

# District Review Report

Greenfield Public Schools

Review conducted December 9-12, 2013

---



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

## Organization of this Report

Greenfield Public Schools District Review Overview .....	1
Greenfield Public Schools District Review Findings .....	8
Greenfield Public Schools District Review Recommendations .....	29
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....	39
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....	41
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....	53

**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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner

**Published September 2014**

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

© 2014 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

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

This document printed on recycled paper

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



# Greenfield Public Schools District Review Overview

---

## Purpose

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

Districts reviewed in the 2013-2014 school year include districts classified into Level 2 or Level 3 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

## Methodology

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

## Site Visit

The site visit to the Greenfield Public Schools was conducted from December 9-12, 2013. The site visit included 21.35 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 43 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, teachers' association representatives, and students. The review team conducted 4 focus groups with 15 elementary school teachers, 2 middle school teachers, and 22 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 classrooms in five schools. The team collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. Appendix C contains the instructional inventory—the record of the team's observations in classrooms.

## District Profile

Greenfield has a mayor-council form of government and the mayor chairs the school committee. There are seven members of the school committee and they generally meet once per month.

The superintendent has been in the position since 2008. She took up the position at a time of financial crisis in the district, with budget deficits in fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2008 necessitating extensive budget cuts; in fiscal year 2008 midyear layoffs and a \$540,000 transfer from the town stabilization fund were necessary in order to finish the school year. At the time of the review team's visit she had announced that she would be retiring, without giving a specific date.

The district leadership team also included the director of grants and professional development, the director of student services, and the business manager. Central office positions were mostly stable in number over the five years before the onsite. The district has six principals leading six schools. There are seven other school administrators, including associate principals, assistant directors of special education, and administrator/teachers. In 2013-2014 there are 136.1 teachers in the district.

As of October 2013, 1,733 students were enrolled in the district's seven schools:

**Table 1: Greenfield Public Schools  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2013-2014**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Academy of Early Learning	EES	PK	111
Federal Street School	ES	K-3	192
Discovery School at Four Corners	ES	K-3	224
Newton School	ES	K-3	218
Green River	EMS	1-6	8
Greenfield Middle School	EMS	4-7	491
Greenfield High School	MSHS	8-12	489
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7 schools</b>		<b>1,733</b>
*As of October 2013			

In 2013-2014 grades 4-7 are housed in two locations: Greenfield Middle School and the Math Science Academy at the Green River School. The 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Academy is housed in a separate wing of the high school. (See the Leadership and Governance Challenge findings and the first Curriculum Challenge finding below.)

Between 2009-2010 and 2013-2014 student enrollment in the Greenfield Public Schools increased by 237 students, from 1496 to 1733 students.<sup>1</sup> Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, students from low-income families, and English language learners (ELLs and former ELLs)) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Actual net school spending in 2013 was 21.6 percent above net school spending required by the Chapter 70 aid program, as shown in Table B8 in Appendix B.

## **Student Performance<sup>2</sup>**

**Greenfield moved from a Level 3 district in 2012 to a Level 2 district in 2013 because its lowest performing schools in 2013 were in Level 2.**

- Greenfield was a Level 3 district in 2012 because Greenfield High was a Level 3 school in the 19<sup>th</sup> percentile of K-12 schools. In 2013 Greenfield High moved into Level 2 for increasing to the 27<sup>th</sup> percentile of K-12 schools.
- The 2013 cumulative Progress and Performance Index (PPI)<sup>3</sup> for Greenfield High was 71 for all students and 64 for high needs students; the target is 75.
- Greenfield Middle is in Level 2 because it is in the 54<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary middle schools. Its 2013 cumulative PPI was 60 for all students and 51 for high needs students.
- Two of Greenfield's three elementary schools are Level 1 schools.
  - The Discovery School at Four Corners is a Level 1 school for having a cumulative PPI of 89 for all students; the target is 75.
  - Newton is a Level 1 school for having a cumulative PPI of 85 for all students; the target is 75.
  - Federal is a Level 2 school for having a cumulative PPI of 70 for all students; again, the target is 75.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2011, 2012, and 2013, students enrolled in the Massachusetts Virtual Academy at Greenfield (MAVA) were counted in the Greenfield Public Schools enrollment, increasing the enrollment numbers, but without counting these students the enrollment still increased every year from 2010 to 2013, increasing again in 2014 after MAVA became an independent Innovation School.

<sup>2</sup> See also student performance tables in Appendix B.

<sup>3</sup> For information about PPI and other accountability measures, see the ESE website at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/accountability/default.html>.

**ELA and math proficiency rates for grade 3 at Four Corners and Newton were higher in 2013 than 2010 and above the state rate, while in 2013 grade 3 at Federal performed below the state rate in ELA and math.**

- Grade 3 ELA proficiency at Four Corners was 64 percent in 2013, 23 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 41 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 57 percent. Math proficiency was 72 percent in 2013, above the 2010 rate of 68 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 66 percent.
- Grade 3 ELA proficiency at Newton was 60 percent in 2013, 18 percentage points above the 2010 rate of 42 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 57 percent. Math proficiency was 68 percent in 2013, 10 percentage points above the 2010 rate of 58 percent and above the 2013 state rate of 66 percent.
- Grade 3 ELA proficiency at Federal was 48 percent in 2010 and 49 percent in 2013, 8 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 57 percent. Math proficiency was 58 percent in 2010 and 2013, 8 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 66 percent.

**Greenfield Middle's overall ELA, math, and science proficiency rates were higher in 2013 than 2010 but remained below the state proficiency rates, especially in math.**

- ELA proficiency at Greenfield Middle was 58 percent in 2010 and 61 percent in 2013.
  - Grade 4 ELA proficiency was 50 percent in 2013, 6 percentage points below the 2010 rate of 56 percent, and below the 2013 state rate of 53 percent.
  - Grade 5 ELA proficiency was 63 percent in 2013, 8 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 55 percent; it was below the state rate of 66 percent.
  - Grade 6 ELA proficiency was 63 percent in 2013, 6 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 57 percent; it was below the state rate of 67 percent.
  - Grade 7 ELA proficiency was 68 percent in 2010 and 2013, four percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 72 percent.
- Math proficiency at Greenfield Middle was 46 percent in 2013, 8 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 38 percent.
  - Grade 4 math proficiency was 40 percent in 2013, 9 percentage points lower than the 2010 rate of 49 percent, and below the state rate of 52 percent.
  - Grade 5 math proficiency was 55 percent in 2013, 17 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 38 percent; it was below the state rate of 61 percent.
  - Grade 6 math proficiency was 50 percent in 2013, 17 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 33 percent; it was below the state rate of 61 percent.

- Grade 7 math proficiency was 36 percent in 2010 and 37 percent in 2013, 15 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 52 percent.
- Science proficiency at Greenfield Middle, which is based on the grade 5 test, was 38 percent in 2010 and 39 percent in 2013, 12 percentage points lower than the state rate of 51 percent for the grade.

**Greenfield High’s ELA, math, and science proficiency rates were all higher in 2013 than 2010.**

- At Greenfield High ELA proficiency for all students was 82 percent in 2013, 24 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 58 percent.
  - Grade 8 ELA proficiency was 75 percent in 2013, 20 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 55 percent; it was below the state rate of 78 percent.
  - Grade 10 ELA proficiency was 91 percent in 2013, 30 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 61 percent, and equal to the state rate of 91 percent.
- At Greenfield High math proficiency for all students was 45 percent in 2010 and 49 percent in 2013.
  - Grade 8 math proficiency was 29 percent in 2010 and 30 percent in 2013, 25 percentage points below the 2013 state rate of 55 percent.
  - Grade 10 math proficiency was 78 percent in 2013, 14 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 64 percent, and slightly below the 2013 state rate of 80 percent.
- At Greenfield High science proficiency for all students was 54 percent in 2013, 12 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 42 percent.
  - Grade 8 science proficiency was 41 percent in 2013, 14 percentage points above the 2010 rate of 27 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 39 percent.
  - Grade 10 science proficiency was 74 percent in 2013, 12 percentage points higher than the 2010 rate of 62 percent, and above the 2013 state rate of 71 percent.

**Except in grade 10 for ELA, students with disabilities at Greenfield Middle and Greenfield High had substantially lower proficiency rates in ELA and math in 2013 than their counterparts across the state.**

- At Greenfield Middle in 2013 ELA proficiency for students with disabilities was 11 percent and math proficiency was 2 percent.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In grades 4, 5, 6, and 7, which Greenfield Middle serves, state ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities were 14 percent, 24 percent, 25 percent, and 29 percent respectively and state math proficiency rates for this subgroup were 18 percent, 22 percent, 20 percent, and 14 percent.

- At Greenfield High in 2013 ELA proficiency for grade 8 students with disabilities was 19 percent, compared with the state rate for this grade and subgroup of 38 percent. ELA proficiency for grade 10 students with disabilities was 60 percent compared with the state rate of 66 percent. Math proficiency for grade 8 students with disabilities was 0 percent, compared with the state rate of 15 percent. Math proficiency for grade 10 students with disabilities was 27 percent compared with the state rate of 40 percent.

**The district did not meet the 2014 four year cohort and five year cohort graduation rate targets of 80 percent and 85 percent.<sup>5</sup>**

- The four year cohort graduation rate was 76.2 percent in 2010 and 74.7 percent in 2013, 10.3 percentage points below the state rate of 85.0 percent.
- The five year cohort graduation rate was 74.2 percent in 2009 and 78.7 percent in 2012, 8.8 percentage points below the state rate of 87.5 percent.
- The annual grade 9-12 dropout rate for Greenfield was 4.3 percent in 2010 and 6.4 percent in 2013, almost three times the 2013 state rate of 2.2 percent.

---

<sup>5</sup> Whether the 2014 graduation rate targets are met is determined based on the 2013 four year cohort graduation rate and 2012 five year cohort graduation rate. ESE's 2014 accountability determinations have not yet been released.

