for the future by completing projects on at least two topics such as revolutionary thinkers, communication, medicine, and alternative energy.
- C. The humanities initiative has made a positive impact on the school’s culture and especially on the teaching of writing and how well students write.
  1. Students have so improved their ability to write that the high school is now redrafting its writing rubric to reflect students’ higher-level skills. One teacher told the principal that college prep students were now writing reflections of the same quality as honors students.
  2. Also, history teachers have developed concrete skills in the teaching of writing, which they gained from collaborating with their English teacher colleagues.

**Impact:** The high-school’s humanities initiative has enabled students to grapple with parallel trends and competing forces in humankind’s ideas, historical events, and social movements. In addition, through creative course development and teacher collaboration, teachers have improved their skills for preparing students to think and write in more complex ways. This likely serves students well as they move to the next level in their education and to work and careers after high school.

### ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

3. **The district does not have an aligned, complete curriculum or a shared instructional model for effective teaching and learning.**
  - A. Administrators said and a document review confirmed that for 2016–2017, the district has assigned curricular and instructional leadership for pre-kindergarten through grade 5 to an elementary principal and for grades 6–12 to the high school principal. This will change in school year 2017–2018 with the appointment of the high-school principal to the new position of assistant superintendent. In that role, the assistant superintendent will provide districtwide curricular and instructional leadership.
    1. Both principals told the team that the additional responsibilities take time away from other tasks and especially from instructional leadership at their schools.
    2. Although interviewees expressed the view that principals and many teachers were energized, some leaders said that they felt pressured by being pulled in many directions at once.
  - B. Interviews and a document review indicated that in some content areas curriculum documents are incomplete and are not fully aligned with the 2017 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks.

1. Administrators told the team that the district does not have a systematic process to review and revise curriculum, does not use a common template to map its curriculum, and teachers do not share a common language about curriculum.
  2. Although the district began to implement a new K–5 literacy program (*Reading Street*) in September 2016, there has not been a follow-up initiative to plan, align, or map curriculum. The current K–5 ELA curriculum map is a June 2011 benchmark/vertical alignment document that lists only the Massachusetts standards for reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language.
  3. The district aligned the ELA/English curriculum for grades 6–12 with state frameworks in September 2014. Not all curriculum maps include the same information and some required components are missing or incomplete.
  4. The math curriculum maps were aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks in September 2014 for grades 6–12 and in September 2015 for kindergarten through grade 5. However, the format and content of math maps vary by grade level, particularly references to teaching resources and materials, strategies, and assessments.
  5. The district does not have a science curriculum map for kindergarten through grade 5 and the middle- and high-school science curriculum maps are aligned with 2006 Massachusetts curriculum frameworks. Middle- and high-school science teachers are in the early stages of aligning curriculum to the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework. At the time of the review in February 2017, teachers had met three times in the 2016–2017 school year for this work.
- C. Interviewees did not express a shared view of what constitutes high-quality instruction in the district.
1. When administrators, supervisors, and teachers were asked to describe the characteristics of high-quality teaching in the district they gave varying views of effective teaching practices.
  2. The district’s document, “Powerful Teaching and Learning in the Fairhaven Public Schools,” outlines four principles that all members of the school community are responsible for: community, assessment, learning, and differentiation. The document details each of these principles of effective instruction.
    - a. When administrators were asked about the “Powerful Teaching and Learning in the Fairhaven Public Schools” document,” they told the team that “everyone saw it [the document] once.”

**Impact:** The absence of a shared instructional model for teaching and learning has resulted in an absence of clarity about district expectations among administrators and teachers. Without a fully developed and organized curriculum in ELA, math, and science aligned with the 2017 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, the district cannot ensure that all students are well prepared for the next stage in their education or for work and careers after high school.

4. **In observed lessons, the quality of instruction at the elementary and middle schools was generally stronger than at the high school where students were not consistently challenged to meet high expectations for learning, to engage in critical thinking and to take responsibility for their learning. Differentiated instruction was the least developed characteristic of effective instruction at all levels.**

**A. Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction.** In most observed lessons, teachers provided and referred to clear learning objectives and most students appeared to understand what they were learning. However, there was variation across school levels in how well lessons reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objectives.

1. Review team members observed moderate and strong evidence that teachers provided and referred to clear learning objectives (characteristic # 2) in 95 percent of elementary classrooms, in 81 percent of middle-school classrooms, and in 81 percent of high-school classrooms.
  - a. In a grade 3 ELA lesson with a clear learning objective, the teacher introduced students to a group of “amazing words” that would be used in a story. Similarly, in a grade 6 ELA lesson focused on personification in poetry, students would learn to understand three levels of reading: literal, inferential, and thematic.
  - b. In contrast, in some classes the teacher did not state or post a lesson objective; in others, the teacher posted an agenda or list of activities without a learning objective.
2. Review team members saw moderate and strong evidence that lessons reflected high expectations aligned to learning objectives (characteristic # 3) in 83 percent of elementary lessons, in 75 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 42 percent of high-school lessons.
  - a. In a high-school English class, students' minds were stretched during an animated discussion on adolescent rebellion when considering arranged marriage from the point of view of Romeo and Juliet and their parents.
  - b. In some lessons with low expectations, teachers provided exemplars but did all the work themselves, or the teacher’s voice dominated the lesson while students listened and took notes. In other lessons with low expectations, there were limited academic as well as behavioral expectations for students.

**B. Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking.** Classroom observations showed variation across school levels in how well students were motivated and engaged in lessons, in how well lesson tasks encouraged students to develop and engage in higher-order thinking, and in how well students assumed responsibility for their own learning.

1. Review team members found moderate and strong evidence that students were motivated and engaged in lessons (characteristic #5) by actively participating in activities and

- volunteering responses and questions in 81 percent of elementary lessons, in 75 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 54 percent of high-school lessons.
- a. In a grade 4 ELA lesson, students were attentively learning to take notes on a story by assessing and choosing which information was important enough to include in their notes.
  - b. In a grade 6 science class students were unfocused as the teacher conducted a review for a science test on solutions and evaporation. The teacher frequently needed to bring the students back to the lesson activity.
  - c. In a grade 11 English lesson, students eagerly revised their essays by analyzing their own writing styles.
2. Observers saw moderate and strong evidence that students were encouraged to develop and engage in critical thinking (characteristic #6) by using analysis, synthesis, and the application of new knowledge, ideas, and concepts in 67 percent of elementary lessons, in 76 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 43 percent of high-school lessons.
- a. In a grade 12 English lesson, students were asked to read a book of their choosing silently for 20 minutes. Instead, some were reading email or using Google.com on their computers, and one student had his head down on the desk.
  - b. In many secondary math lessons, students practiced problem solving by replicating procedures demonstrated by teachers. Students did not engage in large- or small-group discussions to apply the new knowledge and were not asked to demonstrate deeper understanding of the new mathematical concepts.
3. Review team members saw moderate and strong evidence that students had multiple opportunities for doing the thinking in class (characteristic # 7) while the teacher facilitated student-led exploration and learning of content either individually, in pairs, or in groups in 67 percent of elementary lessons, in 69 percent of middle-school lessons, and in 50 percent of high-school lessons.
- a. In observed lessons where students took responsibility for doing the thinking, the teacher assigned group tasks that required collaboration, investigation, and resolution, such as a multi-grade media/TV lesson at the high school. There, the excited buzz in the room indicated highly engaged small groups working on editing projects producing ads for the school's cable TV station, or planning an interview with a local band. The teacher guided students to work at a various paces, based on their individual learning needs.
  - b. In a grade 3 classroom in which students did not assume responsibility for their learning, students played a multiplication game for about six minutes. During the rest of the observation they practiced getting into groups three times, did an "energizer activity," and sang a song; no attention was paid to other academic content or activities during the observation.

**C. Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture.** In most observed lessons, classroom culture was characterized by respectful behavior, productive routines, and a positive tone. In most observed lessons, teachers conducted appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students. However, although each school level has provisions through team meetings and data analysis to identify students in need of support, in observed lessons differentiated instruction was the least developed characteristic of effective instruction at all school levels. In addition, there was variation across school levels in how well teachers used appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs to facilitate learning.

1. Review team members found moderate and strong evidence of teachers appropriately differentiating instruction to make lesson content accessible for all learners (characteristic # 8) by tailoring the content, the product, or the pedagogy to students' learning style or needs in 56 percent of elementary lessons, in 50 percent of middle-school lessons, and in just 12 percent of high-school lessons.
  - a. In several elementary ELA lessons in which instruction was appropriately differentiated, teachers worked with small groups to decode words or to improve comprehension based on students' literacy level. At the same time, other small groups worked at "stations" to complete reading or vocabulary exercises on the computer, to read to themselves, or read aloud to others.
  - b. Similarly, in a grade 5 math lesson, students were assigned additional enrichment opportunities once they completed classwork.
  - c. In contrast, many high-school lessons were traditional "one size fits all," whole-class activities with the teacher directing the thinking and at the center of the lesson.
2. Observers saw moderate and strong evidence that teachers used appropriate resources aligned with students' diverse learning needs such as manipulatives, technology, or support personnel (characteristic # 9) in 75 percent of elementary lessons, in 62 percent of middle-school lessons, and in only 31 percent of high-school lessons.
  - a. While most paraprofessionals supported student learning individually or with small groups, others were mostly inactive in observed lessons.
  - b. In several lessons, teachers made effective use of the interactive white board or a film to reinforce or to probe ideas. An example was a grade 11 English class watching a segment from the film *The Great Gatsby* to compare the director's treatment of a scene in the film with the author's treatment of the scene in the book.

**Impact:** Without common understanding and consistent implementation of district expectations for effective teaching and learning, the district cannot ensure that students can engage in rigorous, challenging thinking; can assume responsibility for their learning; and can apply knowledge, skills, and understandings in new ways. Ultimately, the district cannot guarantee that students are well prepared for post-secondary education, work, and careers.

