

District Review Report

Haverhill Public Schools

Review conducted November 16–19, 2015



Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education

Organization of this Report

Executive Summary.....	1
Haverhill Public Schools District Review Overview.....	4
Leadership and Governance	20
Curriculum and Instruction	25
Assessment	41
Human Resources and Professional Development.....	47
Student Support.....	52
Financial and Asset Management	59
Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit	69
Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures	71
Appendix C: Instructional Inventory	83

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

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

www.doe.mass.edu



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

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner
Published May 2016

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.

© 2016 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



Executive Summary

Strengths

Haverhill is led and governed in an environment of trust that allows the school committee to work collaboratively with the superintendent and the superintendent to have a good relationship with the mayor and city officials. Collaboration is also the hallmark of finance officials who with school leaders are meeting net school spending obligations and finding funding for unexpected as well as expected needs including the construction of the new Hunking School.

The district has strategically implemented districtwide a writing program K–8 and has provided training and ongoing professional development. An assessment for this writing program has been added to a comprehensive range of assessments. Progress in mathematics, ELA, and now writing is regularly measured using a combination of Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark assessments, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), trimester assessments (for mathematics), and Writing on Demand.

Classroom observations indicated that the district is establishing a common understanding of the importance of clear learning objectives and well-structured lessons aligned to the learning objectives. In most classrooms observed districtwide, lessons reflected high expectations aligned to learning objectives and teachers provided and reinforced clear learning objectives.

Observations and interviews indicated that there are multiple opportunities for students to access a rigorous course of study at the high-school level through an early college/dual-enrollment program and academically rigorous pathways at Haverhill High School (including Classical Academy).

Challenges and Areas of Growth

Leadership and Governance

Despite the strengths evident in all standards reviewed, there were many inconsistencies. The district does not have an up-to-date, data-driven District Improvement Plan. There is little evidence of student achievement driving budget decisions, and the two new goals developed for the district do not reflect analysis of current student achievement results. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) differ in scope and the SIPs do not consistently include SMART goals (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action-Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results-Focused; and Timed and Tracked).

At the time of the onsite an inclusive team of leaders had been convened to create a strategic plan (in lieu of a District Improvement Plan), principals were developing SMART goals, and updated SIPs were expected in January 2016.

While leadership and governing relationships are strong, the absence of a dedicated districtwide leader in English language arts and of a data analyst has contributed to the challenges in leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, and assessment.

Curriculum and Instruction

Leadership for English language arts curriculum is currently being assumed by the assistant superintendent. The absence of a dedicated person for this key core curriculum area hampers the district in revising, refining, and maintaining curriculum that is aligned with the 2011 Curriculum Frameworks. Other curriculum supervisors work with teachers and principals across the district to develop plans for improvement. Not having a dedicated ELA supervisor for curriculum limits the time and expertise that could be provided to principals and teachers across the district to improve student achievement in this content area. In addition, there is an inequitable distribution of resources; for example, only 4 of the 10 early elementary and elementary schools have literacy coaches and not all middle schools have science labs. Also, inconsistent time is allotted for science in the elementary schools.

Observations indicated that while the district has identified Power Elements for Teachers, which calls for appropriate student engagement strategies, implementation of these strategies is stronger at the elementary and middle levels than at the high school. In observed classrooms districtwide, students were not consistently engaged with tasks that require critical thinking, nor were lessons appropriately differentiated to account for diverse learning needs.

Assessment

While the team found an abundance of data, there was limited evidence that the district is data driven. There is no dedicated person responsible for the collection, dissemination, and reporting of data. Data analysis is a shared responsibility that is carried out by the assistant superintendent, curriculum supervisors, principals, and literacy coaches and often in different ways depending on the content area, the grade, and the principal.

Human Resources and Professional Development

At the time of this review, the district was in its third year implementing an educator evaluation system aligned to the state framework, yet had not achieved consistency in the implementation. Evaluation documents did not typically contain concrete recommendations that could contribute to professional growth. Of the 41 randomly selected teachers' personnel files, 17 had no recent evaluations. Also, the district has not aligned its evaluation of Unit B personnel with current regulations.

Additionally, in the area of human resources, the team found that the district, while aware of the absence of diversity among its staff, does not have practices in place to attract and retain well-qualified applicants from diverse backgrounds whose experience and skills are aligned with district needs. Although Haverhill High School's SIP states the need to increase the diversity of staff, there is no plan in place to work on this districtwide.

Student Support

While the high school has multiple opportunities for students to choose a rigorous course of study, there is limited evidence of systemic support for all students to access this rigor. The district has not established a well-defined tiered system of support.

Financial and Asset Management

Even though finance officials and school business officials work well together, the high turnover in the school business office in the last several years has contributed to an absence of consistency, clarity, and transparency in budget documents. The district had budget deficits in fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2015.

As the district awaits the completion of the new Hunking School, the condition of several other school buildings varies widely. Some spaces are outdated and a compressive long-range plan for major building renovations is incomplete.

Recommendations

Many of the recommendations cited throughout the report can begin with one unifying document. The review team recommends that the district continue to develop and complete a strategic plan (in lieu of a District Improvement Plan) based on a comprehensive analysis of student data, as soon as possible. An updated strategic plan could help the district review the use of available resources as it explores the need for a dedicated, full-time supervisor of reading/ English language arts curriculum and for a data analyst. The new strategic plan, with districtwide SMART goals, can serve as a model for schools as they update School Improvement Plans.

The district should ensure a common understanding of standards-based instruction and the importance of differentiation as well as of promoting critical thinking in the classroom.

The district and schools should move toward more equitable distributions of time and resources in the early and middle grades.

The district should enhance the implementation of its educator evaluation system, particularly in the area of providing consistent, actionable feedback to teachers.

The team also recommends that district leaders take stock of student support programs districtwide so they can identify gaps and develop a plan to fill them. Concurrently, the district should prepare and provide interventions in academic programming as early as middle school so all students have access to rigorous courses of study. Also, the district should explore options to increase the diversity of its candidate pool.

Lastly, the team recommends that the district provide clear, comprehensive, and transparent budget and finance documents so that the public can be assured of consistent annual reporting. The team also recommends that the district develop a long-range facilities plan.

Haverhill 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 2015-2016 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

Methodology

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

Site Visit

The site visit to the Haverhill Public Schools was conducted from November 16–19, 2015. The site visit included approximately 27 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 59 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team met with one elementary and three middle school teachers. This meeting was re-scheduled after no teachers attended the originally scheduled elementary-, middle-, and high-school focus groups.

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 64 classrooms in 10 schools. The team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

District Profile

Haverhill has a mayor-council form of government and the mayor chairs the school committee. The six members of the school committee meet twice a month.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2011. The district leadership team includes the assistant superintendent, the director of strategy and accountability, the director of special education, and the business manager. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number over the past three years. The district has 12 principals leading 16 schools. Other school administrators include 4 curriculum supervisors K-12, 1 associate principal, 18 assistant principals, and 5 directors. In the 2014-2015 school year, there were 490 teachers in the district.

In the 2015-2016 school year, 7,324 students were enrolled in the district's 16 schools.

**Table 1: Haverhill Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015-2016**

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Moody	EES	Pre-K	199
Crowell	EES	K	133
Bartlett Kindergarten	EES	K	137
Greenleaf	EES	K-2	257
Walnut Square	EES	K-2	154
Golden Hill	ES	1-4	518
Pentucket Lake	ES	K-4	512
Tilton	ES	1-4	509
Bradford	ES	K-5	627
Consentino	ESMS	1-8	993
Nettle	MS	5-8	497
Whittier	MS	5-8	502
Hunking	MS	6-8	389
Haverhill Alternative	MSHS	6-12	40
Haverhill High School	HS	9-12	1,808
TEACH	K-12	1-12	49
Totals	16 schools	Pre-K-12	7,324
*As of October 1, 2015			

Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment increased by 4.9 percent. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were lower than the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 34 K–12 districts of similar size (5,000–7,999 students) in fiscal year 2014: \$12,254 as compared with \$12,676 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

Student Performance

District and Subgroup Results

Haverhill is a Level 3 district because Tilton Elementary School and Haverhill High are in Level 3 for being among the lowest performing 20 percent of schools in their grade span.

- Tilton Elementary is a focus school because its students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students, and high needs students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.
- Haverhill High is a focus school because its students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students, and high needs students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups, and for persistently low graduation rate for students with disabilities. It also has low assessment participation (less than 90 percent) for ELL and former ELL students.
- Pentucket Lake Elementary and Hunking Middle had low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for students with disabilities at Pentucket Lake and for economically disadvantaged students at Hunking.
- Consentino Middle and Whittier Middle had very low assessment (less than 90 percent) for White students, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, Hispanic/Latino students, high needs students, and all students at both schools and for ELL and former ELL students at Consentino.

**Table 2: Haverhill Public Schools
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2012–2015**

School	Group	Annual PPI				Cumulative PPI	School Percentile	Accountability Level
		2012	2013	2014	2015			
EES: Crowell	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ESS: Greenleaf	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ESS: Moody	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ESS: Walnut Square	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ESS: Bartlett	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ES: Bradford	All	60	100	100	35	70	72	1
	High Needs	30	90	85	85	81		
ES: Golden Hill	All	113	69	69	94	83	37	1
	High Needs	113	63	63	94	80		
ES: Pentucket Lake	All	100	88	69	69	76	21	1
	High Needs	106	81	69	69	75		

ES: Tilton	All	63	38	31	56	46	1	3
	High Needs	63	50	38	44	45		
ESMS: Consentino	All	45	75	60	20	46	25	2
	High Needs	45	80	50	50	56		
MS: Hunking	All	60	55	80	50	61	40	2
	High Needs	50	40	90	90	76		
MS: Nettle	All	120	95	95	50	80	25	1
	High Needs	125	95	120	120	100		
MS: Whittier	All	35	90	45	20	43	25	2
	High Needs	35	90	40	40	50		
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
HS: Haverhill High	All	36	64	68	57	60	9	3
	High Needs	29	75	75	75	70		
HS: TEACH	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
District	All	50	61	54	29	45	--	3
	High Needs	57	68	64	64	64		

ELA CPI for all students was 6.4 points lower than the state's ELA CPI and 2.8 to 8.3 points lower for the subgroups that make up the high needs population.

**Table 3: Haverhill Public Schools
ELA CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015¹**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	81.4	81.1	81.6	80.4	1.0	-6.4
	State	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.8	0.1	
High Needs	District	73.1	73.5	74.7	72.3	-0.8	-4.0
	State	76.5	76.8	77.1	76.3	-0.2	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	73.7	--	-3.9
	State	--	--	--	77.6	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	57.1	58.3	57.5	60.6	3.5	-8.3
	State	66.2	67.4	67.8	68.9	2.7	
Students with disabilities	District	64.1	64.9	65.0	64.6	0.5	-2.8
	State	67.3	66.8	66.6	67.4	0.1	

Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI for the district as a whole improved but remained below the state by 8.1 points for all students and by 3.1 to 10.0 points for the subgroups that make up the high needs population.