**Table 2: Greenfield Public Schools  
Performance Trends by School, 2010-2013**



**Performance Trends by School - PPI and Percentile**

Greenfield 01140000

**Elementary Schools**

	2013 Account-ability Level	School Percentile	PPI for Aggregate					PPI for High Needs				
			2010	2011	2012	2013	2013 Cum PPI	2010	2011	2012	2013	2013 Cum PPI
ES: Federal	Level 2		100	88	75	50	70	88	75	113	--	--
ES: Four Corners	Level 1	--	25	0	138	113	89	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Newton	Level 1	--	113	63	88	88	85	--	--	--	63	--
ESMS: Greenfield MS	Level 2	54	65	90	50	50	60	70	90	40	35	51

**Middle, Secondary and K - 12 Schools**

	2013 Account-ability Level	School Percentile	PPI for Aggregate					PPI for High Needs				
			2010	2011	2012	2013	2013 Cum PPI	2010	2011	2012	2013	2013 Cum PPI
MSHS: Greenfield High	Level 2	27	18	54	75	89	71	15	57	64	79	64

# Greenfield Public Schools District Review Findings

---

## Strengths

### *Leadership and Governance*

- 1. Since 2008 the district has recovered from the financial crisis of that time, many teacher positions have been restored, new programs have been developed, and confidence in the school system appears to be increasing.**
  - A.** As described in the District Profile above, budget deficits in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 necessitated extensive budget cuts. Today the district has regained financial stability, though funding for special education depends on supplemental appropriations from time to time to prevent deficits. (See first Financial and Asset Management Challenge finding below.)
  - B.** According to data submitted to ESE, the number of Greenfield teachers has trended up, from 103.0 in 2008-2009 to 136.1 in 2013-2014.<sup>6</sup>
  - C.** Although their success could not be evaluated by the review team, since the current superintendent took office in 2008 the district has developed a number of new programs, including a Math Science Academy at the middle school level, an Innovation School, and a virtual school.<sup>7</sup> Administrators and teachers showed flexibility in adapting to these new programs.
  - D.** The number of Greenfield students leaving the district under the school choice program has decreased every year since 2009-2010 and the number of Greenfield students enrolled in charter schools has remained fairly steady.<sup>8</sup> In combination with the increase in district enrollment from 1496 in 2009-2010 to 1733 students in 2013-2014,<sup>9</sup> this means that the proportion of choice and charter school students leaving the district was lower in 2013-2014 than it was in 2009-2010: 24.4 percent of choice out, charter school, and district students were choice out or charter school students in 2009-2010, as compared with 20.2 percent in 2013-2014.

---

<sup>6</sup> The number of district teachers was 103.0 in 2009, 105.4 in 2010, 101.4 in 2011, 141.5 in 2012, 146.8 in 2013, and 136.1 in 2014. The number of teachers had fallen from 142.3 in 2008. See ESE website at <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/profiles/teacher.aspx?orgcode=01140000&orgtypecode=5&&fycode=2014>.

<sup>7</sup> The virtual school was initially authorized as an Innovation School, but in June 2013 it became a Commonwealth Virtual School, separate from the district).

<sup>8</sup> The number of students leaving the district under school choice was 380.53 in 2010, 357.44 in 2011, 341.54 in 2012, 338.89 in 2013, and 330 in 2014. (And the number of students received in the district under the choice program was higher in 2014 (83.00) than in 2010 (48.24).) See Trends in School Choice Pupils and Tuition at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/schoolchoice/>. The number of Greenfield students enrolled in charter schools was 101.9 in 2010, 111.1 in 2011, 111.7 in 2012, 115.2 in 2013, and 109.0 in 2014, See documents “by district” at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/charter/finance/tuition/>.

<sup>9</sup> See District Profile above.

- E. Citing a change in what had been a negative perception of the school system, in 2010 a group of residents formed the Greenfield Education Foundation, a 501(c)(3) non-profit foundation, for the purpose of raising money to be spent on Greenfield Public Schools programs. According to the foundation's website it has raised over \$150,000.

**Impact:** The stabilization of the district's finances, the efforts of district staff to improve programs, and the changing community perception of the schools have given the district a foundation for continuous improvement of the education provided to Greenfield Public Schools students.

### ***Student Support***

#### **2. A widespread willingness of staff to support and help students is evident in the Greenfield Public Schools.**

- A. Teachers and staff are finding ways to learn more about their students in order to support a productive social culture and a successful school experience.
  - 1. When review team members asked teachers in focus groups what they were most proud of in their work, they spoke of connections with the community and how teachers go above and beyond to help their students learn.
    - a. Teachers talked about creating an environment of mutual respect where students are accepting of other students.
    - b. Teachers in the high school referred to increased student demonstrations of pride at school and sports events.
      - i. One teacher talked about the pride displayed at homecoming during the selection of king and queen, noting that the selection is never a popularity contest but an opportunity to recognize the students who have contributed the most to school spirit.
    - c. Teachers in the middle school focus group said their colleagues were passionate, caring, and motivated to do their best for kids. They said that in spite of other factors that competed for their attention they worked hard to enable student progress.
    - d. Counselors reported meeting with students as needed and having an open door policy to provide students with access.
    - e. Elementary teachers in a focus group expressed pride in the way that they support children. They spoke of people collaborating well and getting along.

- f. In an effort to reach and support low-income students and families, the district has provided outreach services in each of the three low-income housing complexes in the city.
  - g. Students reported having the opportunity to participate on sports teams without paying activity fees. The district also reports that it has removed fees for music instrument lessons and for spectator entrance at home sports events, as well as reducing fees for taking AP exams and field trips. By covering these costs, the district has taken an additional step to strengthen school cultures and to ensure equity.
  - h. High school students agreed that one of the best things about their school is that extra help is always available.
2. When the Greenfield Public Schools experienced an unexpected influx of homeless students in the fall of 2013, teachers immediately collaborated on the best ways to help these new students become a part of the district. Teachers reported meeting to establish a sense of the realities of homelessness and its effect on their students and their schools.
    - a. Staff's fresh understanding about displaced families prompted them to think about the importance of familiarizing themselves with students to determine how they could offer them more support.

**B.** The district is working to create safe learning environments for all students.

1. Students reported feeling for the most part safe in school because they believe that their teachers care about them and would protect them.
2. Students reported knowing whom to go to to address a problem.
3. The rate of incidents resulting in out-of-school suspensions has trended mostly downward since 2008, from 23.1 per 100 students in 2008 and 2009 to 16.4 in 2010 to 3.7 in 2011 to 7.3 in 2012, compared with the state rate of 11.2 per 100 in 2012. A review of the district's discipline policy indicated that administrators have discretion in assigning consequences or using alternate disciplinary measures based on individual student needs.
4. The high school has a part-time truant officer who regularly interacts with students. The district reports that the police department and school department have a written agreement for collaborative communication and support (updated in 2013-2014) and that Greenfield's police department filed a grant in 2014 to fund a full-time school resource officer.
5. Crisis teams, composed of teachers, administrators, counselors, and school psychologists, meet regularly to address safety concerns.

**Impact:** When students feel safe and cared about, they are freer to learn and achieve at high levels. As the teachers and staff in the Greenfield Public Schools work to build caring relationships with their students, they become better able to help them succeed in school.

**3. In recent years out-of-school suspension rates in the district have trended lower and attendance rates and five-year cohort graduation rates higher.**

- A.** The district attendance rate in 2013 was 95.0 percent, higher than in 2009 (and higher than in any year since 2003); it was 93.4 percent in 2009, 93.8 percent in 2010, 93.4 percent in 2011, and 94.8 percent in 2012. In 2013 the percentage of students absent fewer than 10 days was 9 percentage points higher than in 2009; it rose from 56 percent in 2009 to 58 percent in 2010 to 66 percent in 2011 to 70 percent in 2012, dropping to 65 percent in 2013. The statewide rate in 2013 was 68 percent.
- B.** The percentage of students with at least one out-of-school suspension was 5 percentage points lower in 2012 than in 2008; the percentage of such students fluctuated from 10 percent in 2008 to 11 percent in 2009 to 9 percent in 2010, then dropped to 3 percent in 2011, rising slightly to 5 percent in 2012, equal to the 2012 state rate.
- C.** The district's rate of criminal, drug- or tobacco-related, and violent incidents resulting in out-of-school suspension was lower in 2012 than in 2008 and was lower than the state rate in 2011 and 2012; it rose from 5.6 suspensions per 100 students in 2008 to 6.2 in 2009, then fell to 4.2 per 100 students in 2010 to 2.2 in 2011 to 0.9 in 2012, compared with the state rate in 2012 of 2.3 per 100 students.
- D.** The number of incidents per 100 students resulting in out-of-school suspensions was lower in 2012 than in 2008 and was lower than the state rate in 2011 and 2012; the rate was 23.1 per 100 students in 2008, 23.1 in 2009, 16.4 in 2010, 3.7 in 2011, and 7.3 in 2012, compared with the state rate in 2012 of 11.2 per 100 students.
- E.** The five-year cohort graduation rate was 4.5 percentage points higher in 2012 than in 2009; it rose from 74.2 percent in 2009 to 77 percent in 2010 to 79.3 percent in 2011, falling slightly to 78.7 percent in 2012. It remained below the state rate, which was 87.5 percent in 2012.
- F.** Between 2008 and 2012 the annual dropout rate declined by 2 percentage points. It was 4.8 percent in 2008, 4.3 percent in 2009, 4.3 percent in 2010, 3.2 percent in 2011, and 2.8 percent in 2012, slightly above the 2012 state rate of 2.5 percent. (In 2013, however, the dropout rate increased again, to 6.4 percent, compared to the 2013 state rate of 2.2 percent.)

**Impact:** Improvement in these student indicators represents an increase in the proportions of students who are in school ready to learn and who conclude their school careers successfully.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

**4. The town has supported its schools above the required level, has supported capital projects to provide facilities appropriate for education, and has provided supplementary funding for collective bargaining obligations and enrollment growth.**

**A.** The town has funded education above the required net school spending level.

1. For fiscal years 2009-2013, ESE reports indicate that the town's net school spending exceeded the required amount by 18.4 percent to 21.6 percent.

**B.** Municipal and district officials noted that the town has funded capital projects for the schools, including roofs, flooring, windows, asbestos and mold remediation, playgrounds, vehicles, custodial equipment, and technology.

1. According to school committee minutes and the district fiscal year 2015 capital plan, requested projects include vans, roofs, security, technology, parking lots, and playgrounds.
2. The town has made a priority of "green" projects, using energy saving contracts to fund improved heating systems and other projects for schools and municipal buildings.

**C.** The town has recently funded two major school building projects with assistance from the MSBA.

1. The town website indicates that a \$66 million high school project is underway, and review team members observed the construction at the time of their visit to the district. Department of Revenue documents indicate that voters supported a debt exclusion override for the project.
2. Municipal officials reported that the town and the MSBA supported a \$2 million renovation for the Discovery School at Four Corners.

**D.** The town has provided supplementary funding for collective bargaining obligations and unexpected enrollment growth.

1. District and municipal officials reported that negotiated salary increases have been funded from a stabilization fund.
2. The town has transferred supplementary funds to cover needed staffing for the schools.
  - a. Town officials reported that in 2008 the town transferred \$540,000 from the stabilization fund to alleviate a financial crisis and layoffs in the schools.
  - b. School committee minutes indicated a transfer of \$225,000 from free cash in 2012 to cover teachers needed because of enrollment growth.

- c. Administrators reported that the district uses school choice funding to cover some new positions, asking the town to fund them in the school budget in subsequent years.

**Impact:** The town has provided more than adequate financial support for the district, helping to ensure programs and services for students and providing flexibility in the face of unforeseen financial challenges. The support of the town and district for capital projects and renovations of school buildings has created environments for students that include adequate classroom spaces, well-lit facilities, security systems, and comfortable conditions for learning.

## **Challenges and Areas for Growth**

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

### ***Leadership and Governance***

#### **5. On many issues, the district has not taken a collaborative approach, and coordination and communication are not always adequate.**

- A. The district has lost systems for overseeing curriculum, instruction, and professional development, and school administrators are not always involved in decision-making.
  - 1. Administrators told the review team that as a result of the budget deficit in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 the district lost the infrastructure of systems to oversee, coordinate, and articulate curriculum, instruction, and professional development, as well as to allocate resources to fund programs at the school level. During the financial difficulties there was a concerted effort to restore classroom positions rather than to restore systems in the district.
    - a. Principals said that protocols, processes, and procedures are primarily school based and that district norms are more informal, especially at the secondary level, with more consistency at the elementary level.
  - 2. Administrators said that they meet each week as a team. They noted that discussions at these meetings are wide ranging although decisions about most aspects of the district are made centrally.
    - a. Principals said that while there is much discussion at administrative team meetings about issues such as evaluation and supervision, professional development, and budget development, decisions are not reached at them.