**3. The district has not had an elementary science program for several years. Secondary school teachers and leaders are in the early stages of aligning the middle- and high-school science curricula with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework.**

- A. Administrators told the review team that the district does not have a “true science program” for elementary students except for grade 5, the grade for the first MCAS science test.
  - 1. Interviewees stated that the district had chosen to focus on ELA and math instruction at the elementary schools. Although there has been curriculum work in ELA and math, none has been completed for science and social studies.
    - a. Interviewees described the decision not to complete science and social studies curriculum as “a major area of need.”
    - b. Alignment for the K–5 science curriculum with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework has not begun.
  - 2. Interviewees said that time has been scheduled for science and social studies in the school day, noting that the schedule “has not been strongly adhered to except in grade 5.” In recent years, the district has not had a science program and the elementary schools have not had science resources. Interviewees said that they had not talked about “what science looks like” in K–4 classrooms.
  - 3. At the Wood Elementary School, several grade 5 science teachers have followed the “old” Massachusetts standards. Instruction has been based mostly on ELA readings from *Reading Street*, reading A-Z leveled books that deal with science topics, and videos. Younger students might study topics such as butterflies and gardens.
  - 4. According to ESE data, the percentage of grade 5 students in Fairhaven scoring proficient or higher on the science MCAS has declined steadily over in recent years: from 45 percent in 2014 to 37 percent in 2015, to 20 percent in 2016.
- B. Interviewees told the review team that in the 2016–2017 school year, there is renewed interest in integrating science education into the K–5 academic program.
  - 1. The district recently hosted ESE’s “science ambassadors” to provide professional development on science education. This has generated interest in boosting science education at the elementary level.
  - 2. A volunteer team of teachers has met twice to explore which science resources could be used. They have begun to develop units and lessons by selecting science-related readings. The intent is to have elementary students study science two or three times a week starting in 2017–2018. The elementary schools plan to include funding for science resources in the fiscal year 2018 budget.
- C. Administrators said and a document review confirmed that the secondary science curriculum has not been aligned with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering



Curriculum Framework and is far from being a robust science, technology and engineering program.

1. The science curriculum for grades 6–8 and 9–12 is in the early stages of being aligned with the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework.
  2. Middle-school and high-school teachers have had only three professional development sessions to align science curriculum with the new curriculum frameworks.
  3. An administrator told the team that the middle school was considering how to restructure the education technology position to accommodate science, technology, and engineering and was looking into whether grade 6 students could have science every day rather than every other day.
- D.** Observations of secondary school science classes showed inconsistent implementation of effective instructional strategies for science. Observed lessons were, for the most part, not centered on inquiry and hands-on investigation.
1. In two of four observed science lessons at the middle school, students were generally engaged in lesson activities. In one class, students worked independently or in pairs on a workbook exercise. In another, they worked in small groups using a graphic organizer to learn and share definitions of concepts about erosion and land formations.
  2. In the other two science lessons at the middle school, teachers set limited behavioral and academic expectations and students were inattentive and unfocused.
  3. In one of seven observed science lessons at the high school, students worked attentively in groups, plotting and graphing heart rate and cardiac output. The teacher circulated to each group to ask questions and provide support. Students and groups shared and explained their plots and graphs and responded to the teacher's questions about why specific phenomena might have taken place.
  4. The other six observed science lessons at the high school showed teacher-centered instruction rather than student-centered, active learning. Students responded to recall questions or took notes while teachers lectured or reviewed homework questions with the whole class. After a lab on building circuit boards, the teacher provided the wrap-up rather than asking the students to share what they had learned.

**Impact:** When the science curriculum is not aligned with the Massachusetts science standards and does not integrate science, technology, and engineering, the science program cannot help students master challenging 21<sup>st</sup> century knowledge, skills, and understandings. Without engaging science instruction that takes full advantage of inquiry and active, hands-on investigation, it is unlikely that students are being well prepared for college and the many technological jobs and careers of the 21st century.

## ***Recommendations***

- 1. The district should define a research-based, effective instructional model for use in all schools, communicate and seek consensus on the model from teachers and leaders, and establish systems to support teachers and leaders in its implementation.**
  - A.** The district should convene a task force of representative teachers and leaders to research and identify an instructional model for Fairhaven.
    1. There are several resources to build on that are already part of the knowledge base in the district: ESE's educator evaluation rubric, the *Understanding by Design* (UbD) framework used in ESE's model curriculum units, and the workshop model of whole group/small group instruction currently in use in the elementary schools.
    2. The new instructional model should be rigorous. It should challenge and engage students to develop and use higher order thinking skills, include differentiated instructional strategies to address students' diverse learning needs, and provide assessments that require students to demonstrate understanding and application of knowledge and skills, especially through performances, orally and in writing.
    3. Once the school community adopts the model, it should be non-negotiable and used appropriately in all content areas at all school levels. It should become the Fairhaven way of teaching.
  - B.** The district should provide appropriate professional development to deepen teachers' and leaders' understanding and capacity to implement the model. Professional development should specifically focus on teaching strategies that promote critical thinking, differentiated instruction, and the use of resources (technology, instructional materials, and support staff) to meet students' learning styles and needs. Some embedded professional development strategies to consider include: informal supervisory walkthroughs; lesson study; looking at student work; discussing videotapes of lessons at team or full faculty meetings; and meaningful peer observation/discussion.
  - C.** All supervisory and evaluation practices should consistently align with and provide support and actionable feedback to teachers on how well teaching reflects the district's preferred instructional model.

**Benefits:** By implementing this recommendation, the district will ensure that teachers understand and consistently implement a teaching model that reflects best instructional practices in Fairhaven. Furthermore, teachers will consistently engage in productive and vibrant conversations about good teaching as they collaborate with colleagues to improve their practice. Leaders will play an integral role in each school's efforts to improve teaching. The ultimate beneficiaries will be Fairhaven's students, who will likely have more opportunities to become more active, thoughtful learners who can apply their knowledge and skills in the real world.

### Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) 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. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- ESE's *Calibration Video Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/>) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.
- 2. The district should establish, share, and implement a multi-year process for the regular and timely review and revision of curricula based on valid research, an analysis of MCAS results and other relevant data and information, as well as input from professional staff.**
- A.** The district should convene a representative group of teachers and leaders to draft and recommend a systematic plan to review and revise all core academic subjects and co-curricular programs sequentially over a multi-year period.
  - B.** The district should consider implementing the plan in multiple stages. For example:
    1. First, a vertical team of content-based teachers and leaders should research and review best practices and emerging themes in the content area in general. The team should also review existing curriculum maps, units of study, and other curriculum documents to assess alignment to state standards, horizontal and vertical alignment within and across school levels, common assessments, learning objectives, resources in use, student achievement data and other relevant information.
    2. Second, the team should plan and update curriculum documents using a common curriculum template and common language. As the team updates and refines curriculum, it should identify the support needed to implement the new curriculum, such as professional development, new instructional resources, new or added assessments, and the program's financial/budget needs.
    3. Third, the district should have an approval process at the district level, either through a districtwide curriculum team or the district's leadership team, to review and eventually approve the updated curriculum.

4. Fourth, the new curriculum should be implemented as an action research project. Grade-level and content-level teams should engage in lesson study to better understand what works well and what needs further work. Leaders should engage in supervisory activities such as observations and walkthroughs to assess strengths and challenges of the new curriculum and instructional strategies and needed fine-tuning should take place. The district should plan and provide professional development to meet teachers' needs in implementing new resources and new teaching strategies.
  5. Fifth, after an appropriate pre-determined timeframe, the cycle of review and revision should begin again.
  6. A typical cycle for curriculum review and renewal is four or five years. Also, districts often review one core content area and one co-curricular area simultaneously; for example, a review of ELA and health/physical education would take place in the same cycle; math and the arts would take place in a second cycle, and so forth. Each content area should be scheduled to sequence through one of the years of the review cycle each year.
- C. The district should consider the curriculum as a living document. Although it may undergo major review and revision over a multi-year period, it can also benefit from fine-tuning and upgrading based on current practice and needs, each year.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation will mean that the district's curriculum will be current, of high quality and provide more rigorous and challenging learning opportunities for all students. Furthermore, it will encourage students to engage more actively in thoughtful learning experiences that can help develop their critical and analytical thinking. A vibrant curriculum taught using active learning strategies will engage students in learning and develop habits of mind and habits of the heart as they make their way through the Fairhaven Public Schools.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu\\_guide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf)) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t>) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. It includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* ([http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvX\\_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu](http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvX_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu)) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- The *Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.
  - ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
  - *Curriculum Mapping: Raising the Rigor of Teaching and Learning* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/Candi/model/maps/CurriculumMaps.pdf>) is a presentation that provides definitions of curriculum mapping, examples of model maps, and descriptions of curriculum mapping processes.
  - Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
- 3. The district should convene a representative vertical team of elementary-, middle-, and high-school science teachers and leaders to plan a new elementary science program/curriculum and to review and revise the middle- and high-school science curriculum, ensuring alignment of all curriculum to the 2016 Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework. The district should consider reallocating funds as needed to provide appropriate resources for a high-quality science program.**
- A.** The review and revision of the science curriculum should be the priority of a new curriculum review process that the district will hopefully develop and implement.
  - B.** The science curriculum team should take advantage of Fairhaven's geographical location on Buzzard's Bay, the Acushnet River, and other south coast facilities and natural resources (such as alternative energy, the fishing industry, and the environment) as it reinvents science teaching and learning in the district.
  - C.** The new curriculum should be shaped using the district's instructional model and common curriculum template.
  - D.** Science teaching and learning in the district should be constructed on a process of inquiry and hands-on learning and emphasize students' ability to ask questions, test hypotheses, and seek/find evidence-based answers. Students should be given opportunities to explore and explain phenomena from each scientific discipline at each school level. Students should also be expected to build useful and powerful research skills using mathematical concepts and skills and technology as they ask, hypothesize, and answer questions.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation may include a reinvention of science teaching and learning in the district that is grounded in best instructional and curricular practices and embedded in the rich and abundant opportunities of the local environment. Students will be able to engage more in real-life learning and build their understanding of and experience with the scientific method.