¹ 2015 CPIs for the district and groups include MCAS and PARCC scores.

**Table 4: Haverhill Public Schools
Math CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	70.8	73.6	73.1	72.6	1.8	-8.1
	State	79.9	80.8	80.3	80.7	0.8	
High Needs	District	60.4	64.7	64.8	62.3	1.9	-5.6
	State	67.0	68.6	68.4	67.9	0.9	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	63.6	--	-5.3
	State	--	--	--	69.2	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	46.8	53.1	54.8	54.5	7.7	-10.0
	State	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.5	2.9	
Students with disabilities	District	52.0	55.0	54.8	54.2	2.2	-3.1
	State	56.9	57.4	57.1	57.3	0.4	

Between 2012 and 2015 science CPI for the district as a whole improved but remained below that of the state by 8.5 points for all students and by 5.0 to 7.0 points for the subgroups that make up the high needs population.

**Table 5: Haverhill Public Schools
Science CPI by Subgroup 2012–2015**

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	68.4	70.4	74.2	70.9	2.5	-8.5
	State	78.6	79.0	79.6	79.4	0.8	
High Needs	District	58.0	61.2	66.9	60.5	2.5	-5.8
	State	65.0	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	61.5	--	-5.6
	State	--	--	--	67.1	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	43.3	45.6	51.0	48.9	5.6	-5.0
	State	51.4	54.0	54.0	53.9	2.5	
Students with disabilities	District	51.7	56.4	62.3	53.2	1.5	-7.0
	State	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	

The district did not reach its 2015 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for all students, high needs students, ELL and former ELL students, and students with disabilities.

**Table 6: Haverhill Public Schools
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup**

Group	ELA			Math			Science		
	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating
All students	80.4	86.7	No Change	72.6	80.5	No Change	70.9	78.7	Declined
High Needs	72.3	80.9	No Change	62.3	73.3	No Change	60.5	71.1	Declined
Economically Disadvantaged ²	73.7	--	--	63.6	--	--	61.5	--	--
ELLs	60.6	69.2	Improved Below Target	54.5	63.3	No Change	48.9	59.2	No Change
Students with disabilities	64.6	74.2	No Change	54.2	66.8	No Change	53.2	68.1	Declined

Students' growth in ELA was low compared with their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities, and moderate for English language learners. Student's growth in math was moderate compared with their academic peers statewide for all students, high needs students, and English language learners, and low for students with disabilities.

**Table 7: Haverhill Public Schools
2015 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

Group	Median ELA SGP			Median Math SGP		
	District	State	Growth Level	District	State	Growth Level
All students	35.0	50.0	Low	44.0	50.0	Moderate
High Needs	33.0	47.0	Low	40.0	46.0	Moderate
Econ. Disadv.	--	--	--	--	--	--
ELLs	45.0	53.0	Moderate	46.0	51.0	Moderate
SWD	29.0	43.0	Low	34.0	43.0	Low

In 2015 out-of-school suspension and in-school suspension rates were higher than the state rates for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population.

² The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; the 2015 CPI will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

**Table 8: Haverhill Public Schools
Out-o-School and In-School Suspensions by Subgroup 2013–2015**

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	5.1%	5.6%	6.4%	4.8%
	ISS	2.1%	2.2%	4.7%	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	2.1%	5.8%	6.5%	5.4%
	ISS	1.7%	2.1%	5.0%	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	9.7%	10.2%	9.1%	6.1%
	ISS	5.5%	6.2%	6.0%	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	2.1%	3.9%	4.1%	3.8%
	ISS	1.7%	1.6%	4.1%	1.8%
All Students	OSS	3.6%	4.0%	4.7%	2.9%
	ISS	1.4%	1.5%	3.7%	1.8%

*Low- income students' suspensions used for 2013 and 2014

Between 2011 and 2014 the four-year cohort graduation rate improved for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population. However, the district did not reach its annual graduation target for any group.

**Table 9: Haverhill Public Schools
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2011-2014**

Group	Number Included (2014)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2011-2014		Change 2013-2014		State 2014
		2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	303	53.7%	52.3%	59.7%	63.4%	9.7	18.1%	3.7	6.2%	76.5%
Low income	267	52.2%	52.8%	61.2%	64.8%	12.6	24.1%	3.6	5.9%	75.5%
SWD	123	45.5%	41.2%	41.0%	48.8%	3.3	7.3%	7.8	19.0%	69.1%
ELLs	48	44.4%	42.9%	65.0%	54.2%	9.8	22.1%	-10.8	-16.6%	63.9%
All students	487	67.1%	69.6%	72.9%	74.5%	7.4	11.0%	1.6	2.2%	86.1%

Between 2010 and 2013 the five-year cohort graduation rate improved for all students except for students with disabilities and for each group that makes up the high needs population. In 2013 the five-year cohort graduation rate for students with disabilities was 46.7 percent, 26.2 percentage points lower than the 2013 state rate of 72.9 percent.

**Table 10: Haverhill Public Schools
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2010-2013**

Group	Number Included (2013)	Cohort Year Ending				Change 2010-2013		Change 2012-2013		State 2013
		2010	2011	2012	2013	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High needs	288	60.3%	60.5%	59.8%	66.7%	6.4	10.6%	6.9	11.5%	79.2%
Low income	250	59.3%	59.3%	60.5%	68.4%	9.1	15.3%	7.9	13.1%	78.3%
SWD	105	50.0%	52.7%	48.2%	46.7%	-3.3	-6.6%	-1.5	-3.1%	72.9%
ELLs	40	54.2%	53.3%	49.0%	70.0%	15.8	29.2%	21.0	42.9%	70.9%
All students	484	72.4%	71.7%	74.4%	77.1%	4.7	6.5%	2.7	3.6%	87.7%

In 2014 Haverhill's drop-out rate for all students, high needs students, and students with disabilities was twice the state rate, and higher than the state rate for low-income students and English language learners.

**Table 11: Haverhill Public Schools
Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2011-2014**

	2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014
High Needs	10.0	8.2%	6.4%	7.1%	3.4%
Low income	10.4	7.5%	6.0%	6.9%	3.6%
SWD	7.4%	7.3%	6.7%	8.1%	3.4%
ELLs	11.3%	9.1%	9.3%	8.5%	6.2%
All students	6.9%	5.8%	5.5%	5.1%	2.0%

Grade and School Results

In 2015 ELA CPI for all students was lower than the state CPI by 6.4 points and was lower than the state CPI by 2.1 to 12.8 points in each tested grade, except for the 4th grade.

- ELA CPI was lower than the state CPI by 12.8 and 11.7 points in the 5th and 8th grades, respectively, by 9.1 points in the 7th grade, by 7.9 points in the 6th grade, and by 2.1 points in the 3rd and 10th grades.
 - Between 2012 and 2015 ELA CPI decreased by 8.2 points in the 8th grade, by 5.0 points in the 7th grade, and by 0.3 points in the 3rd grade.
- ELA CPI in the 4th grade was 79.0, 1.2 points higher than the state CPI of 77.8.
 - Between 2012 and 2015 ELA CPI improved by 2.9 and 2.3 points in the 4th and 10th grades, respectively, and by 0.9 and 0.7 points in the 5th and 6th grades, respectively.

**Table 12: Haverhill Public Schools
ELA CPI by Grade 2012–2015³**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State 2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	550	80.7	76.4	78.4	80.4	82.5	-0.3	2.0
4	482	76.1	75.2	74.2	79.0	77.8	2.9	4.8
5	494	73.3	78.6	80.0	74.2	87.0	0.9	-5.8
6	609	78.0	76.9	79.7	78.7	86.6	0.7	-1.0
7	578	82.3	83.7	81.4	77.3	86.4	-5.0	-4.1
8	557	88.5	85.4	85.8	80.3	92.0	-8.2	-5.5
10	473	92.3	93.6	92.3	94.6	96.7	2.3	2.3
All	3,751	81.4	81.1	81.6	80.4	86.8	-1.0	-1.2

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA was lower than the state rate in each tested grade at Tilton, Consentino, Nettle, Whittier, and Haverhill High.

**Table 13: Haverhill Public Schools
ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2014-2015⁴**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
EES: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	63%	80%	74%	--	--	--	--	72%
ES: Golden Hill	54%	58%	--	--	--	--	--	55%
ES: Pentucket Lake	46%	61%	--	--	--	--	--	54%
ES: Tilton	32%	35%	--	--	--	--	--	34%
ESMS: Consentino	11%	56%	17%	49%	43%	28%	--	36%
MS: Hunking	--	--	--	56%	62%	57%	--	58%
MS: Nettle	--	--	31%	37%	33%	31%	--	33%
MS: Whittier	--	--	34%	38%	28%	44%	--	36%
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HS: Haverhill High	--	--	--	--	--	--	86%	86%
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
District Total	47%	59%	38%	46%	41%	38%	85%	--
State	54%	57%	63%	60%	61%	64%	91%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 ELA CPI improved by 2.6 and 9.3 CPI points in 2 out of 4 elementary schools with reportable trend data, by 1.1 and 0.6 CPI points in 2 of the 3 middle schools, and by 3.4 CPI points at Haverhill High.

- ELA CPI for high needs students improved by 3.0 to 11.2 CPI points in 4 out of 9 schools with reportable data.

³ 2015 CPIs for grades 3 through 8 refer to the transitional CPI based on the PARCC assessment and grade 10 CPI is based on the MCAS assessment.

⁴ 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

- ELA CPI for students with disabilities improved by 3.8 to 16.7 CPI points in 5 out the 9 schools with reportable data.