- b. The superintendent described having come into a district (at the time of the financial difficulties) that needed to be changed in a short time. She said the district had to “get better at everything all the time—be innovative, high achievement, data-driven.” She said that changes had been made “aggressively.”
  - c. The Math Science Academy (MSA) was developed as an alternative program under the aegis of the middle school without involvement by the middle school administrative staff. The middle school principal is the titular head of the MSA, and he oversees discipline there. For reporting purposes, the academy remains a part of the middle school. However, an administrator told the review team that the academy staff makes instructional decisions for the MSA without involvement by the middle school administration.
- B.** The review team did not find evidence of coordinated planning to increase student achievement in the district. A consultant developed the current district strategic plan with little input from stakeholders. Principals indicated that the templates for the School Improvement Plans were developed as a requirement for a previously submitted grant, noting that the contents were developed by administrators in each school.
- C.** A review of budget documents showed that principals have no funds allotted to their schools for teaching and office supplies. As a result, principals do not make routine decisions about instructional and office supplies to support learning. The superintendent must approve all requisitions no matter how small. She said that this level of scrutiny is necessary to ensure fiscal efficiency. See second Financial and Asset Management Challenge finding below.
- D.** Teachers reported that there is little communication with them about systemwide decisions affecting instructional programs, and that they do not have input into those decisions.
- 1. Elementary teachers interviewed said that they were often unaware of the establishment of programs.
    - a. One described being surprised upon hearing that one school had Strides, a program for elementary children diagnosed with emotional disabilities. This teacher heard about the MSA a few weeks before school opened.
    - b. Another elementary teacher told the review team that teachers had previously had input into programs.
    - c. Another described finding out after the fact that the district had half-day prekindergarten.
    - d. Still another said that she felt a part of her school but felt disconnected from the district or even other elementary schools.

- e. A teacher did say that the superintendent had sought teachers to work on initiatives such as the MSA.
  2. Administrators developed the “Master Plan for Teaching” which outlines the elements of effective teaching. Ultimately this is to be used by administrators to evaluate and provide feedback on instruction. The review team was told by principals that this document was not widely known and understood among teachers.
  3. Teachers said that they do not have any involvement in the development of system goals, core values, or professional development.
- E.** Parents have limited input in planning and developing the direction for schools and programs.
1. The district does not have school councils. Administrators said that school councils do not play a role in the district, and in a focus group parents said, “We don’t know about school councils.”
  2. An administrator told the review team that the district did not have a Special Education Parent Advisory Council, but that one was being created.

**Impact:**

- Without a robust planning process with input from district stakeholders into the districtwide plan and oversight to make sure that School Improvement Plans are focused at least in part on district goals, the district is missing an opportunity for a very effective method of ensuring that all administrators and teachers are working toward and being held accountable for progress toward district goals.
- Without centralized systems to oversee curriculum, instruction, and professional development, there is no assurance that schools’ procedures and processes are aligned with district priorities.
- Without more participation by administrators in decision-making on such topics as new programs and initiatives, and without better two-way communication with teachers and parents, opportunities are missed for a better understanding of issues in the district and a feeling of belonging and commitment to the district.
- When a principal does not have authority over instructional decisions in part of the school, the assessment results for that part of the school do not reflect his instructional leadership, making accountability unclear.

***Curriculum and Instruction***

- 6. The Greenfield Public Schools do not have a coherent, consistently delivered, and continuously improving K-12 curriculum aligned to the Massachusetts frameworks.**

- A.** At the elementary level, district documents identify Common Core aligned textbooks in reading and math as the elementary curriculum. Some K-3 teachers reported having received the latest, Common Core aligned Reading Street materials a week before school started. However, some teachers reported not having any Reading Street materials or using previous Reading Street materials and exam copies.
1. Other elementary school content documents reviewed were not aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts frameworks for ELA and math, which incorporate Common Core standards. In addition, these documents did not identify grade level content standards or assessments that measure student attainment of benchmarks.
  2. The 2003-2004 K-3 science curriculum was robust and aligned to the state frameworks for science and technology/engineering but has not been revised since 2006.
  3. Teachers and teacher leaders reported that they have been given copies of the Common Core standards without guidance as to how the standards are to be worked into the curriculum.
- B.** The district submitted for the review approximately 20 documents representing the curriculum at grades 4-7 at Greenfield Middle School and the Math Science Academy (MSA). The documents included teacher submissions of curriculum maps, pacing guides, unit plans, or classroom scope and sequences dated 2012-2013. Most did not contain any reference to the 2011 Massachusetts frameworks or identified standards. The documents for Greenfield Middle School and the MSA were inconsistent with each other, and the documents for the Greenfield Middle School were inconsistent within grade levels.
1. The Greenfield Middle School documents reflected a sequence in mathematics for grades 3 and 4 as well as for grades 7 and 8, although grade 3 is at the elementary schools and grade 8 is now part of the middle/high school.
  2. The middle school documents reflected varying grade-level content and degrees of rigor in ELA and mathematics. The middle school principal and teachers confirmed that students are taught in what they referred to as “flexible, homogeneous groups.”
  3. Textbooks identified as the Greenfield mathematics curriculum for grades 4-7 varied within Greenfield Middle School. For example at grades 4-5 and 6-7 the textbooks listed included Scott Foresman, Holt-McDougall Algebra, Saxon Math, and none.
  4. The middle school principal reported that his responsibilities did not include curriculum at the MSA. As a result, he could not address questions about the MSA curriculum.
- C.** The district provided a course of studies for grades 9-12, a program of studies for the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Academy, and a document entitled “Introduction: Greenfield High School Programs.” It did not provide the review team with a written grade 8-12 curriculum.

1. High school teachers reported the absence of departmental curriculum oversight. Some said that they write their own curriculum. They noted that this teacher-generated curriculum is not necessarily given to colleagues or to the principal.

**D.** K-12 administrators and teachers reported that there were no specific grade-level learning targets. Yet certain district documents refer to standards, expectations, and targets.

1. The K-3 philosophy documents refer explicitly to grade-level targets: “Our focus is on mastery of key targets by the end of grade 3.”
2. In a focus group K-3 parents indicated that a standards-based report card is in place.
3. The K-3 progress report states: “The code below shows your child’s progress toward state standards and local expectations.”

**Impact:** In the absence of a coherent set of clearly articulated and written curriculum documents, the district has compromised its ability to ensure fidelity to the Massachusetts curriculum frameworks across its schools and programs. Without a K-12 curriculum that includes grade-level standards and content, a sequence of learning, resources, and assessments, the district cannot guarantee equity in the educational experiences and outcomes of all its learners and ensure that all learners are held to high standards for learning. Also, the district cannot adequately monitor its curriculum, assess its effectiveness, or determine how best to improve student performance.

**7. The quality of instruction in 72 observed classes did not consistently reflect research-based best practices.**

The team observed 72 classes throughout the district: 16 at the high school, 24 at the middle school level (both Greenfield Middle School and the Math Science Academy), and 32 at the 3 elementary schools. The team observed 42 ELA classes, 17 mathematics classes, and 13 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 3 special education classes and 2 English language learner (ELL) classes. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE’s instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. See Appendix C for data on the team’s classroom observations.

*Learning Environment*

**A.** The review team found a mostly low incidence of clear and consistent evidence of the elements of an optimal learning environment in observed classes at the high school. Only one of the instructional characteristics in the category of Learning Environment was observed clearly and consistently in more than 50 percent of the visited classrooms.

1. The team found clear and consistent evidence that the tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students was positive and respectful in 62 percent of the observed classrooms at the high school.

2. There was clear and consistent evidence of clearly communicated and effectively managed behavioral standards in 23 percent of observed high school classes.
  3. The physical arrangement of the classroom clearly and consistently ensured a positive learning environment in 31 percent of the observed high school classrooms.
  4. There was clear and consistent evidence of transitions being promoted with limited loss of instructional time in 23 percent of the high school classes observed.
  5. The team saw clear and consistent evidence that multiple resources were available to meet all learning needs in 15 percent of observed high school classrooms.
- B.** The widest variation in clear and consistent evidence of the five learning environment characteristics was found at the elementary level. Clear and consistent evidence of a positive and respectful tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students was found in 90 percent of observed elementary classes, while clear and consistent evidence of multiple resources being available to meet all students' diverse learning needs was found in 35 percent.
- C.** At the middle school level the percentages of clear and consistent evidence the review team found for the five characteristics in the Learning Environment category were all higher than the percentages found at the high school level, with less variation than at the elementary level: the percentages ranged from 63 percent to 75 percent.

### *Teaching*

- D.** Observed instructional practices in the category of Teaching were inconsistent across grade levels and in general did not strongly reflect elements of good instructional design or promote higher-order thinking. In this category of instructional characteristics the review team noted the strongest evidence for demonstration by the teacher of knowledge of subject and content. This characteristic was observed clearly and consistently in 74 percent of visited classes at the elementary level, 92 percent at the middle school level, and 57 percent at the high school.
1. There was clear and consistent evidence of lessons that reflect rigor and high expectations in 19 percent of the elementary classrooms, in 42 percent of the middle school level classes, and in 23 percent of the high school classrooms visited.
  2. The team observed clear and consistent evidence of modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities in 3 percent of the elementary level classes visited and in none of the classes visited at the middle and high schools.

### *Learning*

- E.** Within the category of Learning, there was clear and consistent evidence of students articulating their thinking orally or in writing in 50 percent of the observed classrooms at the middle school

level (the highest percentage at any level for any of the instructional characteristics in this category), but only 19 percent at the elementary level and 23 percent at the high school. The percentage overall of clear and consistent evidence for this characteristic was 31 percent. All characteristics in this category were observed clearly and consistently in less than one-third of observed classes overall.

1. Reviewers observed clear and consistent evidence of higher-order thinking (students inquiring into, exploring, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, or evaluating knowledge or concepts) in 13 percent of the visited classrooms at the elementary level, 30 percent at the middle level, and 15 percent at the high school.
2. There was clear and consistent evidence of students elaborating about content and ideas when responding to questions in 16 percent of observed classrooms at the elementary level, 29 percent at the middle school level, and 8 percent at the high school.

**Impact:** The uneven and often infrequent evidence of characteristics of effective instruction in observed classrooms across the district indicates that students are not consistently experiencing rigorous standards-based instruction based on high expectations for all learners. The inconsistent delivery of effective instruction significantly limits students' opportunities to grow as learners.