Fairhaven's students will also be better prepared for further study and for life and work in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Quick Reference Guide: Establishing an Effective Science and Technology/Engineering (STE) Program* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/ste/STEprogram.docx>): ESE has identified five components districts should attend to when designing a rigorous, coherent and relevant pre-K-12 STE education program. Educators, administrators and curriculum designers can refer to this guide for brief descriptions and resources for each component.
- Sample curriculum maps (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/maps/default.html>) were designed to assist schools and districts with making sense of students' learning experiences over time, ensuring a viable and guaranteed curriculum, establishing learning targets, and aligning curriculum to ensure a consistent implementation of the MA Frameworks.
- *Mathematics Framework Exploration Activities* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/mathexplore/default.html>) are a growing set of activities designed by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education mathematics staff and educators. The activities can be accessed and used to promote discussion and collaborative inquiry.
- The Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/stem/review.html>) provides links to the current frameworks and supporting documents, including updated strand maps, crosswalks, and other guidance materials.

## Assessment

---

### ***Contextual Background***

The district has in place assessments at all levels and continues to develop and expand its assessment system. For example, at the elementary level the district administers the DIBELS assessment several times a year, and is investigating additional assessments to measure the comprehension levels of students. The middle school is focusing on assessing comprehension and in 2016–2017 is piloting the RISE diagnostic reading assessment. Common math assessments are also in place in grades 7–8. At the middle and high schools, common and priority assessments have been established in all content areas to measure students' skill levels and progress. Priority assessments are administered several weeks before the common assessment to determine gaps in teaching and learning.

Time has been allocated for teachers to review assessment data and to collaborate on how to use data to inform instruction and to develop interventions for students who are not achieving at expected levels. Teachers meet during scheduled common planning time at all schools to review and discuss assessment results and student work, to plan lessons, and to develop intervention strategies.

While the district administers assessments at the elementary-, middle-, and high-school levels and time has been allocated for teachers to review and discuss how data should be used to modify instruction, the district does not have a centralized warehouse for the storage of all student data.

### ***Strength Finding***

**1. The district continues to develop and expand the assessment options available to schools to guide instruction and inform interventions.**

**A. District schools administer a range of formative, summative, and benchmark/common assessments to measure students' progress and need.**

1. The elementary schools administered the PARCC in 2016. In addition, interviews and a review of the district's self-assessment as well as other information provided by school and district leaders indicated that the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), DIBELS Maze, and teacher-developed common ELA benchmark assessments K–5 are administered 3 times a year. Reading Street unit assessments are also used to measure progress in ELA. Teacher-developed benchmark assessments and Go Math unit assessments are used to measure math progress.
  - a. Interviewees stated that the elementary schools do not have an assessment to measure comprehension well, but are reviewing the possible use of the I-Ready diagnostic adaptive assessment.
2. The middle school administered the PARCC in 2016. Interviewees said that the middle school was transitioning in 2016–2017 to a more concept-based system of assessments and

- in 2016–2017 has implemented the RISE diagnostic assessment, which focuses on student reading comprehension. The RISE was administered in October 2016 and assessed areas that students struggled with on the spring 2016 PARCC assessment. At the time of the onsite, the middle school was considering administering the RISE diagnostic assessment again in spring 2017.
- a. Interviewees told the team that common math assessments were in place in grades 7–8 and that the middle school was developing “tighter” common benchmark assessments in ELA and math.
  - b. The Gates-MacGinitie assessment is administered to grade 8 students in Fairhaven to determine which students are two years below grade level in reading. However, the Gates-MacGinitie assessment is not administered to grade 8 students in Acushnet, many of whom later attend Fairhaven High School.
  - c. Grade 6 teachers told the team that they administer an ELA benchmark assessment monthly and have a monthly writing goal that requires students to write responses to open-response questions to practice for the PARCC test.
3. At the high school, in addition to the MCAS in grade 10, quarterly assessments and common final examinations are administered in each content area. Interviewees stated that other formative assessments are administered at the discretion of the teacher. Document-based question assessments are used at the high school. Students are required to assess and to investigate primary and secondary sources. This assessment is tiered: grade 9 focuses on the claim, grade 10 on evidence, and grade 11 on reasoning.
  4. The middle and high schools have developed priority assessments in all content areas; these are administered several weeks before the benchmark assessments to identify concepts that require re-teaching before the common assessment. The purpose of priority assessments is to determine for each student gaps in skills and concepts.
  5. The team observed moderate and strong evidence of teachers conducting appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students (characteristic #11) in 75 percent of elementary classes, in 81 percent of middle-school classes, and in 57 percent of high-school classes.
  6. School and district leaders told the team that many departments use common assessment data such as DIBELS to measure students’ progress and not as part of the educator evaluation system.
- B.** District and school leaders and teachers analyze data and make decisions about instruction and interventions.
1. The superintendent has implemented a distributive data analysis model that includes the analysis of academic and non-academic data by the administrative council, supervisors, and teacher teams. Data meetings are held three times a year at all schools.



2. Teachers meet in common planning time at all schools to review and discuss student work and to discuss formative and summative assessment results, to plan lessons, and to develop intervention strategies. A review of team meeting agendas indicated that topics discussed including lesson pacing and questions and concerns about Reading Street. Interviewees stated that supervisors, coaches, or teachers lead the meetings.
  - a. District and school leaders told the team that formative and summative assessment data such as from the PARCC and DIBELS assessments are reviewed to inform school improvement planning and professional development.
  - b. Interviewees told the team about informal practices of displaying results from DIBELS assessments, unit tests, and common assessments on spreadsheets and sharing the data with teachers before meetings with an expectation that teachers would review the data and be ready to discuss it at the meetings.

**Impact:** When the district has a balanced system of assessments, instructional leaders and teachers likely have the ability to identify students' strengths and challenges, to use data to inform instruction, and to implement appropriate interventions to support struggling students.

### ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

#### **2. The district does not have a central repository for academic and non-academic student data.**

- A. The district does not have a data warehouse that enables teachers to access a dashboard of assessments for each student, to create reports to inform adjustments to curriculum and instruction, and to develop additional formative assessments for immediate feedback to students.
  1. Interviewees stated that some DIBELS data is stored in the Ideal Consulting Student Performance System (part of DIBELS) and access to grades and test scores is available in the Aspen X2 student information management system.

**Impact:** The absence of a central repository for the review and analysis of data compromises educators' ability to easily access, organize, and analyze all relevant data and make data-based judgments and timely revisions to its programs, instruction, and professional development program.

### ***Recommendation***

1. **The district should consider reallocating resources to study the development of a data assessment and management system to allow staff to analyze trends and develop student data dashboards.**
  - A. The district should use the assessment management system to include all student academic and non-academic aggregate and subgroup data into a central location.

- B.** Schools could use data from a student assessment system to provide immediate information to students and teachers.

- 1. The assessment system should be integrated with the data stored in TeachPoint, if possible.

- C.** The district could integrate the assessment system with the School Interoperability framework and Edwin Analytics to gain access to information that supports teaching and learning.

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

- Having the ability to review a dashboard of data that includes all academic and social-emotional and health information allows teachers and school leaders to identify gaps in in the curricula and/or instruction and make immediate changes to improve the proficiency of students.
- Having a central source of student data allows a more efficient allocation of resources for struggling students or schools.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

---

### ***Contextual Background***

The district is embarking on an ambitious plan for comprehensive improvement that seeks to strategically place people, structures, and systems in positions to better support its mission and core values. The overarching goal of the 2016–2017 District Improvement Plan (DIP) is to make powerful teaching and learning the central focus of the Fairhaven Public Schools. A primary objective of the DIP is to “Develop and implement a long term, sustainable District and School Leadership/Operations Plan that provides the support and resources to expand and enhance powerful teaching and learning.” Key changes in district leadership positions, aligned with these strategic objectives, have been made in two of Fairhaven’s four schools, along with the creation for 2017–2018 of an assistant superintendent position to coordinate curriculum and instruction K–12.

The DIP states that a key guidepost leading to the accomplishment of its goals is that the district “effectively supervises staff and supports an Educator Evaluation process that identifies needs and helps support educators’ professional growth and improvement and eliminates ineffective instruction.”

It is clear that the district recognizes that the quality of teaching is directly related to the quality of student learning and that providing appropriate supports to improve instruction has a direct impact on learning outcomes. It is not clear, however, that the district has adequate systems and related procedures in place to achieve its strategic goals. Powerful teaching and learning require powerful supervision and evaluation and need to be supported by an equally robust professional development program. The district’s educator evaluation and professional development systems are challenged to effectively support and promote district improvement initiatives of the scope articulated in the DIP.

### ***Strength Finding***

- 1. The district is developing a culture that promotes adult learning and collaboration through on-going and embedded opportunities for professional growth and a shared responsibility for student achievement.**
  - A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district has created structures for collaboration that provide teachers with regular, frequent department and grade-level common planning and meeting time that is used to improve curriculum, student support, and instruction.
    1. Interviewees said that professional development (PD) is school based and job embedded. Structured common planning time by grade level and content area is built into the weekly schedules of all teachers in all schools in the district. The district calendar also includes two full and four early-release PD days, as well as four ninety-minute after-school PD sessions to provide additional opportunities for teachers to collaborate on a range of activities and programs.