**Table 14: Haverhill Public Schools
ELA CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	87.8	89.4	91.7	90.4	2.6
High Needs	77.5	81.0	86.4	82.7	5.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	84.7	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	72.4	76.7	85.7	77.1	4.7
ES: Golden Hill	73.9	74.1	76.4	83.2	9.3
High Needs	67.2	67.5	69.4	78.4	11.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	78.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	59.9	59.1	59.4	76.6	16.7
ES: Pentucket Lake	79.8	75.6	77.1	79.7	-0.1
High Needs	74.1	68.9	71.4	73.9	-0.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	77.6	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	69.0	64.1	56.7	54.3	-14.7
ES: Tilton	70.8	65.2	63.9	69.9	-0.9
High Needs	68.1	63.0	61.1	66.6	-1.5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	67.8	--
ELL and former ELL	--	54.0	55.0	70.5	16.5
Students with disabilities	44.9	43.6	39.4	52.2	7.3
ESMS: Consentino	79.5	79.8	86.6	73.3	-6.2
High Needs	71.9	74.3	81.4	64.7	-7.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	67.3	--
ELL and former ELL	51.4	55.8	68.4	45.7	-5.7
Students with disabilities	51.5	55.3	65.9	46.8	-4.7
MS: Hunking	86.7	86.9	89.0	87.8	1.1
High Needs	77.7	77.0	80.1	75.9	-1.8
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	77.5	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	68.3	64.8	66.7	66.8	-1.5
MS: Nettle	77.6	76.2	80.0	78.2	0.6
High Needs	71.7	69.9	76.2	74.7	3.0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	75.0	--
ELL and former ELL	54.2	55.4	70.6	65.2	11.0
Students with disabilities	69.6	70.1	71.4	73.4	3.8

MS: Whittier	81.3	83.8	82.0	74.0	-7.3
High Needs	70.2	76.0	75.0	62.2	-8.0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	64.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	54.9	64.7	67.2	51.2	-3.7
HS: Haverhill High	92.3	94.1	93.0	95.7	3.4
High Needs	84.5	88.8	88.5	91.6	7.1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	94.4	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	79.0	--
Students with disabilities	72.7	80.6	82.8	87.0	14.3

In 2015 math CPI for all students was lower than the state CPI by 8.1 points and was lower than the state CPI by 6.3 to 14.6 points in each tested grade.

- Math CPI was lower than the state CPI by 14.6 points in the 5th grade, by 8.7 points in the 8th grade, by 7.1 and 7.5 points in the 7th and 10th grades, respectively, and by 6.3 to 6.5 points in the 3rd, 4th, and 6th grades.
 - Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI decreased by 1.5 and 1.6 points in the 4th and 7th grades, respectively, and by 0.8 points in the 10th grade.
- Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI improved by 5.0 points in the 8th grade, by 3.8 points in the 3rd grade, and by 2.4 and 2.5 points in the 5th and 6th grades, respectively.

**Table 15: Haverhill Public Schools
Math Composite Performance Index by Grade 2012-2015**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State 2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	553	75.0	78.2	79.5	78.8	85.3	3.8	-0.7
4	483	72.3	77.4	73.5	70.8	77.1	-1.5	-2.7
5	500	66.2	71.7	73.5	68.6	83.2	2.4	-4.9
6	601	72.2	72.2	73.8	74.7	81.2	2.5	0.9
7	568	67.0	68.8	61.8	65.4	72.5	-1.6	3.6
8	560	64.4	67.8	69.1	69.4	78.1	5.0	0.3
10	478	83.2	83.3	84.8	82.4	89.9	-0.8	-2.4
All	3,759	70.8	73.6	73.1	72.6	80.7	1.8	-0.5

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math was lower than the state rate in each tested grade at Golden Hill, Pentucket Lake, Tilton, Consentino, Nettle, Whittier and Haverhill High.

**Table 16: Haverhill Public Schools
Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2014-2015⁵**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
EES: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	60%	59%	53%	--	--	--	--	58%
ES: Golden Hill	44%	38%	--	--	--	--	--	42%
ES: Pentucket Lake	45%	31%	--	--	--	--	--	38%
ES: Tilton	28%	16%	--	--	--	--	--	22%
ESMS: Consentino	16%	27%	15%	39%	29%	30%	--	29%
MS: Hunking	--	--	--	50%	55%	64%	--	56%
MS: Nettle	--	--	32%	37%	35%	41%	--	37%
MS: Whittier	--	--	21%	38%	26%	46%	--	32%
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HS: Haverhill High	--	--	--	--	--	--	66%	66%
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
District Total	42%	37%	30%	41%	34%	43%	63%	--
State	55%	48%	55%	53%	45%	53%	79%	--

Between 2012 and 2015 math CPI improved in three of four elementary schools with reportable trend data by 0.3, 0.7, and 9.3 CPI points, in two of the three middle schools by 7.1 and 7.9 CPI points, and by 0.3 CPI points at Haverhill High.

- Math CPI for high needs students' improved by 0.2 to 9.9 CPI points in six of nine schools with reportable data.
- Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 1.6 to 14.2 CPI points in seven of nine schools with reportable data.
-

**Table 17: Haverhill Public Schools
Math CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	84.2	88.0	89.9	87.6	3.4
High Needs	73.2	78.1	82.0	79.6	6.4
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	80.6	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	65.6	73.3	79.8	74.4	8.8

⁵ 10th grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

ES: Golden Hill	79.5	79.8	79.5	78.2	-1.3
High Needs	74.0	74.8	74.6	72.9	-1.1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	73.3	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	65.6	68.2	59.4	68.1	2.5
ES: Pentucket Lake	72.9	76.8	75.2	73.2	0.3
High Needs	66.3	71.1	67.4	67.0	0.7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	69.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	66.2	67.2	49.6	49.5	-16.7
ES: Tilton	61.7	67.2	64.3	62.4	0.7
High Needs	57.8	64.5	62.1	56.9	-0.9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	57.5	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	62.8	--
Students with disabilities	35.3	40.1	40.9	49.5	14.2
ESMS: Consentino	64.8	66.0	63.7	62.7	-2.1
High Needs	55.1	59.4	56.8	53.4	-1.7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	56.1	--
ELL and former ELL	39.8	44.9	44.4	38.0	-1.8
Students with disabilities	36.3	36.9	36.6	33.1	-3.2
MS: Hunking	73.4	75.6	78.2	80.5	7.1
High Needs	59.3	62.4	67.6	63.0	3.7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	68.0	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	51.1	48.2	53.9	52.7	1.6
MS: Nettle	65.3	70.1	72.3	73.2	7.9
High Needs	58.5	63.4	67.5	68.4	9.9

Economically disadvantaged	--	--	67.1	68.0	--
ELL and former ELL	46.9	52.7	62.5	64.7	17.8
Students with disabilities	55.6	63.4	64.2	68.2	12.6
MS: Whittier	68.2	72.2	69.5	67.1	-1.1
High Needs	54.5	62.0	59.4	54.7	0.2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	56.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	41.0	48.6	48.3	43.0	2.0
HS: Haverhill High	84.1	85.5	86.3	84.4	0.3
High Needs	71.3	74.9	78.9	72.1	0.8
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	74.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	56.9	61.8	71.4	62.3	5.4

In 2015 science CPI was below the state CPI in each tested grade and in the district as whole.

- 5th grade science CPI was 69.6 in 2012 and 70.5 in 2015, 7.7 points below the state CPI of 78.2.
- 8th grade science CPI was 63.3 in 2012 and 63.2 in 2015, 9.2 points below the state CPI of 72.4.

- 10th grade science CPI increased 6.3 points from 75.6 in 2012 to 81.9 in 2015, 6.3 points below the state CPI of 88.2.

**Table 18: Haverhill Public Schools
Science Composite Performance Index by Grade 2012-2015**

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	516	69.6	72.5	76.9	70.5	78.2	0.9	-6.4
8	590	63.3	64.2	65.3	63.2	72.4	-0.1	-2.1
10	430	75.6	78.9	83.7	81.9	88.2	6.3	-1.8
All	1536	68.4	70.4	74.2	70.9	79.4	2.5	-3.3

Science proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 5th grade at Consentino and in the 8th grade at Hunking, Nettle, and Whittier, and below the state rate in the 10th grade at Haverhill High.

**Table 19: Haverhill Public Schools
Science Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015**

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
EES: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	--	--	51%	--	--	--	--	51%
ES: Golden Hill	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Pentucket Lake	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ES: Tilton	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ESMS: Consentino	--	--	18%	--	--	22%	--	20%
MS: Hunking	--	--	--	--	--	40%	--	40%
MS: Nettle	--	--	35%	--	--	22%	--	28%
MS: Whittier	--	--	47%	--	--	35%	--	41%
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
HS: Haverhill High	--	--	--	--	--	--	58%	58%
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
District Total	--	--	35%	--	--	27%	57%	38%
State	--	--	51%	--	--	42%	72%	54%

Between 2012 and 2015 science CPI improved by 1.5 to 7.1 CPI points in four of the six schools with reportable trend data.

- Science CPI for high needs students improved by 1.5 to 7.1 CPI points in three of six schools with reportable data.
- Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 1.7 to 17.0 CPI points in four of six schools with reportable data

**Table 20: Haverhill Public Schools
Science CPI by School and Subgroup 2012-2015**

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
ESS: Crowell	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Greenleaf	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Moody	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Walnut Square	--	--	--	--	--
ESS: Bartlett	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Golden Hill	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Pentucket Lake	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Tilton	--	--	--	--	--
MSHS: Haverhill Alternative	--	--	--	--	--
HS: TEACH	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Bradford	82.1	87.1	87.5	80.1	-2.0
High Needs	70.2	79.4	80.0	68.4	-1.8
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	71.4	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	59.8	75.7	75.7	61.5	1.7
ESMS: Consentino	61.9	63.9	65.9	56.7	-5.2
High Needs	52.6	57.4	61.7	50.0	-2.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	51.5	--
ELL and former ELL	40.4	47.0	40.6	37.7	-2.7
Students with disabilities	40.0	37.1	50.0	33.3	-6.7
MS: Hunking	72.9	67.9	73.5	74.4	1.5
High Needs	63.4	53.9	66.3	58.8	-4.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	63.2	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	62.8	48.6	58.9	44.8	-18.0
MS: Nettle	62.6	64.8	68.8	69.7	7.1
High Needs	56.0	59.2	65.2	65.6	9.6
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	66.5	--
ELL and former ELL	40.5	43.4	52.8	61.5	21.0
Students with disabilities	50.6	65.0	70.7	67.6	17.0
MS: Whittier	66.6	71.5	72.9	72.2	5.6
High Needs	58.2	62.5	63.8	63.1	4.9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	63.3	--
ELL and former ELL	--	42.5	44.2	45.5	3.0
Students with disabilities	46.4	55.6	53.4	51.8	5.4
HS: Haverhill High	76.5	79.4	84.2	82.7	6.2
High Needs	63.1	68.6	76.1	71.2	8.1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	73.8	--
ELL and former ELL	48.3	44.8	63.8	59.0	10.7
Students with disabilities	55.4	61.9	70.3	64.8	9.4

Leadership and Governance

Contextual Background

The district has 16 schools: 13 PreK–8 schools in various configurations, 1 high school, and 2 alternative schools. According to ESE data, in 2015–2016 7,324 students attended the district’s schools. Since the 2010–2011 school year, enrollment has increased by 436 students (6.4 percent).