### ***Assessment***

**8. Data is not consistently disseminated and analyzed across the elementary schools, across the high school, or across the district; MCAS data for the Greenfield Middle School and the Math Science Academy is not separated; and data is not disaggregated by subgroup.**

- A. Dissemination and analysis of MCAS results takes place in different ways at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.
  1. At the district's elementary level (K-3), 3<sup>rd</sup> grade MCAS data is returned to the middle school where the 4<sup>th</sup> grade is located. Each of the three elementary schools follows up on its own former students' results, but the district does not review 3<sup>rd</sup> grade results across the three schools. Elementary school data meetings take place by school approximately once every 3 weeks during the 30-minute common planning time. However, joint discussions do not take place between the middle school and the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade about the instructional needs that the previous year's 3<sup>rd</sup> grade MCAS scores present.
  2. At Greenfield Middle School (grades 4-7), the full faculty participates in discussion and analysis of MCAS results. And administrators and teachers continue the review during extended-day planning time. However, the results received at the Greenfield Middle School include those for the substantial number of students in the middle school Math Science Academy (MSA) housed in the Green River School. Middle school staff, when they look at

grade level results, have to consider that there are more students reflected in the data than are housed and taught at Greenfield Middle School. Academics are controlled separately at the MSA. Teachers and the teacher/administrator at the MSA access MCAS scores by pulling them by classroom from district data.

3. At the high school (grades 8-12), the principal distributes ELA MCAS results to the English department, mathematics results to the math department, and science results to the science department. The high school does not have a schoolwide discussion about the school's overall MCAS results; MCAS scores are analyzed in the departments that receive them. The review team did not find evidence of discussion of 7<sup>th</sup> grade results between the middle school where students take the assessment and the high school where they have become 8<sup>th</sup> graders when the results are released.

Responsibility for instructional modifications indicated by the results rests with the single department that has received them. The review team did not find evidence of a schoolwide thrust to re-teach in areas of need.

4. Administrators said that they and the teachers do not look at disaggregated scores because, at one level, "[W]e are small enough so teachers know special ed and can look at all" and, at another, "Not that many kids . . . and we have identified places we don't do well."
- B.** The superintendent and two of the three school committee members interviewed by the review team indicated that they did not regard discussion and analysis of MCAS scores as a high priority.
1. The superintendent indicated that she thought "good judgment on how to teach" and "get[ting] down to the individual child" were more useful than analysis of MCAS data.
  2. Although the school committee is given a presentation of MCAS results, one member said that MCAS data came too late to pay attention to and that MAP data was more useful for the improvement of student achievement; another member said that "Most people don't understand the data and use it as a weapon." A third member had a more favorable view of MCAS, saying that the district had "seen a big change in children's writing, in talking about details—[they] now have to think. That's what MCAS is about."
- C.** Administrators reported that the results of MAP tests are used primarily at the school level.
1. School administrators indicated that MAP data is available for communication to the district upon request. However, the district does not request that MAP data be sent from individual schools to the central office.
  2. MAP assessments are administered in grades K-8. Results are produced for each elementary school, for the middle school, and for individual classrooms. Teachers may and do access MAP test results for their classrooms; the results are also available by grade level within schools but not across elementary schools.

- a. At both the elementary and middle school levels, MAP data is discussed during the common planning time available, and decisions are made concerning appropriate instructional interventions.
  - b. At Greenfield Middle School there is horizontal grade level discussion of MAP results, but as mentioned above the results discussed include those for students at the Math Science Academy, whom Greenfield Middle School teachers do not teach.
- D. The high school has common assessments for algebra and geometry only; they serve to maintain the standard for proficiency for students taking these courses at different grades.

**Impact:**

- For the most part assessments are analyzed by school, by department, or by classroom. The absence of thorough understanding at the district level of school and district achievement trends affects the district's ability to make decisions that will improve student achievement. For instance, it restricts the district's ability to plan and implement the professional development needed to help teachers modify their instruction to address their students' needs.
  - Similarly, leaving the analysis of assessment results to the various departments means that the central high school administration is missing an opportunity to have its decisions and improvement initiatives informed by a thorough understanding of assessment results schoolwide.
  - Without separate MCAS results for the Greenfield Middle School and the MSA, it is not possible for either school-level staff or central office administrators to draw accurate conclusions about the differing curriculum and instruction in those two entities or to make data-based decisions about them.
  - By not examining disaggregated data for students with disabilities, English language learners, and other subgroups, the district is missing the opportunity to provide the students in these subgroups with instruction designed to meet their needs.
- 9. The district's approach to grouping students for instruction limits learning opportunities for some students. Student groupings typically last up to one year at the elementary level and for two years at the middle school level.**
- A. Elementary schools use a combination of MCAS and MAP results for Walk to Read and Walk to Math placements.
1. The Greenfield elementary schools use assessment results to give students semi-permanent skill-level assignments. Using MAP results as the primary drivers of Walk to Math and Walk to Read assignments, as elementary principals report, means that a formative assessment, one that captures where a student is in a moment in time against the assessment's benchmarks, determines a student's placement for an extended period of time. Greenfield

principals do report that some changes are made in these assignments in the course of the year; however, these changes are infrequent.

- B.** In the middle school, grades 4 and 5 and grades 6 and 7 are “looped” under a Greenfield design: to keep the range of instructional needs more manageable for teachers, students are assigned for two years to a leveled classroom based on MAP results. In mathematics different texts are used for the different levels of these homogeneous groups.

**Impact:**

- Through elementary school Walk to Read and Walk to Math placements and through the looping in place at the middle school, the district is placing students in grades 1-7 in homogeneous groups for instruction for extended periods of time. While this is done out of concern for the challenges that heterogeneous classrooms pose for teachers, students in the lower-level placements do not have access to more advanced learners to model their own learning after.
- Research indicates that students in lower-level placements tend to fall farther and farther behind their peers in higher-level placements, which limits their opportunities to move to higher levels.
- With students at different levels at the middle school using different texts, which take varying approaches to teaching math and order topics differently, it becomes difficult for students to move across levels.

***Human Resources and Professional Development***

- 10. The quality and consistency of supervisory and evaluative practices and procedures vary widely across the district. The performance of professional staff has been observed and formally evaluated inconsistently and infrequently, particularly at the secondary level.**

- A.** Supervisory practices vary widely across the district’s schools. Teachers said that administrators conducted classroom visits with some regularity at most of the elementary schools and at the middle school but that instruction was seldom supervised at the high school.
- B.** The review team examined the personnel folders of 35 teachers selected randomly from across the school system, as well as all of the district’s current school level and central office administrators. Overall, almost two-thirds of the district’s teachers with professional teaching status had not received evaluations during the five years before the site review. Although annual evaluations of administrators are required by state regulation, evaluations had not been written for any of the district’s administrators during the two years before the onsite.

1. The great majority of the district's teachers had not received either a formative or a summative evaluation in well over five years before the site visit. According to the review of personnel folders, the completion rate was somewhat better at the elementary level, but teachers at both the middle and high schools had rarely been evaluated during that same five-year period.
  2. Those evaluations in place were informative but generally not instructive. They contained few targeted comments or specific recommendations that would contribute in a meaningful way to improved instruction, overall performance, or professional growth.
- C. The district reported investing time and resources into increasing the frequency and effectiveness of classroom visits and observations.

**Impact:** Without consistent, effective supervisory and evaluative practices and procedures, the district has missed the opportunity to provide all its educators with the continuous and timely feedback, support, and direction needed to enhance classroom instruction, expand professional competencies, and advance student learning.

**11. Greenfield did not implement a new educator evaluation system in 2012-2013 as it was required to do as a Race to the Top participant. Although interviewees reported that negotiations had been ongoing, at the time of the review team's visit agreement had not been reached between the teachers' association and the district.**

- A. The district participates in the Race to the Top (RTTT) grant program and was required under 603 CMR 35.11(1) to implement in 2012-2013 a new educator evaluation system aligned with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's model.
1. District and school leaders, teachers, and teachers' association representatives said in multiple interviews that agreement on the terms of the new educator evaluation system had not been reached and that the new educator evaluation system had not been implemented beyond first steps.
- B. Explanations in interviews for the long delay in reaching agreement on a new educator evaluation system varied. The superintendent, teachers' association representatives, faculty, and administrators described different sets of factors that they viewed as having had an impact on progress in developing an agreement. Both the superintendent and a teachers' association representative mentioned as difficult the issue of whether associate principals, who are also part-time teachers, could be evaluators.
- C. There appeared to be uncertainty among teachers and administrators about the implementation status of the new educator evaluation system. Some principals had begun to initiate new evaluation procedures, while others had not. Administrators indicated a need for increased clarity and communication around district policies, procedures, and expectations.

- D.** Despite being nearly two years behind the expected implementation schedule for RTTT districts, the district had begun to implement some of the components of the new state system.
1. Administrators and most teachers had been provided with the state-required training on the new system.
  2. Teachers were in the process of completing the first steps required in the new process: self-assessment, goal setting, and plan development. However, administrators had not yet engaged in these new evaluation practices.
  3. According to the superintendent, the district has purchased appropriate software and iPads as tools for administrators to facilitate and support the observation and reporting components of the new educator evaluation system.

**Impact:** It is deeply concerning that Greenfield did not meet the timelines required of Race to the Top districts. As described in the previous finding, the district has not had sound supervisory and evaluative practices in the past, compromising its ability to improve the competencies and practices of its professional staff. Now, with the inability of the parties to reach agreement on an educator evaluation system that conforms to the regulations, needed changes in the district's supervisory and evaluative policies have been delayed for a second school year. The state's new educator evaluation system has the potential to transform programs, learning opportunities, and student achievement along with professional practice, but without the agreement that would allow a new system to be implemented, the district can benefit from none of that transformative potential. Greenfield has not only failed to honor commitments made in its RTTT grant application, but also appears to be failing to comply with the state educator evaluation regulations.

**12. The effectiveness of professional development in the district is limited by insufficient districtwide common meeting time, little collaboration between teachers and administrators in designing and implementing professional development, and insufficient alignment to core district goals and priorities.**

- A.** The review team identified some elements of the district's professional development (PD) programming worthy of note. These include:
1. Teachers in kindergarten through grade 8 are provided with regularly scheduled common planning time. Although the amount and frequency of embedded time differs from school to school, this time serves as a vehicle for ongoing teacher collaboration in support of student learning.
  2. The district uses K-8 common planning time to provide targeted training for staff in support of new programs, such as the Innovation School at Four Corners, Keys to Literacy, Responsive Classroom, and the new educator evaluation system. Common planning time is also used for weekly meetings to evaluate student work, analyze student performance data, and plan instruction.

- B.** The amount of districtwide common PD released time in the school calendar is small. Greenfield currently provides only one and one-half days of common PD release time annually for staff, thus limiting opportunities for teachers from different schools and grade levels to receive professional development together or to work together in vertical and horizontal collaborations to coordinate curriculum, programs, services, and instruction.
- C.** Administrators said that the planning of PD programs is primarily conducted at their administrative Educational Team meetings with the superintendent. Teachers at every level told the review team that they do not have a role in the planning and implementation of a calendar of PD programs.
- D.** In the 2012 TELL Mass survey, the most recent year for which data is reported for Greenfield, in the three schools that reported results, 90 percent of Newton School respondents (n=11), 80 percent of Federal School respondents (n=10), and 91 percent of high school respondents (n=24) indicated that they played a small role or no role in determining the content of in-service PD programs.
- E.** Because of the limited common K-12 in-service release time, most PD programming is site-based, rather than districtwide; it is conducted primarily at particular grade levels or specific schools and is aligned in only varying degrees with individual School Improvement Plans. Because it is not clearly or consistently linked with well-defined district goals and overarching priorities, PD programming does not have a sustained focus; consequently, the design and delivery of PD appears to be uncoordinated and disconnected.
- F.** Interviewees reported that the district does not have a formal mentoring/induction program for new staff. Although ESE guidelines for mentoring programs have been in place since 2001, teachers told the review team that it has been years since the district provided a mentoring program for teachers. New staff reported “floundering,” having difficulty figuring out what to do, and relying on the helpfulness of colleagues. Teachers expressed the need for a teacher mentor program. Administrators indicated that a restoration of the mentoring program was being planned for 2014-2015.