- a. Administrators reported that common planning meetings are purposeful and productive. Principals monitor and in some cases attend meetings, providing teachers with support and direction. Meetings often have detailed agendas and attendees are held accountable for action items.
  2. Principals indicated and district documents confirmed that the goals in the District Improvement Plan (DIP), the goals in the School Improvement Plans (SIPs), and individual teachers' goals are closely aligned. They said that PD programs, activities, and priorities are developed to achieve these goals.
  3. Interviewees said the PD program is increasingly informed by the collection and analysis of multiple sources of student academic data. These include PARCC and DIBELS at the elementary schools; MCAS, PARCC, RISE Reading Assessments, and school-developed priority assessments at the middle school; and MCAS, Write Boston authentic writing activities, schoolwide student performance rubrics, and departmental common assessments in content areas across the curriculum at the high school.
  4. School leaders expressed the belief that the district's current PD model has done much to promote collaboration among educators, to encourage the timely sharing of ideas, and to expand formal opportunities for teachers to work together in both vertical and horizontal combinations to achieve identified goals and specific objectives.
- B.** The district's mentoring program is designed to enhance the professional development and retention of new teachers, to promote reflective practice and collegiality, to increase awareness of diversity in the schools, to acclimate new staff to their school's culture, and to establish norms for continual professional learning.
1. Administrators reported that all new staff receive formal orientation, mentoring, coaching, and a range of other appropriate supports through the mentoring program, noting that the district's mentoring program was developed to be consistent with ESE's *Guidelines for Induction and Mentoring*.
    - a. In separate interviews principals and teachers described the district's mentoring program positively, indicating that it was a "strong and well organized" teacher-run program and a "great tool for new teachers."

**Impact:** Providing regular and frequent common planning and meeting time expands opportunities for curriculum revision, and for sustained and structured collaboration that focuses on developing professional practices, improving assessment and data analysis competencies, and developing skills directly focused on the identified learning needs of students. Ultimately, this greatly enhances educational opportunities, learning experiences, and academic achievement for all students in the district.

## ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

### **2. The district's professional development program does not have centralized leadership; comprehensive and coordinated long-term planning; specific, measurable goals; or formal teacher collaboration in planning, implementing, and evaluating professional development.**

**A.** The district's professional development (PD) program is not fully aligned with the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development. The guiding principles of these standards are that PD: (a) is intentional; (b) is a structured, comprehensive, and coordinated process; (c) is evaluated for effectiveness; and (d) requires strong and collaborative leadership. The following are among the notable challenges of the district's PD program as measured against the state standards.

1. The district's collective bargaining agreement (CBA) states that an "In Service committee will be established...to survey the membership as to educational needs and interests, compile data to evaluate the quality of in service programs, and create ways to use in service time to achieve system/school goals as efficiently as possible" and that the "In Service Committee will consist of the superintendent or his districtwide designee, one representative from each of the elementary schools, and two teachers from each secondary school."
  - a. Interviewees reported that the district did not have a designated leadership group, a formal steering committee, or a PD director in place to plan, to organize, or to direct the district's PD program.
  - b. Administrators said that principals discussed and planned PD programs and activities at district administrator meetings. They acknowledged that the district did not have a comprehensive annual PD plan or coordinated and unified PD system in place. Administrators also stated that the district has not developed specific or measurable PD goals and objectives with which to inform, guide, and coordinate district and school PD initiatives or priorities.
  - c. Administrators reported that the district did not have structures or systems in place to enable formal and active collaboration of faculty in the planning, oversight, or delivery of the district's PD program.
2. The district does not have a process or system for collecting and analyzing data to identify teachers' needs/interests, to evaluate the effectiveness of PD programs, or to regularly communicate this information to faculty.
  - a. Principals stated that efforts have been made to implement some of these practices at the school level but that they are inconsistent and vary widely among the schools.
3. Interviewees said that much of the district's PD program was delivered at the individual school or department. Teachers indicated that the quality and consistency of PD programs and practices were uneven.
4. District leaders acknowledged a need to provide greater differentiation in PD opportunities for teachers and specialists.

- a. The district's self-assessment submitted before the onsite rated professional learning as "Somewhat well" described by the indicator: "PD programs are available to support educators at all levels of expertise and stages in their careers."
- b. Interviewees also indicated a need to provide appropriate professional learning opportunities for the district's paraprofessional staff to enhance their ability to support students effectively.

**Impact:** The overall effectiveness of the district's PD program is diminished by several factors. These include the absence of a well-defined and collaborative leadership structure, of a comprehensive PD plan with clearly articulated and measurable goals, and of meaningful faculty input and involvement in program planning and implementation. By missing the opportunity to develop a comprehensive, collaborative, and coordinated PD system, the district limits its ability to expand professional practice, to improve classroom instruction, to advance district goals and priorities, and to increase students' academic achievement.

### **3. The district has not achieved consistency in the implementation of its educator evaluation system.**

- A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district's supervisory practices and procedures, as well as the written evaluations themselves, varied widely in quality and consistency.
  1. Team members reviewed the evaluative documentation of 30 teachers randomly selected from all the district's schools. Although supporting documents (for example, self-assessments, goal setting, and educator plans) were timely and complete, most formative assessments/evaluations and summative evaluations were instructive<sup>10</sup> only to a limited degree and seldom contained concrete supporting evidence. They provided little feedback for improved classroom practice that was specific, measurable, or actionable. Nor did they contain concrete recommendations with the ability to significantly improve instruction or contribute to meaningful professional growth.
  2. Although teachers and administrators said that the number of announced and unannounced classroom observations by administrators met contractual requirements, interviewees indicated that there were significant variations in the frequency of classroom visits and in the quality and consistency of feedback provided to teachers after those visits.
    - a. In its self-assessment submitted before the review, the district rated educator growth and development as "Somewhat well" described by the indicator: "Formal and informal supervision of educators includes regular, timely, and actionable feedback that is instructive, identifies next steps for professional development, and enables

---

<sup>10</sup> An informative evaluation is factual and cites instructional details such as methodology, pedagogy, Standards and Indicators of Effective Teaching Practice or instruction of subject-based knowledge that is aligned with the state curriculum frameworks. It does not commit to improvement strategies. An instructive evaluation includes comments intended to improve instruction.

administrators to meet their expectations and goals.” (Possible responses were Not at All Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)

3. The district has developed an electronic Observation Feedback form to be used with announced and unannounced class observations. Administrators and teachers indicated that the document was underused, employed inconsistently and ineffectively, and that the quality of teacher feedback varied greatly.
  - a. A review of almost 50 Observation Feedback forms indicated that although a few contained narrative feedback that was actionable or growth oriented, most did not contain any comments.

**B.** As of the 2015–2016 school year, the educator evaluation regulations (603 CMR 35.07) require all Massachusetts districts to collect and use student feedback as evidence in the teacher evaluation process and staff feedback as evidence in the administrator evaluation process.<sup>11</sup> Feedback may also be used to inform an educator’s self-assessment and goal setting, or as evidence of change in practice over time. The district is currently out of compliance with this regulatory requirement.

1. Administrators acknowledged that the district has not taken action to implement this component of the educator evaluation system and indicated that the district was not considering such an initiative.

**C.** The educator evaluation regulations also require the identification of multiple measures of student learning, including common assessments and other statewide growth measures, to assess students’ learning, growth, and achievement. These assessments are intended to provide reliable feedback about student learning and educator effectiveness across all grades and content areas and to serve as a key element in determining an individual educator’s summative rating. The district is currently out of compliance with this regulatory requirement.

1. Although the district has developed a battery of common assessments, interviewees reported that the district did not plan to include evidence of student learning as a key element in educators’ evaluations.

**Impact:** Without consistent and effective supervisory practices, evaluative procedures, and documentation, the district is challenged to provide enriched educational opportunities, learning experiences, and improved academic outcomes for all students. By not including multiple measures of student learning as evidence in the evaluation of teachers and administrators, the district reduces its

---

<sup>11</sup> On Tuesday, February 28, 2017, after collecting public comment since November 2016, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted 9-1 to amend the educator evaluation regulations. The most significant change in the regulations is the elimination of a separate student impact rating. Under the [amended regulations](#), evaluators do not have to make a separate judgment about an educator’s impact on student learning. Instead, student learning is embedded as an indicator within one of the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework’s four standards.

ability to promote the professional competencies of staff and to significantly enhance learning opportunities, classroom instruction, and academic achievement for all students.

## ***Recommendations***

**1. The district should develop an improved professional development model characterized by strong, collaborative leadership and a comprehensive, coordinated professional development plan that supports district and school goals and priorities as well as the identified needs of educators.**

**A.** The new professional development (PD) model should focus on systematically promoting the professional growth and practice of staff, advancing well defined district and school priorities, and significantly improving student achievement. It should be fully aligned with the principles articulated in the state’s Standards for Professional Development, with attention devoted to the following elements.

1. The district’s PD program should be directed by a designated joint committee composed of administrators, teacher representatives, and specialists. This leadership team should meet regularly to systematically plan, implement, and monitor comprehensive and coordinated PD programs, activities, and systems across the district. It should function under the direction and with the full support of the superintendent or the new assistant superintendent.
2. The new model should provide effective and appropriately strong leadership with the capacity to revise and improve the structure and organization of current programming, ensure connectedness and follow up to PD activities, and promote a culture of consistently high expectations for all elements of the district PD program.
3. The goals and objectives of the district PD plan should be specific and clear and directly aligned with and supportive of priorities articulated in DIP and SIPs, as well as specific student learning needs. The plan should be written and monitored using SMART goals, as appropriate.
4. Improved and standardized policies and practices for the collection and analysis of data relevant to PD goals, effectiveness, and audience should be established. These should include student data from multiple sources to inform decisions about PD programming and educator data to identify the needs and interests of faculty, as well as to assess the effectiveness of PD activities and initiatives to ensure that objectives are being met.

**Benefits:** The creation of a unified, well defined PD leadership model that is informed by data will help ensure that all district resources, including personnel, time, and funding are deployed in a more coordinated, systematic, and effective manner. It will promote communication, efficiency, and the equitable allocation and integration of services and supports. Most importantly, it will help ensure that all K–12 PD programs and services are carefully aligned with and directly supportive of well-defined district priorities and initiatives.



**Recommended resources:**

- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- ESE's *Professional Development Self- Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dsac/professional-development-self-assessment-guide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings' alignment with the Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.