The school committee, chaired by the mayor, leads and governs the district through its policies and procedures. School committee members consider their policies to be a “work in progress” as updates are always needed. School committee members told the review team that their cooperative relationship helps prevent conflicts and supports members’ work toward providing a quality education for the students. They said that they forward parent and constituent concerns to the superintendent for follow-through. The school committee has endorsed a special effort to combat the current opioid crisis.

The district’s superintendent is an experienced administrator and has led the Haverhill Public Schools for five years. The superintendent has a cooperative relationship with the mayor, school committee, and city government. The superintendent is dedicated to providing a quality education for the students of Haverhill. In his dedication to improve student achievement, the superintendent has assembled a staff of quality leaders, teachers, and support staff within the resources that are available to the district. The superintendent takes great pride in the City of Haverhill and supports the students in their various activities.

Interviews suggested that the superintendent along with elected officials, administrators, teachers, and support staff share a goal of providing a quality academic and social education for the district’s students. While the district and schools are working to improve student achievement, the District Improvement Plan (DIP), which sets the over-arching goals and direction for the district, expired in 2014. At the time of the onsite review an inclusive team of leaders had been convened to create a new strategic plan in lieu of a DIP.

Strength Finding

1. District and school leaders and elected officials share responsibility for student learning as exhibited by effective governance and leadership incorporating trust, collaboration, and allocation of available city resources.

A. The school committee governs through its adherence to its responsibilities as outlined in its policies.⁶

1. The school committee follows its policies and updates them as needed.

⁶See [Haverhill School Committee Policies](#) (policy BBA, School Committee Powers and Responsibilities).

- a. School committee members told the team that that they consider their policies to be a “work-in-progress” as updates are always needed. For example, a review of meeting minutes indicated that the school committee and staff at all levels are working to put policies and programs in place to combat the current opioid crisis.
 2. School committee members forward parent and constituent concerns to the superintendent for follow-through. School committee members and administrators said that generally the school committee does not get involved with day-to-day operations of the schools.
 3. At the time of the onsite review the school committee was in the process of evaluating the superintendent.
- B.** To “enhance the quality and effectiveness of public school governance in our community,”⁷ members participate in MASC training when elected to the school committee.
- C.** School committee members said that their cooperative relationship with each other helps prevent conflicts. They told the team that having the mayor on the school committee supports the shared responsibility for student learning and well being.
- D.** The superintendent works collaboratively with the school committee and the mayor and city officials.
1. The superintendent meets frequently with the mayor to discuss the needs of the district and how to better and best serve students.
 2. The School Business Office works collaboratively with the City Auditors Office.
 3. The mayor, school committee, and superintendent worked collaboratively with the community to attain the referendum voter approval for construction of the new Hunking School.
 4. The superintendent along with the school committee work collaboratively to try to obtain resources to address students’ needs.
- E.** District and school leadership work collaboratively.
1. The district leadership team, led by the superintendent, meets once a month to conduct business about operational items, security, and data from state assessments. In addition, led by the assistant superintendent, the leadership team has monthly after-school meetings to review student achievement data in depth, and to strategize and plan improvements to instruction and learning.
 2. The school committee reviews state testing results.

⁷ See [Haverhill School Committee Policies](#) (policy BIB, Committee Member Development Opportunities).

3. Principals and curriculum supervisors, in the areas of mathematics, science and technology, social studies/world language, and English language learners, agreed that they have strong collaboration. Principals and curriculum supervisors meet with teachers to analyze data and plan improvements in student achievement. The principals and curriculum supervisors observe teachers together.

F. An inclusive team of leaders has been convened to create a strategic plan in lieu of a DIP.

1. A review of meeting minutes indicated that in the fall 2015 district goals were presented and discussed with the school committee.
2. Under the guidance of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent, further development of the strategic plan is in progress.

Impact: District and school leaders, teachers, and elected officials work together to make the best use of available resources in educating their students. This close collaboration sets the stage for meaningful conversations and development of plans that are designed to improve student learning and well-being.

Challenge Findings and Areas for Growth

2. The district does not have a current, comprehensive, actionable District Improvement Plan.

- A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that while there are frequent conversations dedicated to improving student learning and achievement in the district, the District Improvement Plan (DIP) expired in 2014 and only three schools have current School Improvement Plans (SIPs).
- B.** District goals have been presented to the school committee, and under the guidance of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent a strategic plan is being developed in lieu of a DIP.
- C.** At the time of the onsite review, principals were developing SMART goals, and updated SIPs were expected in January 2016.

Impact: Without a current, comprehensive strategic plan or DIP and aligned SIPs, the district does not have an action plan to guide continuous improvement and so cannot systematically implement, monitor, and refine efforts to attain strategic goals and cannot ensure accountability for meeting improvement priorities.

Recommendation

1. The district should continue to develop and complete a multi-year strategic plan based on the vision of the district.

- A.** Under the leadership of the superintendent and assistant superintendent, a working group with wide representation should analyze student achievement and other data and continue to develop and complete a strategic plan.
 - 1. It is critically important that this stakeholder group recognize and be committed to the role of the strategic plan in creating a blueprint for student success, achieving greater teacher effectiveness, and strongly influencing each School Improvement Plan (SIP).
- B.** The strategic plan should include the district's mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.
 - 1. The strategic plan's goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measurable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).
- C.** The plan's performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district's educational programs.
 - 1. SIPs should be created in alignment with the strategic plan and based on the analysis of student performance data.
 - a. Principals should regularly communicate progress toward SIP goals to the superintendent, school committee, and staff.
 - b. The principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.
 - 2. The identified district and school priorities established in the improvement plans should be supported by appropriate allocation of resources that are clearly identified in the improvement plans and in the annual district budget.
 - 3. Professional development should be designed to support the strategic plan's initiatives and goals.
- D.** The strategic plan should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
 - 1. The superintendent and assistant superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and community on progress toward achieving the strategic plan's goals.
 - 2. The district should establish procedures to review the plan annually. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted when necessary to meet current conditions.

Benefits: The strategic plan and the SIPs will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district's short- and long-term goals.

Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *What Makes a Goal Smarter?* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/presentations/SMARTGoals/Handout5.pdf>) is a description of SMART goals with accompanying examples. The handout was designed to support educators in developing goals as part of the educator evaluation system, but could also be a useful reference for the district as it develops or refines its DIP and SIPs.
- *The Massachusetts Definition of College and Career Readiness* (<http://www.mass.edu/library/documents/2013College&CareerReadinessDefinition.pdf>) is a set of learning competencies, intellectual capacities and experiences essential for all students to become lifelong learners; positive contributors to their families, workplaces and communities; and successfully engaged citizens of a global 21st century. This could be a helpful resource as the district articulates its vision and goals.
- *Massachusetts Transfer Goals* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MATransferGoals.pdf>) are long range goals that students should work toward over the course of their PK-12 academic experience. They were written to provide an explicit connection between the standards-based Model Curriculum Units and Massachusetts' definition of College and Career Readiness. They are not recommended for use as a checklist, evaluation tool, or as an assessment tool, but they could be a helpful resource for the district as it articulates a vision and engages in long-term planning.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/level-4-guiding-principles-effective-benchmarks.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.

Curriculum and Instruction

Contextual Background

A cohesive K-12 curriculum is a goal of the district. To that end, the district has implemented a unified, research-based K–8 writing program and is providing teachers with ongoing professional development to support its implementation. While the district had documented its core curriculum to reflect the 2011 curriculum frameworks and realigned its math scope and sequence, it is continuing to revise and refine curriculum units in mathematics and in ELA to reflect a deeper understanding of the current standards. At the high-school level, ELA teachers are developing units of study that reflect an Understanding by Design format.

District curriculum development is spearheaded by the assistant superintendent, who has assumed the role of K-12 ELA supervisor, and by the district’s K–12 curriculum supervisors for math, science, and social studies/world languages. Curriculum supervisors lead monthly two-hour curriculum meetings focused on a range of topics related to the curriculum, such as alignment to the standards, assessments, aligning literacy standards to social studies units, curriculum revisions, and the implementation of the new writing program. Elementary principals and assistant principals attend monthly curriculum meetings to build content expertise. While curriculum meetings support a move to a more coherent curriculum approach, the district’s goal of having a cohesive curriculum districtwide is hindered by the absence of a designated K–12 ELA curriculum supervisor. The assistant superintendent is currently filling the duties and responsibilities of two demanding roles.

The district’s approach to literacy varies among its 10 early elementary and elementary schools and its K–8 elementary/middle school. Four of the district’s largest elementary schools have implemented the Lesley Literacy Framework and have seven part-time literacy coaches to support alignment and fidelity to the program. The remaining five early elementary schools and the K–8 elementary/middle school follow a balanced literacy approach with leveled readers and basal readers. Without equitable coaching support for all elementary ELA teachers, fidelity to a balanced approach to literacy is in question in the district.

At the time of the review, the district, under the leadership of the newly appointed K–12 science curriculum supervisor, had begun to unpack the Draft Revised MA Science and Technology/Engineering Standards during monthly curriculum meetings. The district has developed instructional goals and has connected them to its Power Elements for Teachers used in classroom observations. The district’s instructional goals include the development of well-structured lessons with measurable objectives, student engagement, developing critical thinking skills, and structuring lessons to include appropriate differentiation. In addition, there is a districtwide expectation that lesson objectives are linked to the standards. In most lessons observed in the district, the team found that the district has established this standards-based instructional practice. However, classroom observations suggested that the district’s instructional goals of student engagement, developing critical thinking skills, and structuring lessons to include appropriate differentiation have not been consistently implemented districtwide.

Strength Findings

- 1. The district has acted strategically in implementing a cohesive, research-based writing program K–8.**
 - A.** At the start of the 2015–2016 school year, the district began to implement the Lucy Calkins’ Writers Workshop model K–8. Writers Workshop contains units of study, aligned to the standards, for each grade level, K–8.
 1. At the time of the review, interviewees reported that the district had just administered its first narrative on-demand writing assessment.
 - B.** In classroom observations across the district’s elementary and middle schools, the team reported strong evidence of the implementation of Writers Workshop.
 1. The team noted teacher-created anchor charts being displayed in K–8 ELA classrooms.
 2. Teachers used the language of the Writers Workshop model.
 3. The team also observed lessons where students peer edited their writing and lessons where students published their writing in computer labs. In a grade 6 ELA lesson, a student told an observer that after students published their personal narrative stories, the class would share their work in a celebration event.
 - C.** The move to a districtwide K-8 cohesive writing approach is being spearheaded by the assistant superintendent. The assistant superintendent along with the district’s leadership team supports the implementation of Writers Workshop.
 1. The assistant superintendent characterized the district’s vision for curriculum as focused on creating a cohesive, viable curriculum. The introduction of Writers Workshop K–8 was described as an initiative to support this vision and to create structures to ensure a cohesive writing system.
 2. Interviewees said that monthly leadership team meetings are devoted exclusively to curriculum. For example, the October leadership team meeting focused on understanding all the components of Writers Workshop.
 - D.** School leaders described the district’s common learning goals as writing and said that Writers Workshop was the tool to implement the Common Core in the district.
 - E.** Professional development to implement Writers Workshop has been ongoing.
 1. Interviewees reported that over 100 teachers participated in a voluntary professional development (PD) program held in the summer of 2015 to focus on Units of Study in Writers Workshop. Teachers representing every elementary and middle school participated.