**Impact:** Without adequate districtwide professional development and collaboration time, meaningful collaboration and input from teachers on professional development, and the alignment of professional development with district priorities, the district cannot deliver professional development that adequately supports and sustains the professional growth of its educators or systematically and effectively advances the district’s goals.

### ***Student Support***

**13. Most student support programs are school-based. District and school outreach to and involvement of parents is limited.**

- A.** Although interviewees reported a variety of support services, administrators said that they are mostly school-based. As a result, consistent support services are not available to students as they move from elementary to middle to high school.
1. Administrators reported that ELL and special education teachers are not consistently included during common planning time (CPT) in the elementary and middle schools.
  2. Support services available to elementary students such as building monitors, tutors, interns, and a special projects coordinator are often supported through Title I and are not available as students move to higher grades.
  3. Two full-time social workers are on staff at the three elementary schools, and one full-time social worker is employed at the district's preschool.
- B.** District and school outreach to and involvement of parents is limited.
1. According to an administrator, the district does not currently have a Special Education Parent Advisory Council, an organization that provides a voice for parents of students with disabilities, but one was being created.
  2. Schools do not have school councils. See Leadership and Governance Challenge finding above.
  3. Parents in a focus group said that there is little communication to parents from the schools. One said her son "sometimes doesn't bring a lot home." Another said she didn't know at first who her son's kindergarten teacher was. A third said that a recent open house was not adequately publicized.

**Impact:**

- That most student support programs and practices are school-based means uneven support for students as they move through the grades, making it more difficult for the district and its schools to improve student well-being and student achievement.
- That ELL and special education teachers are not consistently included in CPT means a missed opportunity to improve the education students in these subgroups are receiving.
- Without school councils and a Special Education Parent Advisory Council, parents do not have formal means to learn about school issues and have their voices heard in the school system.
- Without frequent communication between schools and families, parents are not sufficiently informed about their children's education and are not working with the schools to improve student achievement.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

**14. In spite of efforts to reduce special education costs, the town has regularly had to transfer funds in order to cover financial overruns in special education tuitions.**

- A. District administrators reported that they have created special education programs in the district to reduce tuition costs, and the district uses in-house drivers and vans to transport homeless and special education students.
- B. District administrators, school committee members, and municipal officials reported that the town has transferred funds to cover special education tuition deficits.
  - 1. School committee minutes and town officials reported a transfer of \$200,000 to cover the prepayment of tuitions in 2013.
  - 2. School committee minutes indicated special education tuitions were over budget by \$280,000 in March 2013, and interviewees confirmed they have generally been underfunded.

**Impact:** If supplemental appropriations for special education tuitions are a regular occurrence, it would be sounder budget practice to appropriate the full expected amount in the district's official budget.

**15. The development of the budget is a centralized process with little input from school administrators. Requisitions for materials and services are controlled centrally.**

- A. The proposed budget is developed at the central office with limited opportunities for principals and other administrators to make formal proposals for their schools' needs for staff, materials, or new programs.
  - 1. Central office administrators reported that they prepare a first draft of the proposed budget based on current staffing, technology, and material budgets and taking into account projected enrollments and new programs. Proposals for new initiatives may be included, such as the addition of a personnel director and additional teachers to cover projected enrollment increases. The use of grants and revolving funds for certain programs is also considered. The draft is then discussed with school and other administrators at their weekly administrative meetings, but though principals told the review team that there was "some conversation about budget needs" at these meetings, they did not see themselves as having a part in budget decision-making.
  - 2. The mayor makes a recommendation to the town ways and means committee and the town council in late spring for the bottom line for the school budget. In 2013 his proposed increase was \$776,506 (plus \$200,000 later appropriated for prepayment of tuitions). School officials reported that the rationale for his proposal, whether based on projected revenues or needs, has not been clear to them.

- B.** Principals do not have discretion over budgets for supplies, materials, or services in their schools.
  - 1. Budget reports do not show budget lines for supplies, materials, contracted services, or equipment at the school level.
  - 2. Administrators and principals reported that they submit requisitions for needed supplies to the superintendent for approval and that they do not have discretionary funds for their schools. They also do not have local access to the online school accounting system.

**Impact:** Principals should have sufficient budget authority to make effective and strategic use of district and school resources. Because budgets and requisitions are currently centralized, principals have limited ability to undertake new initiatives or to ensure that local needs in their schools are met.

# Greenfield Public Schools District Review Recommendations

---

## ***Leadership and Governance***

- 1. The leadership of the Greenfield Public Schools should consider how to enhance its communication and structures to build greater capacity for staff to take appropriate and more informed roles in the decision-making and planning processes that have an impact on their work.**
  - A. Once a new superintendent is in place, the district should consider engaging in a strategic planning process that sets clear direction for the district and includes teachers, administrators, parents, and community members.
  - B. The district should identify ways to strengthen principals' decision-making authority in order to increase efficiency and more directly impact student achievement.
  - C. The district should consider establishing mechanisms within the school system which ensure that teachers have the ability to provide input, make decisions, and determine ways to best carry out key district and school strategies, as appropriate, with the direction and support of principals.
  - D. The district should consider adopting a budget development model that includes wider input and should consider giving principals discretion over the use of school resources.
  - E. The district should establish vehicles for parents and administrators to express their views and ideas concerning the educational needs of students. To this end school councils should be established, as should a special education parent advisory council, as required by statute.

### **Recommended resources include:**

- *Guidance for Special Education Parent Advisory Councils* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/pac/>) is intended to ensure that every Parent Advisory Council (PAC) operating in the state fully understands the capacity and potential that PACs have to collaborate with the school community to influence special education programs and policies in their school districts.

### **Benefits:**

- When all constituencies are meaningfully part of decision-making, the district will have new opportunities for strengthening stakeholder ownership, deepening the understanding of initiatives, improving the implementation of initiatives to improve teaching and learning, and meeting the ever-changing needs of students.
- Shared support for the implementation of initiatives can be powerful in communitywide discussions and can assist the school system in garnering needed support for programs, services, and facilities.

## ***Curriculum and Instruction***

2. **The district should initiate a process to complete a K-12 curriculum that is aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts frameworks and that includes content standards, grade-level learning targets, sequences of learning experiences, grade-level resources, and formative and summative assessments.**
  - A. The district should charge a representative team of skilled and knowledgeable district, school, and teacher leaders with responsibility for the oversight of curriculum development to ensure that all programs and content areas in the district are informed by the 2011 Massachusetts state frameworks.
    1. The team should identify clear expectations for curriculum in each subject and level.
    2. The team should prioritize areas in greatest need of curriculum development and form groups to accomplish the work. A timeline for curriculum development and review should be developed and widely communicated.
    3. The team should implement new curriculum, including ensuring that all teachers are aware of expectations and are supported in implementing the curriculum.

### **Recommended resources include:**

- ESE's *Common Core State Standards Initiative* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/commoncore/>) provides links to several implementation resources for the 2011 ELA and Math Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which incorporate the Common Core.
- ESE's *Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/files.html>) provide exemplars that can be useful as the district develops its systematic approach to curriculum. Supplemental presentations (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/resources/>) provide more information about the units.
- ESE's *Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *Science and Technology/Engineering Concept and Skill Progressions* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/ste/default.html>) are articulations of possible ways for students to progress through levels of understanding of concepts.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will lead to a more systemic, coherent, aligned, and continuously improving district curriculum. Implementation of the curriculum will help to ensure that all students have access to a high-quality learning experience and are equipped to achieve state standards. Also, engaging principals and teachers in the development of this coherent set of curriculum documents will result in increased buy-in and fidelity to the district's curriculum.

**3. The district should provide principals and teachers with focused professional development and support that will enable them to incorporate effective instructional strategies into their repertoire of skills.**

- A. The district should provide administrators with coaching that will enable them to recognize effective instruction and provide useful feedback to teachers about their instruction.
- B. Teachers should receive job-embedded professional development on effective instructional strategies for diverse students and the implementation of those strategies in classrooms.
  - 1. In particular, the district should emphasize teaching that reflects rigorous expectations for all students; requires students to use higher-order thinking skills; and encourages students to articulate their thinking and elaborate about content and ideas.
  - 2. Professional development and support should also address differentiating instruction and providing effective accommodations for English language learners and students with disabilities.
- C. The district should consider revisiting its “Master Plan for Teaching” to ensure that it addresses the elements of instruction that will most significantly impact teaching and learning.
  - 1. The district should ensure that this document reflects wide input and is clearly communicated to all staff.
  - 2. Educators should consider establishing goals through the educator evaluation system that are aligned with the district’s instructional priorities and goals.

**Recommended resources include:**

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

*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.

- ESE’s *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/ImplementationGuide.pdf>) is a resource to support

instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/dart/walk/04.0.pdf>) provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

**Benefit:** The district will serve all of its students best when educators share a clear understanding of instructional practices designed to promote high-quality learning for all students, when those practices are implemented well, and when all students receive the support they need to achieve at high levels.

### **Assessment**

#### **4. The district should set up a system for districtwide dissemination and analysis of assessment results.**

- A.** At the district level, administrators should analyze, discuss, and plan on the basis of district assessment results overall as well as on school and grade level results.
- B.** Elementary principals should have the perspective of, and opportunities to discuss, districtwide elementary school data, in addition to data for their own schools.
- C.** Teachers and administrators should have regular opportunities for vertical discussions about assessment data across grade levels.
- D.** Teachers at all levels should have the opportunity to learn about MCAS results for their current students; this enables them to play a role in addressing the results by modifying their own instruction.
- E.** Teachers should have opportunities to reflect on the performance of students they taught the previous year and the implications of that performance for the instruction they give their current students.
- F.** Administrators and teachers should address the complexity of analyzing middle school MCAS results. Since students at Greenfield Middle School and those at the Math Science Academy are housed in separate locations, have separate academic leadership, and work from distinct curricula, it is essential that data from each group be disaggregated.

#### **Recommended resources include:**

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/ucd/ddtt/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.

**Benefits:** A system for districtwide analysis of assessment data will provide an understanding of all students' achievement. This will enable the district to make decisions, plan programs, and allocate resources to address specific areas in which student needs are greatest. Collaborative, systematic analysis of assessment results will enable teachers to plan and implement instruction directly related to students' strengths and needs.