**2. The district should take deliberate steps to fully and effectively implement all components of the state Educator Evaluation Framework. Attention should focus on improving the overall effectiveness and consistency of supervisory practices and evaluative products, as well as the development of appropriate systems for the collection and use of multiple sources of evidence to inform the evaluation process.**

- A.** The district should develop and implement systems and procedures to improve the ability of its administrators to consistently produce high quality formative and summative evaluations that are evidence based, growth oriented, actionable, and contribute directly to the continuous professional growth of staff.
1. Evaluators should be provided with additional formal training, coaching, and other support structures designed to enhance their overall evaluative competencies. Attention should also focus on calibration activities to promote quality, fairness, and consistency among all evaluators in their observations, analyses, and written descriptions of classroom culture and pedagogical practice.
  2. More effective quality control systems should be created so that the district can continuously monitor and make timely improvements to the educator evaluation program and products. Attention should be given to developing an efficient and reliable process whereby all evaluations are reviewed to ensure that they are high quality documents that contain evidence based feedback and recommendations that are specific, growth oriented, and actionable.
  3. The district should develop enhanced and more consistent supervisory practices, procedures, and instruments to ensure that all staff receive regular, frequent, and actionable feedback. Increased and more effective use should be made of both announced and unannounced classroom observations, and the Observation Feedback instrument, as key evaluative tools to promote professional dialogue and improve and expand pedagogical practice.
- B.** The district is urged to move forward promptly with the adoption of the two new components of the state educator evaluation frameworks that require the collection and use of multiple sources of evidence to inform the summary evaluations of teachers and administrators.

1. Procedures and systems needed to collect and appropriately incorporate student and staff feedback as an evidence component of teacher and administrator evaluations should be developed. In addition to informing evaluations, student feedback could be included in an educator's self-assessment, goal setting, or used to demonstrate improvements in practice over time.
2. The district should develop an effective process, consistent with state guidelines, whereby the results of common student assessments and other statewide growth measures are factored as a component of an educator's evaluation. Although a recent amendment to the educator evaluation regulations eliminates the need to determine a separate student impact rating, evidence of student learning as a component of an educator's summative performance rating is still required.

**Benefits:** By enhancing the quality and consistency of supervisory practices and evaluative procedures and products, the district will create a powerful mechanism with which to produce enriched learning opportunities and increased academic outcomes for all students. By adopting the important new components of educator evaluation that require the collection and use of multiple measures of evidence to be used in the evaluation of teachers and administrators, the district will be better able to provide educators with a comprehensive and accurate description of their overall effectiveness. This will enable staff to reflect more objectively on their professional efficacy and thereby identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Ultimately, the use of multiple sources of student academic achievement appropriately places student learning at the center of all district improvement efforts.

**Recommended resources:**

- Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf>) and Administrators (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf>) are designed to provide schools and districts with information about the status of their educator evaluation implementation. Information from these surveys can be used to target district resources and supports where most needed to strengthen implementation.
- ESE's Online Calibration Training Tool (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/calibration/tool/>) uses videos of classroom instruction from ESE's Calibration Video Library to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as school leaders or educator preparation program supervisors, watch a lesson video, assess the teacher's practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric, and then provide the teacher with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare with each other as well as with educators throughout the state.

## Student Support

---

### ***Contextual Background***

The district has not developed a systematic approach to meet the needs of struggling students. Although the four schools in the district have historically made decisions about student support separately, there is increased effort for the two elementary schools to offer similar services and the district is considering ways to expand and improve the breadth of behavioral supports available to all students at each level. A new director of student services began service in July 2016 and the position of districtwide assistant for student services was established in 2016–2017.

There is widespread attention across the district to students' social-emotional learning for which the district has martialed resources and professional development. However, the district does not have in place a districtwide, comprehensive plan that addresses students who struggle academically and with social-emotional issues. The two elementary schools have implemented Responsive Classroom, which emphasizes the equal importance of academic and social-emotional learning in the classroom, and the teaching of skills including cooperation, empathy, and self-control. The two elementary schools also use the Response to Intervention model to identify struggling learners, including screening, progress monitoring, and tiered instruction. At the elementary schools and across the district paraprofessionals are widely used for tiered instruction beyond Tier 1.

In 2016–2017 the new middle-school principal has focused his efforts on instilling the belief across the school that all students can learn and progress, increasing expectations for learning for all students, and helping staff arrive at a united vision of what effective teaching looks like.

Supports for struggling students at the high school, including attention to social-emotional issues, are administered through the guidance department. Incidences of behavior issues are reportedly low. At the high school, the need exists for strategies that support the learning of all students.

Interviewees said that in the 2016–2017 school year high-school staff has seen an increase in the incidence of social-emotional needs in students arriving from Acushnet.

### ***Strength Finding***

- 1. At the elementary level, schools create positive conditions for learning and offer social-emotional supports for all students.**
  - A.** A district administrator reported that the elementary schools are creating the conditions that enable all students to learn, by implementing Responsive Classroom, an approach that emphasizes the development of social-emotional learning skills.
    1. A district leader reported that Responsive Classroom was first implemented at the Wood elementary school several years ago and has been adopted at East Fairhaven in 2016–2017.

2. The Responsive Classroom approach emphasizes that important cognitive growth takes place through social interaction, and teaches skills including cooperation, empathy, and self-control.<sup>12</sup> A student support staff person reported that in one practice of Responsive Classroom, the schoolwide morning meeting, adults set expectations for the school day and can give “subtle messages” to students about people “not giving up on you.”
  3. The Responsive Classroom approach is reflected in the professional development activities at the elementary schools.
    - a. Review team members were told that several teachers at the Wood Elementary School were trained in the Responsive Classroom approach and have reached a level of expertise called “ambassadors.” They provide professional development in the Responsive Classroom approach to their peers at the Wood and East Fairhaven elementary schools.
    - b. A review of the 2016–2017 District Professional Development Calendar indicated four professional activities about the Responsive Classroom approach for elementary school staff, including an initial four-day training in the summer.
- B.** Additional personnel and partnerships further support students’ social-emotional learning including those students who struggle with behavior.
1. A special education teacher runs the new behavioral sub-separate classroom, for students whose Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) have a behavioral component. Interviewees reported that students in that classroom work their way to inclusion with positive behavior “points,” and can return to the sub-separate classroom as needed.
  2. There are three elementary-level school adjustment counselors, one of whom splits time between the elementary schools. The counselors offer activities including lunch groups and a curriculum on self-regulation for students on the autism spectrum, a peer mediation program for fifth graders, and an after-school mentor program with faculty volunteers for students who might otherwise “fall through the cracks.”
  3. Student support services staff reported that elementary schools create strong working relationships with community partners to create wrap-around services to students and families, including Child and Family Services, The Caring Network, and translation services for parents of English language learners.

**Impact:** A unified and well-implemented model at the elementary level that emphasizes social-emotional learning skills in school, along with wrap-around services outside of school, create positive conditions for learning for all students during students’ early years and can set the stage for their success at subsequent school levels.

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.responsiveclassroom.org>

## ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

- 2. The district has not implemented a systematic approach for addressing the needs of all struggling students across the district.**
  - A.** A district leader stated that the district has four schools with four distinct student services teams, noting that steps need to be taken for the district to become “one true district” of aligned student services.
  - B.** The superintendent stated that his focus in 2015–2016 was to hire new student services leaders, and now the process for delivering student services needed to include a tiered system of support.
  - C.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district is in the beginning stages of developing a tiered system to assess and respond to students’ behavior, noting that assessment of students’ social-emotional needs and staff responses to those needs are not systematic and comprehensive across all levels.
  - D.** As part of the budget process, the superintendent is looking at the number and appropriate use of paraprofessionals across the district to support struggling students, including those with social-emotional needs.
  - E.** At the secondary level, services to address the social-emotional needs of all students are uncoordinated.
    1. At the middle school, supports for students struggling with social-emotional issues are numerous, infrequent, and are not based on a consistent and ongoing social-emotional learning approach.
    2. The district plans to create a substantially separate behavior classroom at the middle school to enable students from the substantially separate behavior classroom at the elementary level to continue to receive therapeutic services in-district.
  - F.** According to ESE data, the district did not meet its 2016 target toward narrowing proficiency gaps for all students, showing the least progress with narrowing proficiency gaps for high needs students and students with disabilities.

**Impact:** When a district’s approach to meeting the needs of struggling students is not systematic and regular, students do not receive the consistent and ongoing services that they need.

## ***Recommendation***

- 1. The DIP should articulate a clear, unified vision to support struggling students in grades K–12 featuring districtwide SMART goals. Each SIP should feature SMART goals that are aligned with the districtwide vision for social-emotional support.**
  - A.** The creation of a unified vision to support struggling students should be an iterative process that includes input from student services leadership, student support staff at each school level, in creating district SMART goals,<sup>13</sup> resources, and programs.
  - B.** The superintendent should periodically report to school committee, staff and families the extent of the attainment of goals related to improved outcomes for students with disabilities and other student subgroups.
  - C.** The director and assistant director of student services should ensure that activities that address the DIP goals are carried out at each school and in alignment across the district, driven by the regular use of student data, disaggregated by student subgroup.
  - D.** At each school level, principals, with input from the director and assistant director of student services should ensure that their SIP aligns with the DIP, as well as align with each subsequent school level to ensure appropriate support for students transitioning from one level to the next.
    1. At the elementary schools, the two principals should work closely to ensure appropriate horizontal alignment of their SIPs, getting input from teachers, paraprofessionals and parents, in setting goals and tracking progress toward goals.
    2. At the middle school, the principal should solicit input for the SIP from a team that includes at least one teacher from each grade level along with student support staff serving each of the three school levels. This will ensure that goals and related data tracking reflect issues that may arise during transition years.
    3. For the high school SIP, the principal should seek input from a team composed of a teacher from each department and a guidance counselor from each grade, making careful use of current and historical data disaggregated by student subgroup. Data should inform decisions and goals regarding activities and reallocated resources to support students at each grade level.
  - E.** Once a unified vision to support struggling students is in place, the director and assistant director of student services should meet with student services providers in the Acushnet public school district to compare and align services at the elementary and middle schools.

---

<sup>13</sup> SMART goals are specific and strategic; measureable; action-oriented; rigorous, realistic, and results- focused; and timed and tracked.