2. The team was told that PD to implement Writers Workshop was provided at the start of the 2015–2016 school year. In addition, in October 2015, 25 teachers representing every elementary and middle school, including special education teachers and two administrators, participated in a day-long conference on Writers Workshop.
 - a. Attendees, using the “train the trainer” model, created a Power Point presentation which they shared with colleagues. A district leader told the team that the focus in on “building capacity” in the district. To that end, each school now has one teacher fully trained in Writers Workshop to support other teachers.
 3. Interviews with teachers and district leaders and a review of documents showed that on November 3rd, 2015, all K–8 ELA and ELE (English Learner Education) teachers participated in a full day of PD on Writers Workshop Units of Study and all components of the writing program.
 4. Interviewees reported that seven literacy coaches at the district’s four largest elementary schools provide ongoing, embedded PD to support the full implementation of both Writers Workshop and the Lesley Literacy Collaborative.
- F.** District goals for the 2015–2016 school year include the development of assessments to measure students’ writing growth K–8.
1. The district has outlined the following goal: “All students enrolled in grades K–8, as of September 25, 2015, will demonstrate sufficient growth as outlined below by June 2016 in narrative on-demand writing prompts and measured by the Learning Progressions for Narrative Writing.”

Impact: By acting strategically through the implementation of a research-based writing program K–8, the district has taken an important step in realizing its goal of having a viable and guaranteed curriculum districtwide. This strategic step could serve as a model for the district to follow as it continues to develop a cohesive curriculum. By continuing to provide teachers with ongoing professional development the district is likely to realize the potential of Writers Workshop. By having a districtwide writing approach that includes the tools for progress monitoring and common writing assessments, students are likely to improve their writing skills and to achieve at higher levels.

2. The district is establishing a common understanding of instructional practices characterized by clear learning objectives and well-structured lessons aligned to the learning objectives.

The team observed 70 classes throughout the district: 24 at the high school and the 2 alternative schools, 23 at the 3 middle schools and at the elementary/middle school, and 23 at 5 of the district’s 10 elementary and early elementary schools. The team observed 30 ELA classes, 27 mathematics classes, and 13 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 21 special education classes, and 3 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. This data is presented in Appendix C.

- A.** In observed classes, most teachers demonstrated expertise in subject matter that engaged students in learning experiences that were related to learning objectives.
 - 1. In 83 percent of lessons observed overall, teachers demonstrated knowledge of the subject matter and content (56 percent, strong evidence; 27percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. The team noted that most elementary lessons observed enabled students to acquire complex knowledge and skills. For example, in a grade 3 mathematics lesson, the teacher designed the lesson to enable students to understand how arrays can be used to model the commutative property of multiplication. In a grade 5 mathematics lesson, observers noted that students were finding hidden questions to solve multiple step problems.
 - b. In a grade 11 physics lesson, the teacher designed a well-structured lesson with objectives, essential questions and collaborative opportunities for student-led exploration.
- B.** Most teachers in observed classes provided and reinforced clear learning objectives throughout the lesson.
 - 1. Interviews with teachers, school and district leaders and a document review indicated that developing well-structured lessons with measureable objectives was a district goal and was included the district's 2015–2015 Educator Evaluation Power Elements for teachers. In addition, interviewees told the team that evaluators look for evidence of objectives linked to the standards when they observe lessons and review lesson plans.
 - 2. In 70 percent of lessons observed overall, teachers provided and reinforced clear learning objectives throughout the lesson (27percent, strong evidence; 43percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. For example, in a grade 4 ELA writing lesson, the objective read, Students Will Be Able to (SWBAT): Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences.
 - b. In a grade 7 mathematics lesson, the objective read, SWBAT: Solve 2 step equations; the objective was followed by the standard, written in student friendly terms.
 - c. Observers noted the objectives, essential question, and standards posted in a grade 9 ELA class. For example, the essential question read, "How is irony a part of everyday life?" The objective stated, "Students will understand sarcasm."
- C.** In a majority of classes observed, teachers implemented lessons that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objectives.

1. In 70 percent of lessons observed overall, teachers implemented well-structured lessons that had high expectations for the quality of student work (30 percent, strong evidence; 40 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. For example, in a grade 1 ELA writing class, students were learning about the use and purpose of ellipses in the middle of sentences. The teacher modeled ellipses, showed examples of ellipses in books, and gave students an opportunity to turn and talk to their partner about writing moments that might call for ellipses.
 - b. In a grade 10 geometry lesson on parallel and transverse lines, the teacher introduced the lesson in the computer lab where students had access to computers with Sketchpad apps, enabling them to create parallel and transverse lines.
- D. In observed classrooms most teachers used appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective so that students could access and engage with the content.
 1. In 71 percent of lessons observed overall, teachers used appropriate instructional strategies (31 percent, strong evidence; 40 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. For example, in a grade 3 mathematics lesson, the teacher used both exemplar charts and guided practice for students to engage with the math content.
 - b. In a grade 7 mathematics lesson, students worked in pairs at their own rate solving two-step equations on iPads that accessed the Khan Academy.
 - c. In another grade 7 ELA lesson, students focused on compelling writing as they revised writing drafts using “round-robin” peer editing.

Impact: When standards-based learning objectives are posted and shared, students can make meaning of what they are learning and why. And when appropriate instructional strategies are linked to learning objectives, students are more likely to get what they need to access the lesson. Finally, with lessons that are characterized by rigor and high expectations, students are more likely to develop the tools they need to achieve at higher levels and to experience success in college and in careers.

Challenge Findings and Areas for Growth

Curriculum

3. **The district is does not have a dedicated, full-time ELA curriculum supervisor K–12, hindering the achievement of the district’s vision for a cohesive curriculum.**
 - A. The district is focused on revising and refining curriculum to reflect a deeper understanding of the 2011 Frameworks. The core curriculum (in ELA, math, science and social studies) is being

addressed at every level in monthly curriculum meetings led by curriculum supervisors who along with the assistant superintendent are largely responsible for the curriculum.

1. At the time of the review, the district had K–12 curriculum supervisors in mathematics, social studies/world language, ELE (English Learner Education), and science and technology.
 - a. In addition to supervising teachers in their specific content areas, K–12 curriculum supervisors meet monthly with their respective content teachers at each grade level to address standards and curriculum issues.
 2. The team was told that limited resources resulted in the assistant superintendent choosing to assume the role of K–12 ELA supervisor to ensure that the full-time K–12 science and technology supervisor’s position was filled.
 - a. Interviewees said that although the assistant superintendent has the knowledge base to fill the role, she is responsible for other district priorities, and that the responsibilities of both roles divide her attention.
 - b. School leaders expressed the opinion that the dual role “is a lot” for an assistant superintendent and that a fulltime person should be assigned to oversee ELA.
 3. District and school leaders told the team that monthly curriculum meetings are attempting to address the inconsistencies in horizontal alignment of the curriculum at the elementary and middle levels because of variations in grade structures across the district’s 16 schools. Interviewees stated that vertical alignment takes place within schools, but not necessarily across the district.
- B.** While the district is using curriculum meetings to deepen its knowledge of the standards and ensure alignment to the standards, it has not achieved a cohesive approach to literacy at the elementary level (with the exception of the new K–8 writing initiative). At the middle- school level, interviewees reported that there is a more unified approach to ELA with teachers using leveled readers and/or novel studies.
1. District and school leaders and teachers stated that the district does not have a coordinated literacy approach at the elementary level. The four largest elementary schools are part of the Lesley Literacy Collaborative and follow the Lesley Literacy Framework for literacy instruction. The other elementary schools use basal readers or a balanced literacy approach.
 - a. Bradford, Pentucket Lake, Golden Hill, and Tilton elementary schools are part of the Lesley Literacy Collaborative and all have literacy coaches. The team was told that coaches provide teacher training and help teachers implement the Lesley Literacy Framework and standards with fidelity. Coaches also help teachers to implement Writers Workshop. However, all seven coaches also serve as half-time interventionists.

- b. Interviewees reported that because the remaining 6 early elementary schools and the elementary level in the K–8 school, do not have literacy coaches it was more difficult for them to achieve fidelity in their balanced literacy approach. They also stated that as a result vertical articulation at transition points between early elementary and elementary schools may be compromised.
2. District and school leaders told the team that the district purchased leveled libraries for the middle schools and trained teachers to operate bookrooms. However, at the time of the review, formal professional development for a leveled-reading program had not taken place. School leaders told the team that teachers had begun using the leveled readers though after determining students' Lexile levels.

Impact: While the district has created structures to support curriculum alignment and documentation, it has not allocated sufficient resources to ensure that all district level curriculum positions are adequately funded and filled, hindering the achievement of its vision for a cohesive curriculum. Without equitable resources to ensure the full implementation of a balanced literacy approach, student learning outcomes in literacy are compromised.

Instruction

4. While the district's Power Elements for Teachers calls for appropriate student engagement and critical thinking as important instructional goals, in observed lessons districtwide students were not consistently engaged with tasks that required critical thinking.

- A. The team found stronger evidence of students actively engaged with content and activities at the elementary and middle-school levels.
 1. In 83 percent of elementary lessons observed, students were motivated and engaged with content and lesson objectives (48 percent, strong evidence; 35percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. The team characterized most elementary classrooms as engaged or highly engaged with students working alone, in pairs, small groups or with the teacher on content tasks connected to the objectives. For example, in a grade 2 ELA lesson, the observer noted that "all students" were engaged in writing a paragraph about Thanksgiving in their writing notebooks.
 2. In 78 percent of middle-school lessons observed, students were actively participating in lesson activities connected to the learning objectives (26 percent, strong evidence; 52 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. For example, in a grade 7 mathematics lesson, observers noted that "all students" were creating four, one-step equations for their partners to solve.
 3. In high school lessons observed, 67 percent of lessons reflected student engagement (38 percent, strong evidence; 29% = moderate evidence).