### ***Human Resources and Professional Development***

**5. District and school leaders should urgently pursue agreement on educator evaluation contractual language and should ensure that the new educator evaluation system is fully implemented.**

Massachusetts regulations set forth an implementation schedule for all districts to implement educator evaluation systems consistent with the regulatory framework. Greenfield, as a participant in the Race to the Top program, was required to implement a new evaluation system with at least 50 percent of educators in the district by 2012-2013, and to implement the system with all educators in 2013-2014. The district and teachers' association have not yet reached agreement on a new system.

- A.** The district should immediately undertake the collaborative steps necessary to successfully conclude negotiations with the teachers' association and submit an educator evaluation agreement that meets state requirements.
- B.** The district is encouraged to move forward with implementation of those elements of its educator evaluation system that have already been agreed upon. This includes the five-step evaluation cycle: self-assessment; analysis, SMART goal setting and plan development; plan implementation; formative assessment/evaluation; and summative evaluation.
- C.** The district is urged to prioritize the development of a comprehensive set of district determined measures (DDMs) with which to effectively measure student academic progress and achievement, as well as to reliably reflect educator effectiveness and inform educator evaluation. To date, Greenfield has not submitted a DDM Implementation Plan, which was due to ESE by June 1, 2014.
- D.** The district should provide additional and ongoing training for both teachers and administrators in support of the new educator evaluation system.
- E.** The district should address identified communication and coordination concerns and ensure that each principal is uniformly and consistently implementing the policies, practices, and timelines articulated in the new educator evaluation system.

**Recommended resources include:**

- ESE's *Educator Evaluation* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/>) provides a wealth of resources to support effective implementation of the new Educator Evaluation system. Resources that might be particularly useful for Greenfield include:
  - The Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/model/>), developed to support effective implementation of the regulations by districts and schools across the Commonwealth;
  - *Quick Reference Guide: The 5-Step Cycle* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-5StepCycle.pdf>), which provides key ESE resources associated with each step in the cycle to assist educators and evaluators throughout the process;
  - *Student Impact Rating and DDM Implementation Briefs* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/briefs.html>), designed to provide targeted guidance focused on timely questions around the implementation of District Determined Measures and Student Impact Ratings;
  - *Performance Rating Guidance* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/RatingEdPerformance.pdf>) and *Impact Rating Guidance* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/ddm/EducatorImpact.pdf>), companion documents designed to support evaluators in determining Summative Performance Ratings and Student Impact Ratings, respectively;
  - *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation and the MA Curriculum Frameworks* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/EdEvalandCF.pdf>), an overview of how the Educator Evaluation System supports implementation of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks; and
  - *Educator Evaluation Implementation Surveys for Teachers and Administrators* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/TeachersSurvey.pdf> and <http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/implementation/AdministratorsSurvey.pdf>), which are designed to provide schools and districts with information about the status of their educator evaluation implementation from the perspectives of the district's educators and evaluators.

**Benefits:** A well-organized and consistent educator evaluation system that is supported by district leaders will improve professional growth and accountability, instructional quality, and student achievement.

6. **The district is strongly encouraged to create a collaborative and inclusive professional development leadership structure; provide increased opportunities for regularly scheduled**

**planning/meeting time for faculty at all grade levels; and use a systematic approach to professional development that is appropriately resourced and addresses identified needs of students, teachers, and administrators.**

- A. Educators should become formally and actively involved in identifying specific PD needs, determining how they might be best met, and in designing PD practices, systems, and structures.
  - 1. A joint committee of administrators and teachers from the elementary, middle, and high schools should direct the district's professional development (PD) program. Under the leadership of the director of grants and professional development, this committee should work collaboratively to oversee, plan, and implement comprehensive and integrated K-12 PD programs and services.
- B. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) should be carefully aligned with the district's Strategic Improvement Plan. Teachers should consider aligning the goals in their Educator Plans with SIP goals. Team goals may be an appropriate opportunity to focus on addressing growth areas identified in the SIP.

1. The PD program should directly support well-defined district priorities and goals as articulated in the Strategic Improvement Plan and SIPs.

- C. Under the new educator evaluation regulations, "Educators whose summative performance rating is exemplary and whose impact on student learning is rated moderate or high shall be recognized and rewarded with leadership roles, promotion, additional compensation, public commendation or other acknowledgement." 603 CMR 35.08(7). The district is encouraged to support teacher growth by creating or expanding opportunities for exemplary staff to exercise instructional leadership. Opportunities could include serving as data coaches, mentors, curriculum developers, and trainers/facilitators to support the new evaluation system and models of best classroom practice.
- D. The district should make the restoration of the mentoring/induction program a priority. The program should be aligned with the ESE guidelines, be designed to meet the needs of both first year and incoming teachers and administrators, and extend throughout beginning teachers' second and third years of teaching.
- E. The district should ensure sufficient embedded K-12 planning/meeting time to properly support and effectively advance the district's PD programs and services.
  - 1. More districtwide time dedicated to professional development programs and activities should be added to the calendar for all the district's schools, including the high school. When possible and as appropriate, PD should be scheduled at the same time for each school in the district to facilitate opportunities for cross-school collaboration.

2. At the elementary schools, consideration should be given to creating a standard model of common teacher planning time. This model could reallocate and align the time dedicated to common planning/meeting among all elementary teachers and thereby expand opportunities for vertical and horizontal articulation and coordination of curriculum, programs, and services.
- F. Additional resources, including those that may be available through the District and School Assistance Center (DSAC), should be used to support and expand PD programming.

**Recommended resources include:**

- *Quick Reference Guide: Educator Evaluation & Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/QRG-ProfessionalDevelopment.pdf>), which describes how educator evaluation and professional development can be used as mutually reinforcing systems to improve educator practice and student outcomes.
- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- The *PLC Expansion Project* website (<http://plcexpansionproject.weebly.com/>) is designed to support schools and districts in their efforts to establish and sustain cultures that promote Professional Learning Communities.
- *PBS LearningMedia* (<http://www.pbslearningmedia.org/>) is a free digital media content library that provides relevant educational resources for PreK-12 teachers. The flexible platform includes high-quality content tied to national curriculum standards, as well as professional development courses.
- ESE's *Educator Induction* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/educators/mentor/>) provides guidelines and resources for teacher and administrator induction programs.

**Benefits:**

The direct involvement and formal collaboration of teachers in the PD process will contribute to the continual development of an authentic and cohesive community of professional learners. Involving staff in the design and implementation of PD programming can enhance their sense of ownership, support, and active participation in school improvement initiatives and will promote a culture of continuous improvement through shared learning.

Additional and coordinated common planning/meeting time will provide increased opportunities to build consistency in curriculum and instruction, to strengthen teaching throughout the district, to design assessments (possibly including district-determined measures), and to help educators continually improve their ability to use assessment data to inform instruction.

## ***Student Support***

- 7. The district should organize centrally to develop a comprehensive K-12 system of support for its students and should ensure that students' families are engaged.**
  - A.** The district should review the student supports available in individual schools and at various levels and determine which are the most effective in helping students succeed, as well as the existing gaps in support.
  - B.** The district should build on existing programming and services to plan and implement a comprehensive system of supports for all students. The effectiveness of this system should be evaluated regularly.
  - C.** In addition to creating school councils and a special education advisory council (see Leadership and Governance recommendation above), the district should establish clear expectations for teachers' and administrators' frequent and meaningful two-way communication with students' families.

### **Recommended resources include:**

- *Addressing Students' Social, Emotional, and Health Needs* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/StudentsNeeds.pdf>) provides guidance and promising practices to help schools create a safe school environment and make effective use of a system for addressing the social, emotional, and health needs of its students.
- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mtss/>) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students.
- ESE's Early Warning Indicator System (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html>) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to address systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.
- *Parents' Guides to Student Success* (<http://pta.org/parents/content.cfm?ItemNumber=2583>) are grade-specific guides from the National PTA (available in English and Spanish) with specific descriptions for parents of what children should be learning once Common Core standards are fully implemented, along with suggestions for helping students at home and communicating with teachers.
- *Family, School, and Community Partnership Fundamentals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/sac/parent/FSCPFundamentals.pdf>) provide a framework for family engagement, along with a self-assessment tool.

- ESE's *Family and Community Involvement* web page ([http://www.doe.mass.edu/FamComm/f\\_involvement.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/FamComm/f_involvement.html)) includes links to several resources, including ESE's *Guide to Parent, Family, and Community Involvement*.
- ESE's *Title I Family Engagement* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/titlei/parta/family-engagement/?section=FE>) includes links to policies, toolkits, research, presentations, and other resources.
- *Youth Voices - How High Schools can Respond to the Needs of Students and Help Prevent Dropouts* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/YouthFocusGroup.pdf>) is a report based on youth focus groups across the Commonwealth who shared their insight about what they liked most and least about school; why students drop out; and how schools should be improved.

**Benefits** include the assurance that the district has maximized opportunities for students to learn by addressing their academic and social needs.

### ***Financial and Asset Management***

**8. The district and town officials should establish procedures for developing realistic budgets that do not depend on supplemental appropriations.**

- A. The superintendent, school committee, and town officials should develop more realistic budgets that take into account expected school district needs as well as town revenues, grants, and other funds.
- B. The budget should include funding for all currently known out of district special education tuitions, services for high needs students, personnel for increased enrollments, and needed new programs, thus minimizing the need for supplementary funding from stabilization funds or revolving fund balances carried over from the previous year.
- C. Supplemental appropriations may still be needed for truly unexpected expenses, such as new special education placements or larger than projected kindergarten enrollments.

**Recommended resources include:**

- The Rennie Center's *Smart School Budgeting* ([http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart\\_school\\_budgeting.html](http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html)) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will enable the district to allocate its resources more effectively, knowing in advance that known needs are adequately funded.

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

---

### **Review Team Members**

The review was conducted from December 9-12, 2013, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Magdalene Giffune, leadership and governance
2. Dr. Marilynne Quarcoo, curriculum and instruction
3. Patricia Williams, assessment, review team coordinator
4. Dr. Frank Sambuceti, human resources and professional development
5. Willette Johnson, student support
6. Dr. George Gearhart, financial and asset management

### **District Review Activities**

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager, accounting assistant. The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: three members.

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, director of grants and professional development, director of student services, and business manager.

The team visited the following schools: Federal Street (K-3), Discovery School at Four Corners (K-3), Newton (K-3), Greenfield Middle School (grades 4-7), and Greenfield High School (grades 8-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 6 focus groups with 15 elementary school teachers, 2 middle school teachers, and 22 high school teachers. Because one of the elementary schools was on an extended day schedule, the team conducted two elementary teacher focus groups. The team observed 70 classes in the district: 16 at the high school, 24 at the middle school, and 31 at the 3 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**

<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>
12/09/13	12/10/13	12/11/13	12/12/13
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; and an interview with teachers’ association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group, student focus group; teachers’ association interview; and a visit to Greenfield High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with town or city personnel; interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Federal, Discovery Schools at Four Corners, and Newton Elementary Schools for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; district review team meeting; visits to Green River Elementary School, Greenfield Middle School, and Greenfield High School for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Greenfield  
2013-2014 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
Afr. Amer./Black	26	1.5%	82990	8.7%
Amer. Ind. or Alaska Nat.	1	0.1%	2209	0.2%
Asian	32	1.8%	58455	6.1%
Hispanic/Latino	199	11.5%	162647	17.0%
Multi-race, Non-Hisp./Lat.	37	2.1%	27803	2.9%
Nat. Haw. or Pacif. Isl.	--	--	1007	0.1%
White	1438	83.0%	620628	64.9%
<b>All Students</b>	<b>1733</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>955739</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: As of October 1, 2013

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

Student Groups	District			State		
	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of District	N	Percent of High Needs	Percent of State
Students w/ disabilities	319	27.7%	18.0%	164336	34.8%	17.0%
Low Income	1036	90.0%	59.8%	365885	77.5%	38.3%
ELLs and Former ELLs	61	5.3%	3.5%	75947	16.1%	7.9%
All high needs students	1151	100.0%	65.1%	472001	100.0%	48.8%

Notes: As of October 1, 2013. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 1,768; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 966,360.