- F. In making decisions and setting priorities, all schools should prioritize highly qualified staff and equity in the allocation of resources for each school, based on data about student needs.

**Benefits** from implementing this recommendation could include an aligned continuum of supports for all students in the district that would result in stronger outcomes for all students, including student subgroups. Moreover, struggling students and their families would be aware that the district policies and practices value all students, and may motivate students to persist in their studies until graduation, and to consider and appreciate the wide variety of college and career opportunities their education has prepared them for.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Massachusetts Transfer Goals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MATransferGoals.pdf>) are long range goals that students should work toward over the course of their Pre-K–12 academic experience. They were written to provide an explicit connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts’ definition of College and Career Readiness. They are not recommended for use as a checklist, evaluation tool, or as an assessment tool, but they could be a helpful resource for the district as it articulates a vision and engages in long-term planning.
- ESE’s *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs.
- *Ninth Grade Counts* (<http://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/resources/ninth-grade-counts/>) is a resource to help high schools identify weaknesses in their ninth-grade programs, and then develop a purposeful, proactive plan to strengthen this critical educational transition. The guide is divided into three areas of focus:
  - Strengthening the Transition into High School
  - Strengthening the High School Transition for English Language Learners
  - Using Summer Bridge Programs to Strengthen the High School Transition
- The *Massachusetts Definition of College and Career Readiness* (<http://www.mass.edu/library/documents/2013College&CareerReadinessDefinition.pdf>) is a set of learning competencies, intellectual capacities and experiences essential for all students to become lifelong learners; positive contributors to their families, workplaces and communities; and

successfully engaged citizens of a global 21st century. This could be a helpful resource as the district articulates its vision and goals.

- *Dropout Prevention* (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/9>) is a practice guide produced by the US Department of Education, the Institute of Education Sciences, and the What Works Clearinghouse. It provides specific and coherent evidence-based recommendations for use by educators addressing the challenge of reducing dropping out. Strategies presented include identifying and advocating for at-risk students, implementing programs to improve behavior and social skills, and keeping students engaged in the school environment.
- *The Impact of Dropping Out Student Flyer* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/2014-05ImpactFlyer.pdf>) is a brief resource that can be shared with students and their families as part of the exit intervention process to share the potential negative impacts of dropping out of high school.
- *The Impact of Dropping Out Staff Resources Summary* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/2014-05ImpactSummary.pdf>) provides a summary of research findings on the impacts of dropping out, listed by the following categories: personal income and employment, economy, crime, literacy, health, and family formation. Following the summary of findings is a listing of references.



## Financial and Asset Management

---

### ***Contextual Background***

Town support for the schools has exceeded the required net school spending (NSS) level for the past four years. In fiscal year 2012, Fairhaven was 12 percent above its NSS requirement; in fiscal year 2013, 5.8 percent above; in fiscal year 2014, 3.8 percent above; and in fiscal year 2015, the district was 0.5 percent above its NSS requirement. In addition, the increase approved for the fiscal year 2016 school budget was 0.7 percent above its NSS requirement.

School committee members and municipal officials have expressed concern about financial management and reporting. School committee members said that financial reports were not provided on a timely basis. The district and the town do not have a signed, written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of schools.

The district participates in the community's capital plan, and has reported several deferred maintenance items associated with excessive heat and humidity in the high school gym and other areas of the school. At the time of the onsite in February 2017, the district planned to address these items in fiscal year 2018.

### ***Strength Finding***

**1. Fairhaven public schools and Acushnet public schools have collaborated to develop a tuition agreement for high-school students which benefits both districts.**

**A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that after a lengthy history of Acushnet students enrolling in Fairhaven High School, on August 5, 2014, the Acushnet and Fairhaven districts reached a tuition agreement which provides Acushnet students an “unrestricted right” to attend Fairhaven High School.

1. The steadily increasing number of students that have enrolled in recent years led to the formation of this agreement.

**B.** At the time of the review in February 2017, both districts were planning to further consolidate their educational programs and services by discussing the formation of a K–12 superintendency union or a 9–12 regional school district. Each district has committed to contributing \$20,000 toward a feasibility study to explore this matter.

**Impact:** This agreement establishes a synergistic relationship between Acushnet and Fairhaven, which features quality educational services to Acushnet students and needed revenue for the Fairhaven public schools.

## ***Challenges and Areas for Growth***

- 2. The budget document does not contain a summary or narrative highlighting goals or priorities; it does not include all expenditures for education in the district. Financial reports are provided to the school committee and town upon request. The district and the town do not have a signed, written agreement on municipal expenditures in support of schools.**
  - A.** The former school business administrator developed a detailed 2017 budget document that includes requests from all cost centers and explains Fairhaven's net school spending requirement, the ESE chart of accounts, and the district's expenditure allocations, which are provided under each of the account function codes.
    1. Staffing and salary information is included for each school as well as for central office positions.
    2. The budget proposal is program based and articulates the rationale for all budget requests. The budget document also includes a section identifying district achievements, and many graphs, tables, and narratives are also employed to provide clarity.
    3. The budget document is not linked to the District Improvement Plan (DIP) and does not include the district's annual goals and priorities.
    4. The budget document does not include all district expenditures in the provision of academic and support services, such as revolving accounts, food service funds, and grants.
    5. The budget is not site based in accordance with 603 CMR 10.03.
  - B.** The review team was told that the business office only prepares financial reports for the school committee and town officials when asked.
    1. In its self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit, the district rated fiscal health and financial management as "Not at All Well" described by the indicator "The school committee received regular reports and information from the superintendent about current expenditures and projections for annual expenditures." (Possible responses were Not at All Well, Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)
  - C.** The district does not have a formal agreement for determining indirect costs for municipal services that are provided to the district by the town, as required by state regulation 603 CMR 10.04.
    1. In its self-assessment submitted in advance of the site visit, the district rated its relationship with civic leaders as "Not at All Well" "described by the indicator "District and municipal leaders agree on a method for assigning education-related municipal costs to net school spending." (Possible responses were Not at All Well, Well, Somewhat Well, Well, and Very Well.)

2. The district does not have a signed written agreement between the school department and the town on municipal expenditures in support of the schools, such as buildings and grounds, health insurance, other insurances, Medicaid payments, unemployment compensation, and snow removal.

**Impact:** The apparent absence of transparency in the budget document is confusing and limits cooperative efforts between the district and the town. The missed opportunity to prepare financial reports at least quarterly significantly increases the chance of the district's finishing the fiscal year in deficit. It also severely limits the school committee's ability to approve budget transfers, which is their legal responsibility; and finally, it runs counter to fiscal operational services that are open and transparent.

## ***Recommendations***

1. **School committee members, administrators, and town officials should build on their recent efforts to communicate and collaborate more effectively. This process should involve the development of a budget document that is clear, comprehensive, and meets all statutory requirements.**

- A. This process should begin with the development of a budget document that comprises all funds that are related to education including the general fund, grants, revolving accounts, capital funds, and special funds such as the food service program.
  1. The budget should also include comparisons of local expenditures to comparable districts for areas such as class size, educational assistants, changes in special education costs, and professional development.
- B. The budget document should feature the school district's overall goals and priorities, which should be linked to data contained in the DIP.
- C. The budget document should also be site based.
- D. As the budget season commences there should be joint meetings of the school committee and the town's finance committee.

**Benefits:** Frequent, meaningful and honest communication, including face to face meetings and complete and transparent budget documents are essential to developing an atmosphere of trust, collaboration, and mutual benefit. Such measures always require a long-term commitment and effort by all involved.

2. **Special attention should be given to creating quarterly financial and budget reports that are complete, transparent, and accurate and that satisfy the needs of the school committee and the town.**

- A. The superintendent should propose a format for budget and financial reports. Model financial reports can be found on the Massachusetts Association of School Business Officials (MASBO) website.

1. Quarterly financial reports should be prepared and disseminated to both the school committee and pertinent town officials.
2. A brief presentation of the financial report at a school committee meeting can help committee members to understand how to use them.
3. Quarterly reports should include grants, revolving accounts and special funds as well as the district operating budget. They should include transfer requests, encumbrances, current balances, and previous years' data and projected balances.

**Benefits:** The implementation of this recommendation will result in more effective communication with school committee members and town officials. This climate of complete transparency would also help to cultivate trust and generate increased support for school budgets. Finally, it would provide a clearer picture regarding how resources are allocated, and how they might be more effectively reallocated to better address student needs.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets* (<http://smarterschoolspending.org/resources/spending-money-wisely>), authors Nathan Levenson, Karla Baehr, James C. Smith, and Claire Sullivan of the District Management Council identify and discuss the top ten opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities. Drawing on the wisdom of leading thinkers, district leaders, and education researchers from across the country, the authors gathered a long list of opportunities for resource reallocation. To distill these down to the ten most high-impact opportunities, each opportunity was assessed based on its financial benefit, its impact on student achievement, its political feasibility, and its likelihood of success relative to the complexity of implementation.
- *Smarter School Spending for Student Success* (<http://smarterschoolspending.org/>) provides free processes and tools to help districts use their resources to improve student achievement.
- The Rennie Center's *Smart School Budgeting* (<http://www.renniecenter.org/research/reports/smart-school-budgeting-resources-districts>); direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/sites/default/files/2017-01/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation. This study was commissioned by MASBO.
- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

**3. The district should comply with state regulation 603 CMR 10.04, which requires the development of a written agreement on the district's methodology for reporting municipal indirect expenditures for services that are provided to the district by the town.**

- A.** The agreement should include an accounting of the indirect costs for services that are typically provided by the town such as buildings and grounds, health insurance, other insurances, Medicaid payments, unemployment compensation, and snow removal.
- B.** The agreement should include the specific calculations and methodologies used to determine municipal indirect expenditures that are not included in the school department budget but must be included on Schedule 19 of the end-of-year report.
- C.** The agreement should be in writing and should be reviewed and signed by both the superintendent of schools and the town administrator annually.
- D.** The district and town should refer to the state regulations on School Finance and Accountability (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html>) in developing an agreement.<sup>14</sup>

**Benefits:** A written agreement prepared in accordance with state regulation 603 CMR 10.04 will enable the district to effectively monitor and internally audit municipal costs for education-related services and thereby ensure the accuracy of these expenditures.