- a. Observers noted examples of student engagement in high-school lessons where students worked in pairs, in small groups or independently focused on tasks and activities connected to the learning objectives. For example, in a grade 10 ELA lesson, students worked in small groups reading and coding their writing; in a grade 11 physics lesson, students worked in groups of four, measuring and discovering relations of trigonometry ratios.
 - b. The team noted that in college prep classes at the high school there was little or no evidence of student engagement even though there were two adults in each classroom. Observers noted that in these classes, some students had their heads down or were wearing headphones or checking their cell phones. In one lesson, several students were sitting in the back of the room talking during the entire observation with no evidence of engaging in the lesson. Teachers seemed unable to prevent these behaviors that interfered with learning and did not reinforce expectations for appropriate behavior.
- B.** While the Power Elements for Teachers also calls for lessons to include critical thinking and analysis and/or application, districtwide in observed classes adherence to this instructional practice varied by level.
- 1. In only 44 percent of observed elementary lessons, students were engaged in tasks that required critical thinking (22 percent, strong evidence; 22 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. In many lessons the team found little evidence of critical thinking. For example, in a grade 3 mathematics class, a teacher- centered lesson limited opportunities for students to be involved in critical thinking tasks.
 - 2. Observers noted that in 69 percent of observed middle-school lessons, students were engaged in critical thinking tasks (26 percent, strong evidence; 43 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. In these lessons most students were involved in a range of tasks that involved critical thinking. Examples include: creating and solving two-step equations; using multiple ways to find the same answer to solve math problems; pairs of students using different data from a game to work out ratios; and writing out strategies used to solve math problems.
 - 3. In only 50 percent of observed high-school classes, students were engaged in critical thinking (21 percent, strong evidence; 29 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. Many lessons were teacher centered. For example, after students watched a video clip in a grade 9 ELA lesson, students missed the opportunity to summarize what they had seen when the teacher summarized the video clip for them. In a grade 10 ELA lesson, which was co-taught, both teachers did the explaining, limiting opportunities for students to exercise their critical thinking skills.

- C. Students were more likely to be responsible for their own learning in elementary and middle-school classrooms.
1. In 83 percent of observed elementary lessons, students had multiple opportunities for doing the thinking in their classrooms (35 percent, strong evidence; 48 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. In these lessons, observers noted that elementary students had opportunities to work independently, in small groups, and in pairs where they shared their thoughts in “turn and talk” opportunities or collaborated on assignments.
 2. Observers noted that in 87 percent of observed middle-school lessons, teachers facilitated lessons so that students had opportunities to be responsible for their own learning (35 percent, strong evidence; 52 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. For example, in a grade 5 mathematics lesson, students had three separate opportunities to share and explain their thinking and to share their math strategies with partners.
 3. In 63 percent of observed high-school lessons, students had multiple opportunities to assume responsibility for their own learning (21 percent, strong evidence; 42 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. However, in many lessons, student voice was not evident. For example, in a grade 11 ELA class, the teacher recapped what students had previously read, asked students few questions, and then reading the chapter herself; students did not have opportunities to be responsible for their own learning.

Impact: When students are not consistently challenged to be active and fully engaged in all of their lessons, they are missing the opportunity to be active participants in their own learning. In order for students to develop critical thinking skills they need rich and consistent opportunities to do so. When students are not primarily responsible for doing the thinking in classrooms districtwide, they are not being prepared with the skills they will need to succeed now and in post-secondary education and beyond.

5. Districtwide most lessons observed were not appropriately differentiated to account for the learning needs of all students.

- A. The district’s Power Elements for Teachers identifies differentiation as an indicator of a well-structured lesson and as a goal in classroom instruction. However, observers noted that teachers implemented lessons that were appropriately differentiated to meet the needs of all learners in only 43 percent of lessons overall (16 percent, strong evidence; 27 percent, moderate evidence).

1. In observed elementary lessons, teachers appropriately differentiated instruction in only 48 percent of lessons (22 percent, strong evidence; 26 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. While some mathematics lessons observed had math centers, the centers were not necessarily differentiated according to students' learning needs.
 - b. In contrast, in a grade 2 mathematics lesson students worked in differentiated math centers that included a listening station and in small guided mathematics groups with both the classroom teacher and a special education teacher.
 2. In middle-school lessons, observers noted that teachers implemented lessons with appropriate differentiation in only 43 percent of lessons (17percent, strong evidence; 26 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. Many lessons were "one size fits all" with limited examples of differentiation.
 - b. One example of differentiation was a grade 5 ELA writing workshop lesson where some students worked independently completing personal narratives assignments while other students worked in small groups with the classroom teacher and a special education teacher.
 3. In just 37 percent of observed high-school lessons, teachers accounted for differences in students' learning needs (8 percent, strong evidence; 29 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. As at the middle-school level, "one size fits all" was the dominant mode of instruction observed. Exceptions included a grade 10 geometry class where students worked independently or in groups while both the classroom teacher and the special education teacher moved from group to group to work with students.
- B. Appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs varied among levels in the district.**
1. In 65 percent of observed lessons at the elementary level, appropriate resources were available to meet students' diverse learning needs (30 percent, strong evidence; 35 percent, moderate) evidence.
 - a. Observers noted that most elementary classrooms were well-equipped with resources to meet the diverse needs of learners, including leveled libraries, classroom centers, math manipulatives, graphic organizers, blocks, whiteboards, computers, document cameras, Smartboards, and audio listening equipment.
 2. In 52 percent of lessons observed at the middle-school level, appropriate resources were available to meet students' diverse learning needs (13 percent, strong evidence; 39 percent, moderate evidence).

- a. Many observed middle-school classrooms had limited resources to meet students' diverse learning needs. For example, a middle-school ELD (English Language Development) class was held in a corner of an art room that had few resources to meet the needs of English language learners (ELLs). The room was devoid of literacy rich resources required to meet the specific learning needs of ELLs. For example, there were no word walls, no posted content vocabulary words, and no audio stations or technology to enable students to access content and acquire language skills. The review team also noted that all middle schools did not have science labs.
- b. Examples of the availability of appropriate resources to meet students' diverse learning needs at the middle-school level included graphic organizers, classroom sets of iPads, personal writing notebooks, access to computer labs, Smartboards, and document cameras and whiteboards.
- 3. The team noted that in 51 percent of lessons observed at the high-school level there were appropriate resources to meet the needs of diverse learners (13 percent, strong evidence; 38 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. Many observed lessons at the high-school level had limited resources used effectively to meet the diverse needs of learners. For example, although an Educational Support Personnel (ESP) was assigned to a middle-school class, she sat in the back of the room and did not engage with the students during the observation.
 - b. Examples of appropriate resources noted by the team included graphing calculators, Smartboards, laptops, Sketchpad apps in computers, audio-recordings, and additional support personnel including ESPs and special education teachers in inclusion classes.
- C. Observed classrooms at the middle- and high-school levels showed a stronger use of formative assessments to check for understanding and to provide feedback to students.
 - 1. In 52 percent of elementary lessons observed, teachers conducted periodic formative assessments to check for understanding and to provide feedback to students (35 percent, strong evidence; 17 percent, moderate evidence).
 - a. Examples of formative assessments in elementary lessons included teachers' conferencing with students, checking their writing notebooks, asking frequent questions, and circulating the room to monitor student's work. The team also noted the use of routines such as thumbs/up and thumbs/down to get students' immediate feedback.
 - 2. Observers noted that middle-school teachers conducted formative assessments in 70 percent of observed lessons (35 percent, strong evidence; 35 percent, moderate evidence). High school teachers conducted formative assessments in 75 percent of observed lessons (21 percent, strong evidence; 54 percent, moderate evidence).

- a. Observers noted that questions were the most frequent tool for formative assessments at both the middle- and high-school levels. Teachers monitored students' work by circulating classrooms and providing students with immediate feedback. The team also noted the use of exit tickets as a formative assessment strategy.

Impact: When lessons are not structured sufficiently to address differences in student learning needs and appropriate resources are not adequately available, learning outcomes are compromised. Without a districtwide robust approach to the use of frequent formative assessments, efforts to differentiate are hampered and all students are not getting what they require to succeed.

6. The district has not allocated consistent instructional time for science at the elementary level or consistent resources in science at the middle-school level.

- A. Inconsistent allocation of instructional time for science at the elementary level and inconsistent allocation of science resources at the middle schools is a concern.
 1. The team was told that instructional time for science at the elementary level is not consistent districtwide. For example, interviewees said that in a number of K–4 elementary schools 30 minutes is allocated for science on a rotation with social studies; at the K–5 elementary school 30 minutes is also allocated for science on a rotation with social studies. A fourth K–4 school devotes 40 minutes per day to science. Middle schools that serve grades 5–8 have a daily science block.
 2. School and district leaders told the team that inequitable instructional time for science at the elementary level contributes to students having widely variant science experiences.
 - a. District leaders stated that a survey is being conducted with science staff to determine instructional time and intensity of learning.
 3. School leaders reported that some middle schools do not have science labs and no money is available to purchase supplies for the labs.
 4. Interviewees and a review of documents indicated that the district is in the initial stages of addressing the Draft Revised MA Science and Technology/Engineering Standards.
 - a. While curriculum meetings are being used to unpack the new standards, school leaders expressed concern about the resources and textbooks which will be required to implement the new standards.

Impact: By not allocating consistent instructional time for science at the elementary schools and consistent resources for science at the middle schools, the district is limiting students' learning experiences and opportunities in science.

Recommendations

Curriculum

1. The district should ensure sufficient curriculum leadership in ELA districtwide and sufficient curricular support in ELA at the elementary and middle-school levels.

- A.** The district should reallocate funds as necessary to create a permanent ELA curriculum supervisor position, making clear the duties of the position with respect to coordination of ELA curriculum development and revision districtwide.
 - 1. The ELA curriculum supervisor should assume responsibility for ELA curriculum leadership currently led by the assistant superintendent.
 - 2. The responsibilities of the supervisor should be clearly and widely communicated to ensure that all staff members understand his or her role.
- B.** The ELA curriculum supervisor should take steps to ensure sufficient and equitable curriculum support for all elementary and middle-school ELA teachers so that the district has a cohesive literacy program delivered with fidelity across all elementary and middle schools.
 - 1. The district might consider identifying teacher leaders at both the elementary- and middle-school levels who have the expertise to serve as coaches to support the faithful implementation of the balanced literacy approach, alignment to the standards, and consistency across the district.
- C.** The district should continue the practice of monthly districtwide curriculum meetings to support horizontal alignment and create additional opportunities for teachers to collaborate at grade levels districtwide.
- D.** The district should consider a plan for periodic meetings of teachers at the multiple transition points between early elementary and elementary schools, between elementary and middle schools, and between middle schools and the high school to ensure that the curriculum in core content areas is aligned vertically.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will mean implementation of a comprehensive and cohesive ELA program districtwide as well as fidelity to a balanced approach to literacy districtwide. Also, stronger horizontal and vertical connections will support the district's vision for a cohesive curriculum and will likely improve student achievement.