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

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	181	82.5	78.8	88.2	82.5	83.3	0	-5.7
	P+	181	44.0%	46.0%	63.0%	55.0%	57.0%	11.0%	-8.0%
4	CPI	149	77.2	76.3	73.7	77.7	78.9	0.5	4
	P+	149	49.0%	41.0%	45.0%	48.0%	53.0%	-1.0%	3.0%
	SGP	121	55	68.5	51	42	49	-13	-9
5	CPI	160	79.8	82.9	85.1	80.6	84.7	0.8	-4.5
	P+	160	53.0%	62.0%	60.0%	61.0%	66.0%	8.0%	1.0%
	SGP	135	52	47.5	58	49	52	-3	-9
6	CPI	184	78	85.5	82.4	86	85.1	8	3.6
	P+	184	54.0%	66.0%	56.0%	63.0%	67.0%	9.0%	7.0%
	SGP	143	27.5	51	43	52	52	24.5	9
7	CPI	178	83.7	86	86.7	86.1	88.4	2.4	-0.6
	P+	178	62.0%	61.0%	66.0%	63.0%	72.0%	1.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	153	50	47.5	49	43	48	-7	-6
8	CPI	196	79.1	86.1	89.7	90.1	90.1	11	0.4
	P+	196	53.0%	70.0%	72.0%	76.0%	78.0%	23.0%	4.0%
	SGP	168	33.5	22	51	51	50	17.5	0
10	CPI	99	83.1	90.3	95.1	96	96.9	12.9	0.9
	P+	99	58.0%	73.0%	79.0%	88.0%	91.0%	30.0%	9.0%
	SGP	86	43	36	54	61	57	18	7
All	CPI	1147	80.4	83.3	85.3	85.2	86.8	4.8	-0.1
	P+	1147	53.0%	59.0%	62.0%	64.0%	69.0%	11.0%	2.0%
	SGP	806	43	46	51	49	51	6	-2

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2b: Greenfield Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
3	CPI	180	85.7	84.3	84.5	81.4	84.3	-4.3	-3.1
	P+	180	59.0%	61.0%	65.0%	62.0%	66.0%	3.0%	-3.0%
4	CPI	151	76.2	79.1	73.6	71	80.2	-5.2	-2.6
	P+	151	50.0%	45.0%	40.0%	36.0%	52.0%	-14.0%	-4.0%
	SGP	125	47	65	39	27	54	-20	-12
5	CPI	162	63.8	69.7	72.4	71.9	80.6	8.1	-0.5
	P+	162	37.0%	46.0%	44.0%	49.0%	61.0%	12.0%	5.0%
	SGP	134	35	36	36	28	54	-7	-8
6	CPI	188	59.8	72	70.2	72.9	80.3	13.1	2.7
	P+	188	32.0%	45.0%	44.0%	46.0%	61.0%	14.0%	2.0%
	SGP	146	27	56	35.5	41	50	14	5.5
7	CPI	180	62	53.4	62.7	62.9	74.4	0.9	0.2
	P+	180	33.0%	19.0%	32.0%	34.0%	52.0%	1.0%	2.0%
	SGP	153	58	32	36	33	46	-25	-3
8	CPI	190	55.6	55	55.2	56.8	76	1.2	1.6
	P+	190	27.0%	23.0%	27.0%	28.0%	55.0%	1.0%	1.0%
	SGP	168	24	29	33.5	22.5	50	-1.5	-11
10	CPI	102	80.7	83	82.9	85.8	90.2	5.1	2.9
	P+	102	61.0%	68.0%	62.0%	72.0%	80.0%	11.0%	10.0%
	SGP	89	52	45.5	41	66	51	14	25
All	CPI	1153	68.9	70	70.1	70.8	80.8	1.9	0.7
	P+	1153	42.0%	42.0%	43.0%	45.0%	61.0%	3.0%	2.0%
	SGP	815	38	44	36	33	51	-5	-3

Notes: The number of students included in CPI and percent *Proficient* or *Advanced* (P+) calculations may differ from the number of students included in median SGP calculations. A median SGP is not calculated for students in grade 3 because they are participating in MCAS tests for the first time.

**Table B2c: Greenfield Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2010-2013**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2010	2011	2012	2013	State 2013	4-Year Trend	2 Year Trend
5	CPI	160	72.1	76.1	74.1	71.4	78.5	-0.7	-2.7
	P+	160	38.0%	49.0%	38.0%	33.0%	51.0%	-5.0%	-5.0%
8	CPI	189	60.3	63.3	61.4	70	71	9.7	8.6
	P+	189	24.0%	27.0%	26.0%	33.0%	39.0%	9.0%	7.0%
10	CPI	85	79.6	85.1	85.1	89.1	88	9.5	4
	P+	85	61.0%	59.0%	59.0%	69.0%	71.0%	8.0%	10.0%
All	CPI	434	69.6	72.6	70.9	74.3	79	4.7	3.4
	P+	434	38.0%	42.0%	37.0%	40.0%	53.0%	2.0%	3.0%

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

**Table B3a: Greenfield Public Schools  
English Language Arts (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	719	75.5	79.2	80.7	80.4	4.9	-0.3
		P+	719	44.0%	48.0%	52.0%	53.0%	9.0%	1.0%
		SGP	487	40.5	47	50	49	8.5	-1
	State	CPI	237163	76.1	77	76.5	76.8	0.7	0.3
		P+	237163	45.0%	48.0%	48.0%	48.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	180087	45	46	46	47	2	1
Low Income	District	CPI	656	77.5	80.7	81.6	81	3.5	-0.6
		P+	656	48.0%	51.0%	54.0%	56.0%	8.0%	2.0%
		SGP	453	41	47	50.5	49	8	-1.5
	State	CPI	184999	76.5	77.1	76.7	77.2	0.7	0.5
		P+	184999	47.0%	49.0%	50.0%	50.0%	3.0%	0.0%
		SGP	141671	46	46	45	47	1	2
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	196	59.1	65.1	68.6	64.2	5.1	-4.4
		P+	196	11.0%	13.0%	20.0%	19.0%	8.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	102	29	37	47.5	49.5	20.5	2
	State	CPI	88956	67.3	68.3	67.3	66.8	-0.5	-0.5
		P+	88956	28.0%	30.0%	31.0%	30.0%	2.0%	-1.0%
		SGP	64773	41	42	43	43	2	0
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	51	63.9	67.3	76.2	83.3	19.4	7.1
		P+	51	30.0%	33.0%	41.0%	55.0%	25.0%	14.0%
		SGP	32	60	55	66.5	58.5	-1.5	-8
	State	CPI	46676	66.1	66.2	66.2	67.4	1.3	1.2
		P+	46676	32.0%	33.0%	34.0%	35.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	31672	51	50	51	53	2	2
All students	District	CPI	1147	80.4	83.3	85.3	85.2	4.8	-0.1
		P+	1147	53.0%	59.0%	62.0%	64.0%	11.0%	2.0%
		SGP	806	43	46	51	49	6	-2
	State	CPI	496175	86.9	87.2	86.7	86.8	-0.1	0.1
		P+	496175	68.0%	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	1.0%	0.0%
		SGP	395568	50	50	50	51	1	1

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

**Table B3b: Greenfield Public Schools  
Mathematics (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	726	63.1	67	64	64.6	1.5	0.6
		P+	726	33.0%	36.0%	33.0%	35.0%	2.0%	2.0%
		SGP	495	35	44	35	31	-4	-4
	State	CPI	237745	66.7	67.1	67	68.6	1.9	1.6
		P+	237745	36.0%	37.0%	37.0%	40.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	180866	46	46	46	46	0	0
Low Income	District	CPI	662	64.5	68.3	64.3	64.8	0.3	0.5
		P+	662	36.0%	39.0%	35.0%	36.0%	0.0%	1.0%
		SGP	460	36	45	36	30	-6	-6
	State	CPI	185392	67.1	67.3	67.3	69	1.9	1.7
		P+	185392	37.0%	38.0%	38.0%	41.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	142354	47	46	45	46	-1	1
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	198	45.5	53.8	51.6	49.4	3.9	-2.2
		P+	198	7.0%	12.0%	9.0%	10.0%	3.0%	1.0%
		SGP	108	25	29	31.5	31.5	6.5	0
	State	CPI	89193	57.5	57.7	56.9	57.4	-0.1	0.5
		P+	89193	21.0%	22.0%	21.0%	22.0%	1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	65068	43	43	43	42	-1	-1
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	52	46.3	55.1	59.5	66.3	20	6.8
		P+	52	22.0%	29.0%	32.0%	44.0%	22.0%	12.0%
		SGP	35	36	67	50	58	22	8
	State	CPI	47046	61.5	62	61.6	63.9	2.4	2.3
		P+	47046	31.0%	32.0%	32.0%	35.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	31986	54	52	52	53	-1	1
All students	District	CPI	1153	68.9	70	70.1	70.8	1.9	0.7
		P+	1153	42.0%	42.0%	43.0%	45.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	815	38	44	36	33	-5	-3
	State	CPI	497090	79.9	79.9	79.9	80.8	0.9	0.9
		P+	497090	58.0%	58.0%	59.0%	61.0%	3.0%	2.0%
		SGP	396691	50	50	50	51	1	1

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

**Table B3c: Greenfield Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2010-2013**

Group and Measure		Number Included (2013)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines		
			2010	2011	2012	2013	4 Year Trend	2-Year Trend	
High Needs	District	CPI	278	63	68.3	63.8	68.8	5.8	5
		P+	278	28.0%	33.0%	26.0%	31.0%	3.0%	5.0%
	State	CPI	96902	64.3	63.8	65	66.4	2.1	1.4
		P+	96902	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	31.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Low Income	District	CPI	254	64.3	70.3	63	70.4	6.1	7.4
		P+	254	30.0%	36.0%	27.0%	33.0%	3.0%	6.0%
	State	CPI	75485	63.6	62.8	64.5	66.1	2.5	1.6
		P+	75485	28.0%	28.0%	31.0%	32.0%	4.0%	1.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	75	47.8	55.9	55.6	54	6.2	-1.6
		P+	75	9.0%	10.0%	10.0%	5.0%	-4.0%	-5.0%
	State	CPI	37049	59	59.2	58.7	59.8	0.8	1.1
		P+	37049	19.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.0%	0.0%
English language learners & Former ELLs	District	CPI	18	43	47.5	54.3	68.1	25.1	13.8
		P+	18	12.0%	10.0%	26.0%	33.0%	21.0%	7.0%
	State	CPI	16179	51.8	50.3	51.4	54	2.2	2.6
		P+	16179	16.0%	15.0%	17.0%	19.0%	3.0%	2.0%
All students	District	CPI	434	69.6	72.6	70.9	74.3	4.7	3.4
		P+	434	38.0%	42.0%	37.0%	40.0%	2.0%	3.0%
	State	CPI	209573	78.3	77.6	78.6	79	0.7	0.4
		P+	209573	52.0%	52.0%	54.0%	53.0%	1.0%	-1.0%