---

<sup>14</sup> 603 CMR 10:00: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr10.html>

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

---

### Review Team Members

The review was conducted from February 13–16, 2017, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. James Caradonio, Ed.D., Leadership and Governance
2. Linda Greyser, Ed. D, Curriculum and Instruction
3. James Hearn, Assessment and *review team coordinator*
4. Frank Sambuceti, Ed. D, Human Resources and Professional Development
5. Dr. Janet Smith, Ph.D., Student Support
6. John Crafton, Financial and Asset Management

### District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: the director of technology and finance and the business office manager.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: the president, two vice presidents, two building representatives, the treasurer, and the secretary.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: the superintendent, the director of student services, the assistant director of student services, the business office manager, the director of technology and finance, the assistant to superintendent for curriculum 6–12 (also the high-school principal), and the assistant to the superintendent for curriculum K–5 (also an elementary-school principal).

The team visited the following schools: Leroy Wood Elementary (K–5), East Fairhaven Elementary (Pre-K–5), Hastings Middle (grades 6–8), and Fairhaven High (grades 9–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 4 principals and focus groups with 1 elementary-school teacher, 4 middle-school teachers, and 16 high-school teachers.

The team observed 78 classes in the district: 26 at the high school, 16 at the middle school, and 36 at the 2 elementary schools.

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

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

## Site Visit Schedule

Monday 02/13/2017	Tuesday 02/14/2017	Wednesday 02/15/2017	Thursday 02/16/2017
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association; and visits to Leroy Wood, East Fairhaven, Hastings Middle, and Fairhaven High for classroom observations.	Interviews with district staff and principals; interviews with town or city personnel; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; student focus group; and visits to Leroy Wood, East Fairhaven, Hastings Middle, and Fairhaven High for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Hastings Middle, Leroy Wood, and Fairhaven High for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Leroy Wood, East Fairhaven, Hastings Middle, and Fairhaven High for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent.

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Fairhaven Public Schools  
2016–2017 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	25	1.2%	84,996	8.9%
Asian	40	2.0%	63,690	6.7%
Hispanic	111	5.5%	184,782	19.4%
Native American	7	0.3%	2,125	0.2%
White	1,773	87.6%	584,665	61.3%
Native Hawaiian	--	--	855	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	68	3.4%	32,635	3.4%
<b>All Students</b>	<b>2,024</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>953,748</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2016

**Table B1b Fairhaven Public Schools  
2016–2017 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	295	37.8%	14.4%	167,530	38.4%	17.4%
Econ. Disad.	582	74.5%	28.8%	288,465	66.1%	30.2%
ELLs and Former ELLs	30	3.8%	1.5%	90,204	20.7%	9.5%
All high needs students	781	100.0%	38.1%	436,416	100.0%	45.2%

Notes: As of October 1, 2016. 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 2,049; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,514.



**Table B2a: Fairhaven Public Schools  
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	MCAS Year			PARCC		Gains and Declines
			2013	2014		2015	2016	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	144	90.3	90.8	CPI	79.9	85.5	5.6
	P+	144	69%	72%	Lv 4&5	39%	58%	19
4	CPI	151	85.6	88.4	CPI	75.8	82.0	6.2
	P+	151	61%	69%	Lv 4&5	53%	59%	6
	SGP	141	51.0	54.5	SGP	28.0	55.0	27.0
5	CPI	157	89.1	85.5	CPI	85.2	84.6	-0.6
	P+	157	73%	61%	Lv 4&5	57%	56%	-1
	SGP	149	31.0	32.5	SGP	23.0	50.0	27.0
6	CPI	137	89.1	86.3	CPI	77.6	87.3	9.7
	P+	137	71%	64%	Lv 4&5	43%	66%	23
	SGP	132	30.0	16.0	SGP	18.0	46.5	28.5
7	CPI	140	90.3	92.7	CPI	86.8	79.5	-7.3
	P+	140	73%	79%	Lv 4&5	53%	45%	-8
	SGP	123	27.0	38.0	SGP	35.0	26.0	-9.0
8	CPI	148	88.8	91.3	CPI	91.0	89.5	-1.5
	P+	148	70%	78%	Lv 4&5	59%	50%	-9
	SGP	143	35.0	38.0	SGP	33.0	30.0	-3.0

**Table B2b: Fairhaven Public Schools  
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016<sup>15</sup>**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	MCAS/Accountability Year					Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
10	CPI	150	96.2	97.7	97.1	97.2	96.7	1.0	0.1
	P+	150	88%	95%	91%	90%	91%	2	-1
	SGP	126	50.0	49.0	33.0	36.0	50.0	-14.0	3.0
All	CPI	1,035	90.1	90.5	84.8	86.5	87.2	-3.6	1.7
	P+	--	73%	74%	--	--	--	--	--
	SGP	814	39.0	38.0	28.0	40.0	50.0	1.0	12.0

<sup>15</sup> In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2c: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	MCAS Year			PARCC		Gains and Declines
			2013	2014		2015	2016	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	145	90.9	92.2	CPI	82.2	82.4	0.2
	P+	145	76%	81%	Lv 4&5	45%	49%	4
4	CPI	151	85.2	85.2	CPI	68.6	77.9	9.3
	P+	151	60%	54%	Lv 4&5	24%	48%	24
	SGP	142	54.0	53.0	SGP	16.0	50.5	34.5
5	CPI	157	88.0	83.4	CPI	81.2	78.3	-2.9
	P+	157	72%	66%	Lv 4&5	41%	41%	0
	SGP	149	49.0	47.0	SGP	30.0	49.0	19.0
6	CPI	137	75.8	82.3	CPI	74.2	80.4	6.2
	P+	137	44%	58%	Lv 4&5	40%	51%	11
	SGP	131	18.0	29.0	SGP	25.0	49.0	24.0
7	CPI	138	73.2	71.8	CPI	75.3	73.7	-1.6
	P+	138	47%	43%	Lv 4&5	42%	46%	4
	SGP	121	35.0	49.0	SGP	45.0	47.0	2.0
8	CPI	147	78.1	75.9	CPI	72.0	73.7	1.7
	P+	147	52%	53%	Lv 4&5	40%	46%	6
	SGP	142	57.0	56.0	SGP	44.0	34.5	-9.5

**Table B2d: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016<sup>16</sup>**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	MCAS/Accountability Year				State (2016)	Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016		4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
10	CPI	150	90.3	93.4	95	93.3	89.7	3	-1.7
	P+	150	81%	88%	88%	87%	78%	6%	-1%
	SGP	126	61.5	73.0	63.5	68.5	50.0	7.0	5.0
All	CPI	1,032	83.5	84.0	78.6	80.0	81.5	-3.5	1.4
	P+	--	63%	65%	--	--	--	--	--
	SGP	811	45.0	51.0	36.0	48.0	50.0	3.0	12.0

<sup>16</sup> In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2e: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2013	2014	2015	2016	State (2016)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	159	75.2	77.1	71.4	62.3	76.4	-12.9	-9.1
	P+	159	41%	45%	37%	20%	47%	-21	-17
8	CPI	152	70.5	75.9	69.6	72	71.3	1.5	2.4
	P+	152	31%	39%	34%	41%	41%	10	7
10	CPI	134	88.0	90.2	90.2	90.5	88.9	2.5	0.3
	P+	134	69%	73%	69%	75%	73%	6	6
All	CPI	445	78.3	81.7	77.2	74.1	78.7	-4.2	-3.1
	P+	445	48%	54%	47%	44%	54%	-4	-3

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE) MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE.

**Table B3a: Fairhaven Public Schools  
English Language Arts (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016<sup>17</sup>**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Accountability					2-Year Trend	4-Year Trend
				MCAS			PARCC			
				2013	2014		2015	2016		
High Needs	District	CPI	387	81.9	84.3	CPI	74.2	75.2	1.0	-6.7
		P+	--	54%	60%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	273	35.0	35.5	SGP	23.5	36.0	12.5	1.0
	State	CPI	222,707	76.8	77.1	CPI	76.3	77.1	0.8	0.3
		P+	--	48%	50%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	165,487	47.0	47.0	SGP	47.0	47.0	0.0	0.0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	296	--	--	CPI	78.3	78.0	-0.3	--
		P+	--	--	--	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	212	--	--	SGP	23.5	37.5	14.0	--
	State	CPI	152,877	--	--	CPI	77.6	78.2	0.6	--
		P+	--	--	--	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	114,361	--	--	SGP	46.0	46.0	0.0	--
SWD	District	CPI	147	68.7	71.5	CPI	59.2	59.9	0.7	-8.8
		P+	--	25%	35%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	94	29.0	31.0	SGP	21.0	25.0	4.0	-4.0
	State	CPI	91,177	66.8	66.6	CPI	67.4	68.2	0.8	1.4
		P+	--	30%	31%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	66,633	43.0	43.0	SGP	43.0	43.0	0.0	0.0
ELL or Former ELLs	District	CPI	21	--	89.1	CPI	--	--	--	--
		P+	--	--	69%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	13	--	--	SGP	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	52,960	67.4	67.8	CPI	68.9	70.7	1.8	3.3
		P+	--	35%	36%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	35,109	53.0	54.0	SGP	53.0	54.0	1.0	1.0
All students	District	CPI	1,035	90.1	90.5	CPI	84.8	86.5	1.7	-3.6
		P+	--	73%	74%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	814	39.0	38.0	SGP	28.0	40.0	12.0	1.0
	State	CPI	491,267	86.8	86.7	CPI	86.8	87.2	0.4	0.4
		P+	--	69%	69%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	388,999	51.0	50.0	SGP	50.0	50.0	0.0	-1.0