Recommended resources:

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in

curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.

- *Creating Model Curriculum Units* (<http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h2cSpDVZqe6t>) includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.
- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvX_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *The Model Curriculum Unit and Lesson Plan Template* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/MCUtemplate.pdf>) includes Understanding by Design elements. It could be useful for districts' and schools' curriculum development and revision.
- *ESE's Quality Review Rubrics* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/rubrics/>) can support the analysis and improvement of curriculum units.
- *ESE's Writing Standards in Action* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/wsa/>) provide examples of high-quality student writing with annotations that highlight how each piece demonstrates competence in learning standards at each grade level.

2. The district should ensure equitable time for science instruction at the elementary level and consistent resources for science at the middle-school level.

- A. The district should move forward with a sense of urgency to unpack the standards and to create scope and sequence documents and units that are aligned to the Massachusetts 2011 frameworks and the Draft Revised MA Science and Technology/Engineering Standards and are aligned vertically at contiguous grades.
 - 1. The district might consider enlisting the support of the Northeast Region District and School Assistance Center (DSAC) to locate collaborative opportunities with other districts for teachers representing all grade levels to gain a deeper understanding of the new standards and to collaboratively develop science units aligned to the new standards.
- B. The district should ensure that equitable time for science instruction is allocated at the elementary level and that consistent resources are allocated for science at the middle-school level.

Benefits: Districtwide all students will have a guaranteed and viable science curriculum with well-equipped science classrooms and labs for deeper, more engaging and relevant science experiences.

Instruction

3. The district should further articulate the district's instructional model and support teachers in its implementation.

- A.** The district should convene a representative group of leaders and teachers to define the characteristics of high-quality instruction.
 - 1. The district should consider further development of its Power Elements for Teachers to support this work.
 - a. The recommended product of these meetings is a model that meets the needs of all students through differentiation, used multiple strategies to promote higher-order thinking, promotes high levels of student engagement, and benefits from frequent assessment of practice and student performance.
- B.** Once a model of instructional practice is identified and defined, district administrators should develop a plan to share instructional expectations. The district is encouraged to provide opportunities for educators to discuss ideas and strategies from the instructional model. These opportunities might include faculty meetings, department meetings, monthly curriculum meetings, grade-level team meetings, content team meetings, common planning time, and/or professional development days.
- C.** The administrative team is also encouraged to conduct non-evaluative walkthroughs in pairs/small groups to generalize and share feedback about trends.
- D.** Teachers should be provided with appropriate guidance and feedback as they implement the model.
 - 1. Job-embedded professional development should focus on elements of the instructional model, and especially skills associated with differentiation and modifications to instruction.
 - 2. Principals, as instructional leaders, should ensure that teachers have the information and support necessary to meet the district's expectations for instruction.
 - 3. Teachers should receive frequent, helpful feedback that helps them to continually improve their practice.

Benefits for implementing this recommendation include clear and articulated expectations for administrators and teachers for what constitutes high-quality teaching. This will provide a common language that will facilitate more focused feedback and professional development. A district that prioritizes high-quality instruction for all students creates and sustains a culture of continuous improvement, resulting in professional growth and increased student achievement.

Recommended resources:

- A resource the school might consider is ESE's *Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a walkthrough process. 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 an actionable manner.
- *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) provides an overview of 17 characteristics of standard-based practice, along with related indicators to suggest the level at which the practice is implemented, from not evident to developing to providing to sustaining.
- ESE's *Calibration Video Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/>) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.

Assessment

Contextual Background

Formative and summative assessments are given regularly in ELA and mathematics throughout the district. Measuring writing progress K-8 three times per year has been recently added to the assessment system. The district has some promising practices taking place in pockets where data collection, dissemination, and reports are reviewed and discussed but at the school level there are inconsistent structures and practices to ensure the use of data districtwide to improve student achievement.

The district has not clearly articulated expectations or provided a model of being data driven. At the time of the review there was no district data-driven plan for the improvement of student achievement. The team did not find evidence of district budget deliberations based on student achievement data. The responsibility for data analysis and reporting was shared by various administrators including the assistant superintendent, curriculum supervisors, principals, and literacy coaches. There was no designated leader to ensure ongoing collection, dissemination, and reporting of student achievement data to monitor continuous improvement.

Strength Finding

- 1. The district has an assessment calendar with plans to administer a range of formative and summative assessments K–12 in 2015–2016. Some schools are using assessment results for planning and making decisions about supports and interventions.**
 - A.** Formative and summative assessments are given regularly in ELA and mathematics throughout the district. Measuring writing progress K–8 three times per year has been recently added to the assessment system.
 1. Interviews and a document review indicated that ELA data is collected through the administering of Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessment K–4 three times per year. A Fountas and Pinnell report for one school’s September 2015 assessment lists the proportion of students at or above the expected benchmark for each class in grades 1–4.
 2. Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) is given in grades 2–8 in ELA and mathematics. Information for parents posted on the Haverhill website describes MAP as an important assessment used to keep track of progress and growth and to guide instruction in the classroom.
 - a. Accompanying the district’s renewed focus on writing is the Writing on Demand assessment that is scheduled to be given K–8 three times a year; the district administered the first assessment in September 2015. A district goal included on a handout shared with the review team states: “All students enrolled in grades K-eight, as of September 5, 2015, will demonstrate sufficient growth by June 2016, in narrative on

demand writing prompts and measured by the Learning Progression for Narrative Writing.”

- b. Mathematics is assessed three times a year in grades 1–8. EnVisions mathematics benchmark for kindergarten is offered twice per year.
 - c. In the high school data-based questions Writing Assessments (DBQs) are administered in grades 9–12 three times per year. Interviewees also reported that all high school courses have common mid-year and final assessments.
 - d. Other assessments in 2015-2016 include science MCAS for grades 5, 8, and 10 as well as ELA and mathematics MCAS in grade 10. The district administered PARCC last spring in grades 3–8 in ELA and mathematics.
- B.** There are some promising practices where data collection, dissemination, and reports are reviewed and discussed for planning and decision making about instruction to improve student outcomes.
- 1. Interviewees told review team members that Haverhill is in its fifth year implementing the Lesley University Literacy Framework. Four literacy collaborative schools have literacy coaches who guide teachers in interpreting literacy benchmarks and in planning instruction based on results. The agenda of one grade level data team meeting indicated that benchmark results were discussed and action plans were to be developed for students not achieving proficiency.
 - 2. Curriculum supervisors share MAP assessment results with middle-school teachers during monthly curriculum meetings. Discussions include how to improve curriculum to help students who are performing below expectations.
 - 3. Data walls were observed in several schools.
 - a. In one Literacy Collaborative school a room was dedicated to posting data results. The wall displayed data results by student for MAP and Fountas and Pinnell assessments. It also indicated what services were in place for students performing below expectations, including, for example, Individualized Education Plan (IEP), English Language Learner designation (ELL), Student Teacher Assistant Team (STAT) referrals, and 504 Plans. The principal said that these were active data walls and teams meet around the data and are constantly updating actions and plans.
 - b. At another elementary school the data wall also displayed a chart listing instructional team priorities to address students with low benchmark scores. In one middle school, data of student MAP results was posted on a wall under a goal stating: “By June 2016 80% of all students will meet or exceed the target as measured by MAP benchmark testing.”

4. Teachers told the review team that MAP data is used frequently and is posted on walls, and discussions take place to help ensure that students get to the next level.

Impact: The district administers a range of assessments at all levels and results are being used in some schools to monitor student progress and to create goals to improve student outcomes. These promising practices could be used as a model for other schools thereby providing the district with opportunities to expand the use of data and likely improving student results districtwide.

Challenge Finding and Areas for Growth

2. The district does not have consistent districtwide processes or practices to analyze student achievement data to improve instructional practice. The district has limited opportunities, resources, and expertise to guide data-driven decisions.

- A. Even though the district has an abundance of data, it has inconsistent structures and practices to discuss data or to ensure its use to improve student achievement.
 1. When asked what structures are in place to discuss data at the elementary level, administrators said that each of the four Literacy Collaborative schools has a literacy coach to assist teachers in administering and interpreting the results of the Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessment. The two other K-2 schools and the K-8 school are not Literacy Collaborative schools and do not have literacy coaches.
 2. While all middle-school mathematics teachers meet monthly with curriculum supervisors to review data and plan instruction, elementary teachers are divided among four content areas and only a selected number are available to discuss, analyze, and plan around math assessments with the curriculum supervisor.
 3. School-based data discussions vary. Reviewers were told that while there is common planning time (CPT) at the elementary schools how the time is used depends on the school.
 - a. At one school, the principal meets with teachers individually during faculty meeting time for 15 minutes to update data walls.
 - b. At another, the principal meets with teachers by content area.
 - c. At yet another school, time is provided for teachers to discuss math data every week during CPT.
 4. Interviewees told the review team that data discussions at the high school depend largely on the curriculum.
- B. Current district documents do not use student achievement data to drive district or school improvement efforts.

1. The district is poised to approve a strategic plan that includes two district goals: one about improving district culture using survey results and the other about improving writing in K-8 Progressions for Narrative Writing.
 2. These district goals do not include analysis of currently available data or improvements based on Fountas and Pinnell, MAP, or MCAS.
 3. School Improvement Plans do not consistently include SMART goals based on an analysis of student achievement.
 - a. An administrator reported that professional development was being provided because many principals were writing action steps instead of goals.
 - b. The team was told that principals are beginning to develop SMART goals and that they should be included in the updated SIPs which are due in January 2016.
- C.** The district does not have a culture of data-driven decision making.
1. The superintendent reported that while student data should be a factor in budgetary deliberations, decisions are driven by a dollar amount identified by the mayor.
 2. A document review indicated that the superintendent's cover memos to the school committee for his proposed budget for the last four years do not refer to student achievement or to improvement initiatives.
 3. The team was told that the district does not have a data culture or a data team.
- D.** There are limited opportunities, resources, and expertise to guide data-driven decisions.
1. Although Fountas and Pinnell benchmark assessments are administered K-4 throughout the district, only four schools have literacy coaches who help with training, administering, and interpreting results.
 2. District leaders reported that they need to create a data culture and train principals to use it. They said that have tried to get a data analyst position in the budget but they have not been successful in convincing the school committee to approve it.
 3. Other administrators reported that the districtwide data analyst position was eliminated and there is a reliance on DSAC to help with analysis. They also said that schools are not looking at data in the same way; everyone is doing it differently.
 4. Interviewees also said that teachers are given tables and graphs but not much information about the use of data and noted that without a central district office data analyst, that responsibility has fallen on principals.
 5. The responsibility for sharing MCAS, PARCC, and MAP data with principals lies with curriculum supervisors. There is currently one supervisor for mathematics K-12, one for

science K-12, one for social studies/world languages K-12, and no designated K-12 ELA supervisor. The assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction has assumed the responsibilities for K-12 ELA.