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

**Table B4: Greenfield Public Schools  
Annual Grade 9-12 Dropout Rates, 2010-2013**

	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent	Percentage Points	Percent	
All students	4.3	3.2	2.8	6.4	2.1	48.8%	3.6	128.6%	2.2

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

**Table B5a: Greenfield Public Schools  
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	70	68.2%	68.5%	74.4%	67.1%	-1.1	-1.6%	-7.3	-9.8%	74.7%
Low income	64	70.7%	70.4%	76.1%	70.3%	-0.4	-0.6%	-5.8	-7.6%	73.6%
Students w/ disabilities	23	39.1%	30.8%	41.4%	34.8%	-4.3	-11.0%	-6.6	-15.9%	67.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	--	71.4%	75.0%	100%	--	--	--	--	--	63.5%
All students	95	76.2%	76.6%	77.8%	74.7%	-1.5	-2.0%	-3.1	-4.0%	85.0%

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

**Table B5b: Greenfield Public Schools  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates, 2009-2012**

Group	Number Included (2012)	School Year Ending				Change 2009-2012		Change 2011-2012		State (2012)
		2009	2010	2011	2012	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	78	61.9%	69.4%	72.6%	75.6%	13.7	22.1%	3.0	4.1%	78.9%
Low income	71	63.2%	72.0%	73.2%	76.1%	12.9	20.4%	2.9	4.0%	77.5%
Students w/ disabilities	29	39.3%	39.1%	34.6%	44.8%	5.5	14.0%	10.2	29.5%	73.8%
English language learners & Former ELLs	6	87.5%	71.4%	87.5%	100%	12.5	14.3%	12.5	14.3%	68.5%
All students	108	74.2%	77.0%	79.3%	78.7%	4.5	6.1%	-0.6	-0.8%	87.5%

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

**Table B6: Greenfield Public Schools  
Attendance Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	93.8%	93.4%	94.8%	95.0%	1.2	1.3%	0.2	0.2%	94.8%

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

**Table B7: Greenfield Public Schools  
Suspension Rates, 2010-2013**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State (2013)
	2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
In-School Suspension Rate	4.4%	1.4%	2.5%	1.9%	-2.5	-56.8%	-0.6	-24.0%	2.2%
Out-of-School Suspension Rate	9.6%	1.8%	5.3%	5.5%	-4.1	-42.7%	0.2	3.8%	4.3%

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

**Table B8: Greenfield Public Schools  
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2011–2013**

	FY11		FY12		FY13	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
<b>Expenditures</b>						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$14,314,720	\$14,045,523	\$14,966,300	\$15,042,015	\$15,635,000	\$15,829,471
By municipality	\$12,859,807	\$11,966,301	\$12,678,032	\$16,341,393	\$12,226,399	\$13,049,374
Total from local appropriations	\$27,174,527	\$26,011,824	\$27,644,332	\$31,383,408	\$27,861,399	\$28, 878, 845
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$7,069,259	--	\$7,554,346	--	\$7,350,613
Total expenditures	--	\$33,081,083	--	\$38,937,754	--	\$36,229,458
<b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b>						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$9,267,538	--	\$9,957,403	--	\$10,481,762
Required local contribution	--	\$8,874,442	--	\$9,165,933	--	\$9,446,211
Required net school spending**	--	\$18,141,980	--	\$19,123,336	--	\$19,927,973
Actual net school spending	--	\$22,050,716	--	\$23,196,705	--	\$24,238,363
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$3,908,736	--	\$4,073,369	--	\$4,310,390
Over/under required (%)	--	21.5%	--	21.3%	--	21.6%

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

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

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

Data retrieved December 20, 2013 and June 13, 2014

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

<b>Expenditure Category</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Administration	\$557	\$457	\$471	\$553
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$987	\$880	\$1,360	\$1,119
Teachers	\$5,199	\$4,679	\$4,010	\$4,290
Other teaching services	\$1,063	\$1,058	\$1,041	\$1,001
Professional development	\$9	\$73	\$10	\$22
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$1,058	\$1,325	\$1,071	\$939
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$165	\$116	\$117	\$114
Pupil services	\$1,471	\$1,081	\$1,032	\$1,136
Operations and maintenance	\$1,514	\$1,204	\$1,138	\$1,164
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$3,055	\$2,469	\$2,309	\$2,455
<b>Total expenditures per in-district pupil</b>	<b>\$15,078</b>	<b>\$13,342</b>	<b>\$12,559</b>	<b>\$12,793</b>

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

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

## Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Learning Environment	Evidence by Grade Span			Evidence Overall				
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
1. Tone of interactions between teacher and students and among students is positive and respectful.	ES	0%	10%	90%	#	1	14	53
	MS	0%	29%	71%	%	1%	21%	78%
	HS	8%	31%	62%	---	--	--	--
2. Behavioral standards are clearly communicated and disruptions, if present, are managed effectively and equitably.	ES	16%	16%	68%	#	10	16	42
	MS	4%	21%	75%	%	15%	24%	62%
	HS	31%	46%	23%	---	--	--	--
3. The physical arrangement of the classroom ensures a positive learning environment and provides all students with access to learning activities.	ES	3%	26%	71%	#	5	21	42
	MS	4%	29%	67%	%	7%	31%	62%
	HS	23%	46%	31%	---	--	--	--
4. Classroom rituals and routines promote transitions with minimal loss of instructional time	ES	10%	19%	71%	#	4	20	34
	MS	0%	33%	67%	%	7%	34%	59%
	HS	15%	62%	23%	---	--	--	--
5. Multiple resources are available to meet all students' diverse learning needs.	ES	23%	42%	35%	#	12	28	28
	MS	0%	38%	63%	%	18%	41%	41%
	HS	38%	46%	15%	---	--	--	--

(Please see next page)

Teaching	Evidence by Grade Span			Evidence Overall				
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
6. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject and content.	ES	10%	16%	74%	#	3	10	49
	MS	0%	8%	92%	%	5%	16%	79%
	HS	0%	43%	57%	---	--	--	--
7. The teacher plans and implements a lesson that reflects rigor and high expectations.	ES	16%	65%	19%	#	10	39	19
	MS	4%	54%	42%	%	15%	57%	28%
	HS	31%	46%	23%	---	--	--	--
8. The teacher communicates clear learning objective(s) aligned to 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. SEI/language objective(s) are included when applicable.	ES	63%	17%	20%	#	35	11	21
	MS	38%	13%	50%	%	52%	16%	31%
	HS	54%	23%	23%	---	--	--	--
9. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) and content.	ES	20%	30%	50%	#	14	20	32
	MS	17%	22%	61%	%	21%	30%	48%
	HS	31%	46%	23%	---	--	--	--
10. The teacher uses appropriate modifications for English language learners and students with disabilities such as explicit language objective(s); direct instruction in vocabulary; presentation of content at multiple levels of complexity; and, differentiation of content, process, and/or products.	ES	61%	35%	3%	#	45	22	1
	MS	67%	33%	0%	%	66%	32%	1%
	HS	77%	23%	0%	---	--	--	--
11. The teacher provides multiple opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking such as use of inquiry, exploration, application, analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation of knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	42%	29%	29%	#	23	22	21
	MS	17%	33%	50%	%	35%	33%	32%
	HS	55%	45%	0%	---	--	--	--

(Please see next page)

Teaching (continued)	Evidence by Grade Span			Evidence Overall				
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
12. The teacher uses questioning techniques that require thoughtful responses that demonstrate understanding.	ES	26%	39%	35%	#	15	26	27
	MS	8%	33%	58%	%	22%	38%	40%
	HS	38%	46%	15%	---	--	--	--
13. The teacher implements teaching strategies that promote a learning environment where students can take risks—for instance, where they can make predictions, make judgments and investigate.	ES	25%	43%	32%	#	13	26	26
	MS	8%	38%	54%	%	20%	40%	40%
	HS	31%	38%	31%	---	--	--	--
14. The teacher paces the lesson to match content and meet students' learning needs.	ES	16%	35%	48%	#	15	22	31
	MS	17%	29%	54%	%	22%	32%	46%
	HS	46%	31%	23%	---	--	--	--
15. The teacher conducts frequent formative assessments to check for understanding and inform instruction.	ES	16%	32%	52%	#	14	20	34
	MS	4%	29%	67%	%	21%	29%	50%
	HS	62%	23%	15%	---	--	--	--
16. The teacher makes use of available technology to support instruction and enhance learning.	ES	76%	7%	17%	#	33	17	16
	MS	29%	42%	29%	%	50%	26%	24%
	HS	31%	38%	31%	---	--	--	--

(Please see next page)

Learning	Evidence by Grade Span				Evidence Overall			
	Grade Span	None	Partial	Clear & Consistent		None	Partial	Clear & Consistent
		(0)	(1)	(2)		(0)	(1)	(2)
17. Students are engaged in challenging academic tasks.	ES	21%	52%	28%	#	11	34	20
	MS	4%	57%	39%	%	17%	52%	31%
	HS	31%	46%	23%	---	--	--	--
18. Students articulate their thinking orally or in writing.	ES	19%	61%	19%	#	11	36	21
	MS	4%	46%	50%	%	16%	53%	31%
	HS	31%	46%	23%	---	--	--	--
19. Students inquire, explore, apply, analyze, synthesize and/or evaluate knowledge or concepts (Bloom's Taxonomy).	ES	48%	39%	13%	#	29	25	13
	MS	39%	30%	30%	%	43%	37%	19%
	HS	38%	46%	15%	---	--	--	--
20. Students elaborate about content and ideas when responding to questions.	ES	35%	48%	16%	#	24	31	13
	MS	25%	46%	29%	%	35%	46%	19%
	HS	54%	38%	8%	---	--	--	--
21. Students make connections to prior knowledge, or real world experiences, or can apply knowledge and understanding to other subjects.	ES	42%	29%	29%	#	25	24	19
	MS	25%	46%	29%	%	37%	35%	28%
	HS	46%	31%	23%	---	--	--	--
22. Students use technology as a tool for learning and/or understanding.	ES	84%	3%	13%	#	51	10	8
	MS	63%	29%	8%	%	74%	14%	12%
	HS	71%	14%	14%	---	--	--	--
23. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	23%	45%	32%	#	15	31	22
	MS	25%	33%	42%	%	22%	46%	32%
	HS	15%	69%	15%	---	--	--	--
24. Student work demonstrates high quality and can serve as exemplars.	ES	61%	32%	6%	#	37	20	9
	MS	39%	35%	26%	%	56%	30%	14%
	HS	75%	17%	8%	---	--	--	--