<sup>17</sup> 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B3b: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Mathematics (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016<sup>18</sup>**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Accountability					2-Year Trend	4-Year Trend
				MCAS			PARCC			
				2013	2014		2015	2016		
High Needs	District	CPI	384	74.5	76.2	CPI	68.8	67.2	-1.6	-7.3
		P+	--	45%	50%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	270	37.0	45.0	SGP	33.0	40.0	7.0	3.0
	State	CPI	222,349	68.6	68.4	CPI	67.9	68.8	0.9	0.2
		P+	--	40%	40%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	165,191	46.0	47.0	SGP	46.0	46.0	0.0	0.0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	294	--	--	CPI	71.5	69.1	-2.4	--
		P+	--	--	--	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	210	--	--	SGP	36.0	39.5	3.5	--
	State	CPI	152,560	--	--	CPI	69.2	70.0	0.8	--
		P+	--	--	--	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	114,091	--	--	SGP	46.0	45.0	-1.0	--
SWD	District	CPI	145	59.3	61.9	CPI	54.7	52.9	-1.8	-6.4
		P+	--	20%	25%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	93	27.5	38.0	SGP	29.5	38.0	8.5	10.5
	State	CPI	91,049	57.4	57.1	CPI	57.3	58.1	0.8	0.7
		P+	--	22%	22%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	66,511	42.0	43.0	SGP	43.0	44.0	1.0	2.0
ELL or Former ELLs	District	CPI	21	--	83.8	CPI	--	--	--	--
		P+	--	--	65%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	13	--	--	SGP	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	53,048	63.9	63.8	CPI	64.5	65.8	1.3	1.9
		P+	--	35%	36%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	35,290	53.0	52.0	SGP	51.0	50.0	-1.0	-3.0
All students	District	CPI	1,032	83.5	84.0	CPI	78.6	80.0	1.4	-3.5
		P+	--	63%	65%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	811	45.0	51.0	SGP	36.0	48.0	12.0	3.0
	State	CPI	490,612	80.8	80.3	CPI	80.7	81.5	0.8	0.7
		P+	--	61%	60%	Lv 4&5	--	--	--	--
		SGP	388,423	51.0	50.0	SGP	50.0	50.0	0.0	-1.0

<sup>18</sup> 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B3c: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2016)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2013	2014	2015	2016	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	147	67.3	72.8	66.2	59.4	-7.9	-6.8
		P+	147	30%	35%	30%	20%	-10%	-10%
	State	CPI	89,857	66.4	67.3	66.3	65.4	-1.0	-0.9
		P+	89,857	31%	33%	32%	31%	0	-1
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	110	0	0	69.1	61.4	61.4	-7.7
		P+	110	0%	0%	36%	24%	24%	-12%
	State	CPI	61,476	--	--	67.1	65.8	--	-1.3
		P+	61,476	--	--	33.0%	29%	--	-4
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	63	58.3	59.6	53.7	52	-6.3	-1.7
		P+	63	14%	17%	10%	8%	-6%	-2%
	State	CPI	38,109	59.8	60.1	60.2	59.7	-0.1	-0.5
		P+	38,109	20%	22%	22%	21%	1	-1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	8	--	--	--	--	--	--
		P+	8	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	18,594	54	54	53.9	54.1	0.1	0.2
		P+	18,594	19%	18%	18%	19%	0	1
All students	District	CPI	445	78.3	81.7	77.2	74.1	-4.2	-3.1
		P+	445	48%	54%	47%	44%	-4%	-3%
	State	CPI	208,262	79	79.6	79.4	78.7	-0.3	-0.7
		P+	208,262	53%	55%	54%	54%	1	0

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

**Table B4: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High Needs	5.7%	3.8%	5.1%	2.9%	-2.8	-49%	-2.2	-43%	3.4%
Econ. Disad. <sup>19</sup>	5.7%	4.6%	5.6%	1.7%	-4	-70%	-3.9	-70%	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	7.0%	3.6%	3.3%	6.2%	-0.8	-11%	2.9	88%	3.5%
ELL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5.7%
All students	2.4%	1.9%	3.1%	1.2%	-1.2	-50%	-1.9	-61%	1.9%

Notes: The annual drop-out 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. Drop outs 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 high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B5: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2013–2016		Change 2015–2016		State (2016)
	2013	2014	2015	2016	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	95.7%	95.6%	95.3%	95.7%	0.0	0.0%	0.4	0.4%	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.

<sup>19</sup> Low income numbers used for economically disadvantaged for 2012, 2013, 2014

**Table B6: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

	FY14		FY15		FY16	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$17,424,735	\$17,975,880	\$18,348,083	\$18,340,407	\$18,737,186	\$18,761,403
By municipality	\$8,820,091	\$12,274,161	\$11,421,429	\$9,632,363	\$9,201,212--	\$9,243,221
Total from local appropriations	\$26,244,826	\$30,250,041	\$29,769,512	\$27,972,770	--	\$28,004,624
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$2,792,940	--	\$2,458,284	\$2,582,568	\$2,696,673
Total expenditures	--	\$33,042,981	--	\$30,431,054	--	\$30,701,297
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$7,338,560	--	\$7,383,635	--	\$7,428,260
Required local contribution	--	\$11,242,923	--	\$11,371,020	--	\$11,597,160
Required net school spending**	--	\$18,581,483	--	\$18,754,655	--	\$19,025,420
Actual net school spending	--	\$19,282,842	--	\$18,851,338	--	\$19,175,108
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$701,359	--	\$96,683	--	\$149,688
Over/under required (%)	--	3.8%	--	0.5%	--	0.8%

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

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

Sources: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved 12/13/16, 6/27/17



**Table B7: Fairhaven Public Schools  
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil  
Fiscal Years 2013–2015**

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
Administration	\$365	\$1,308	\$490
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$658	\$699	\$673
Teachers	\$4,482	\$4,686	\$4,712
Other teaching services	\$813	\$723	\$763
Professional development	\$63	\$44	\$58
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$342	\$399	\$361
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$394	\$407	\$360
Pupil services	\$1,023	\$1,081	\$1,049
Operations and maintenance	\$1,016	\$913	\$946
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$1,806	\$1,949	\$1,804
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$10,961</b>	<b>\$12,209</b>	<b>\$11,215</b>

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

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

## Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
<b>Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives &amp; Instruction</b>						
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	<b>ES</b>	0%	14%	39%	47%	2.3
	<b>MS</b>	0%	25%	31%	44%	2.2
	<b>HS</b>	4%	35%	46%	15%	1.7
	<b>Total #</b>	1	18	31	28	2.1
	<b>Total %</b>	1%	23%	40%	36%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	<b>ES</b>	0%	6%	56%	39%	2.3
	<b>MS</b>	0%	19%	50%	31%	2.1
	<b>HS</b>	8%	12%	54%	27%	2.0
	<b>Total #</b>	2	8	42	26	2.2
	<b>Total %</b>	3%	10%	54%	33%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	<b>ES</b>	0%	17%	47%	36%	2.2
	<b>MS</b>	6%	19%	44%	31%	2.0
	<b>HS</b>	8%	50%	38%	4%	1.4
	<b>Total #</b>	3	22	34	19	1.9
	<b>Total %</b>	4%	28%	44%	24%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	<b>ES</b>	0%	22%	44%	33%	2.1
	<b>MS</b>	6%	13%	63%	19%	1.9
	<b>HS</b>	8%	38%	42%	12%	1.6
	<b>Total #</b>	3	20	37	18	1.9
	<b>Total %</b>	4%	26%	47%	23%	
<b>Total Score For Focus Area #1</b>	<b>ES</b>					<b>9.0</b>
	<b>MS</b>					<b>8.3</b>
	<b>HS</b>					<b>6.7</b>
	<b>Total</b>					<b>8.1</b>

Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.	ES	0%	19%	42%	39%	2.2
	MS	0%	25%	56%	19%	1.9
	HS	0%	46%	42%	12%	1.7
	Total #	0	23	35	20	2.0
	Total %	0%	29%	45%	26%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	ES	8%	25%	25%	42%	2.0
	MS	6%	19%	63%	13%	1.8
	HS	4%	54%	31%	12%	1.5
	Total #	5	26	27	20	1.8
	Total %	6%	33%	35%	26%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	8%	25%	39%	28%	1.9
	MS	0%	31%	50%	19%	1.9
	HS	4%	46%	42%	8%	1.5
	Total #	4	26	33	15	1.8
	Total %	5%	33%	42%	19%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	ES					6.1
	MS					5.6
	HS					4.7
	Total					5.5

<b>Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction &amp; Classroom Culture</b>		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.	<b>ES</b>	33%	11%	50%	6%	1.3
	<b>MS</b>	38%	13%	44%	6%	1.2
	<b>HS</b>	73%	15%	8%	4%	0.4
	<b>Total #</b>	37	10	27	4	1.0
	<b>Total %</b>	47%	13%	35%	5%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	<b>ES</b>	6%	19%	50%	25%	1.9
	<b>MS</b>	0%	38%	56%	6%	1.7
	<b>HS</b>	35%	35%	27%	4%	1.0
	<b>Total #</b>	11	22	34	11	1.6
	<b>Total %</b>	14%	28%	44%	14%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	<b>ES</b>	0%	8%	42%	50%	2.4
	<b>MS</b>	19%	13%	25%	44%	1.9
	<b>HS</b>	8%	27%	58%	8%	1.7
	<b>Total #</b>	5	12	34	27	2.1
	<b>Total %</b>	6%	15%	44%	35%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	<b>ES</b>	0%	25%	39%	36%	2.1
	<b>MS</b>	6%	13%	75%	6%	1.8
	<b>HS</b>	12%	23%	42%	23%	1.8
	<b>Total #</b>	4	17	37	20	1.9
	<b>Total %</b>	5%	22%	47%	26%	
<b>Total Score For Focus Area #3</b>	<b>ES</b>					<b>7.8</b>
	<b>MS</b>					<b>6.6</b>
	<b>HS</b>					<b>4.8</b>
	<b>Total</b>					<b>6.6</b>