Impact: There is limited guidance or modeling from the district in the use of data to drive improvement initiatives. This has contributed to dependence on principals and curriculum supervisors and inconsistent, uncoordinated use of data across the district.

Recommendation

- 1. The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources.**
 - A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.
 1. Building on the practices in place in some schools, the district should establish systematic, consistent processes for the analysis and use of assessment data.
 2. The district should ensure that educators at all levels use data strategically to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.
 - B.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making, including budget development.
 - C.** The district should provide all schools with equitable support with data discussions and analysis.
 1. The district should consider the shared use of literacy coaches among all the elementary schools.
 2. The district should consider identifying and supporting teacher leaders to provide guidance for peers in the use of data to inform instruction and planning.
 - D.** The district should consider expanding the role of the director of technology or the director of strategy and accountability to include more data analysis and reporting for district, school, and curriculum leaders.

Recommended resources:

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

Benefits: By implementing these recommendations the district will achieve clarity and consistency in its use of data for decision making. It will help district leaders and teachers to analyze and use data to improve instruction and raise student achievement using consistent processes districtwide. It will help all stakeholders to evaluate programs, texts, and services. It will enable the district to provide all students with greatly improved learning opportunities and academic outcomes.

Human Resources and Professional Development

Contextual Background

The district has a policy book and a set of personnel policies (G Series-NSBA model) that it updates periodically. Two collective bargaining agreements expired in June 2014 and renewals have not been approved.

District practices for recruiting and selecting staff do not systematically focus on attracting and retaining well-qualified staff from diverse backgrounds. The district relies on School Spring as its major recruiting vendor. Applications are received by the “job owner” who decides methods of screening and interviewing. Beyond the licensing requirement for new staff, there is no screening rubric to identify qualified candidates for positions. There is no centralized training for screeners or interviewers in the district. Principals, in cooperation with the superintendent, hire their staff.

Few teachers are on waivers. There is a mentor program for new teachers. While the district is in its third year of implementing its educator evaluation system consistent with educator evaluation regulations, it has not achieved consistency in the implementation.

Challenge Findings and Areas for Growth

- 1. While the district is in its third year of implementing its educator evaluation system consistent with current educator evaluation regulations, it has not achieved consistency in the implementation.**
 - A.** A document review by the team indicated that in its evaluations of principals and Unit A personnel (teachers) the district is using forms and processes aligned with current regulations, but it has not aligned its evaluations of Unit B personnel (administrators who are represented by a union) with the regulations.
 1. The Unit B collective bargaining agreement (CBA) expired in June of 2014; a renewal has not been approved.
 - a. The Unit B CBA language governing evaluation protocols for its members was aligned with The Principles of Effective Teaching set forth in 603 CMR 35.00 formerly in effect.^{8 9}
 2. All Unit B evaluations were timely.
 3. The team did not find evidence of a plan to align evaluations of Unit B personnel with current regulations.

⁸ Previous CMR: 35 regulations were in effect from 1996 to 2010.

⁹ The Principles of Effective Teaching accompanied the regulations on evaluation of teachers and administrators (at 603 CMR 35.00) that were in effect through the 2010–2011 school year; on June 28, 2011, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education voted to substitute a new set of regulations on the evaluation of educators.

- B. The team reviewed the personnel folders of 41 teachers selected randomly from across the district.
 - 1. Of the 41 files reviewed, 17 did not have a recent evaluation, and several were new employees' files and so had no evaluation documents.
 - 2. All completed evaluations were timely and informative.¹⁰ All rated overall performance and progress toward goals.
- C. The team reviewed the personnel folders of all 16 principals.
 - 1. Three principals were new to their positions, and so the folders had no evaluations.
 - 2. All completed evaluations were timely and informative.
- D. While a document review indicated ample evidence of continuous, targeted professional development in place in the district, evaluation documents did not typically contain concrete recommendations that could contribute to professional growth.

Impact: Without consistency in implementation and in the quality of feedback to teachers, it will be difficult for the district to create a culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation in its many schools and classrooms.

2. District practices for recruiting and selecting staff do not systematically focus on attracting and retaining well-qualified staff from diverse backgrounds with skills and experience aligned with district needs.

- A. The district uses School Spring as its major recruitment vendor.
 - 1. Under Article IX of the teachers' bargaining agreement, all vacancies are posted internally. Internal candidates qualified for posted vacancies may apply for such vacancies.
 - 2. The team was told that the principal (or other "responsibility center manager" or "job owner") decides which candidates should be interviewed, using his/her judgment in selecting potential interviewees. Beyond the licensing requirement for new staff, the district does not have in use a uniform screening rubric that reflects district needs and priorities.
 - 3. The process that then takes place was described by staff as involving a standard set of questions developed by Human Resources and a hiring committee chosen by the principal. This is consistent with school committee policy.

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

B. A clear recruiting value is established in school committee policy.

1. One of the goals of school committee policy GA (Personnel Goals/Priority Objectives) is the *“development and implementation of strategies and procedures for staff recruitment, screening, and selection which will result in the employment of individuals with the highest capabilities, most relevant training, the strongest commitment to quality education, and the greatest probability of contributing effectively to the District’s learning program.”*
2. The goal of school committee policy GCFA (Hiring of Instructional Staff) is that through its employment policies *“the Haverhill School Committee will strive to attract, secure, and hold the highest qualified personnel for all professional positions.”*
3. Another school committee policy (policy GCEC, Posting of Professional Vacancies) states in part, *“The search for good teachers and other professional employees will extend to a wide variety of educational institutions and geographical areas. It will take into consideration the characteristics of Haverhill and the need for a heterogeneous staff from various cultural backgrounds.”*

C. This organizational value is further strengthened in school committee policy GCEC (Posting of Professional Vacancies) which states in part: *“It is the responsibility of the Superintendent, with the assistance of administrative staff, to determine the personnel needs of the school system.”*

D. Student demographics have been changing in recent years.

1. According to ESE data, Haverhill’s enrollment increased 6.4 percent in recent years, from 6,804 in 2011 to 7,240 in 2015.
2. The proportion of students from low-income families has increased steadily in recent years, from 40 percent in 2011, to 48 percent in 2012, to 55 percent in 2013, to 57 percent in 2014 (state, 38 percent).¹¹
 - a. The team was told that in recent years there has been an increase in homeless students and of students from low-income families.
3. Hispanic students made up 29 percent of enrollment in 2015, up from 25 percent in 2011.

E. Although stakeholders were aware of changing student populations and there was interest in meeting students’ needs as shown in the school committee policies reviewed by the team and in the team’s observations and interactions with staff, the team did not find documentation of any aggressive recruiting effort to seek out and hire new staff to the district who are aligned with the *“characteristics of Haverhill”* and the district’s *“need for a heterogeneous staff from various cultural backgrounds.”*

¹¹ In 2015, ESE introduced a different variable called “economically disadvantaged,” which typically is a lower percentage. Economically disadvantaged students made up 38 percent of the district in 2015 (state, 26 percent).

1. The 2014 High School Improvement Plan Statement of Needs includes the following goal: “Search out and hire teachers who can add a more diverse setting for our students,” but specific action steps or benchmarks are not detailed.
2. The team was told that there is a perception that educators from diverse backgrounds do not apply for professional positions in Haverhill, because few educators from diverse backgrounds live in the region.
3. The team visited 70 classrooms in the district and observed many students from diverse backgrounds, but staff and administrators did not appear to reflect the cultural makeup of the student population.
 - a. According to 2015 ESE data, of 839 FTEs in the district 7 are identified as African American, 1.6 as Asian, and 25.7 as Hispanic.

Impact: Without connecting the district’s recruiting, screening, interviewing, and hiring of new teaching staff to the needs of the student body and the cultural diversity of the town, the district cannot ensure that it builds and develops a diverse, highly qualified staff *“with the greatest probability of contributing effectively to the District’s learning program”* or ensure that staff can meet district, school, and educator goals.

Recommendations

1. **The district should revise its evaluation practices so that they are aligned with state regulation and so that evaluations of administrators and teachers include consistent, actionable feedback and recommendations for professional development. The district should provide additional focused training for teachers and administrators.**
 - A. The district should consider the formation of a joint committee, composed equally of administrators and teachers, that would meet regularly and serve as a formal mechanism to monitor overall implementation of the educator evaluation system, to identify problems proactively, and to collaboratively develop appropriate and timely solutions.
 - B. Additional and ongoing training for teachers and administrators should be provided to further support and promote the educator evaluation system. All administrators should receive focused training in contemporary supervisory and evaluative practices in order to improve their professional judgment. This includes enhancing their abilities to observe and to analyze classroom instruction, and to provide specific evidence-based feedback to staff that can significantly improve teaching and expand professional competencies.

Benefits: Improved district monitoring and communication systems will enable the superintendent, his administrative team, and all key stakeholders to more effectively oversee and ensure the full and consistent implementation of the educator evaluation system. Additional and ongoing training will

enhance the likelihood that the professional skills and judgment and the overall effectiveness of teachers and administrators will continue to improve and that an authentic and collaborative culture of growth-oriented supervision and evaluation will result.

2. The district should continue to improve its system for building human capital by

- Aligning its recruiting and hiring system with school committee policies and district needs, and
 - Linking its professional development initiatives to its evaluation system.
- A.** The district should put high priority on reaching out to colleges, universities, and other more informal sources to attract candidates of various cultural diverse backgrounds and whose experience and skills are aligned with the needs of the district. In addition, the Massachusetts Association of School Personnel Administrators (MASPA) could be helpful in directing the district to resources.
- B.** Professional development should be connected to performance improvement recommendations generated by the district's evaluation process.
- C.** The district may consider finding ways to encourage its graduates who are training to become teachers to consider teaching in Haverhill.

Benefits: To tie together these important elements---recruitment, hiring, evaluation, and professional development ---in a coordinated human resources system will help the district continue to build an excellent staff that meets the needs of the district, engages in a continuous cycle of improvement, and leads students to achieve at high levels.

Student Support

Contextual Background

The student population of the Haverhill Public Schools reflects the city's diversity and challenges. While the district's population generally reflects the state's demographics for English language learners, students whose first language is not English, and students with disabilities, the proportion of economically disadvantaged students at 38.1 percent exceeds the state's 26.3 percent and the proportion of Hispanic/Latino students at 28.8 percent surpasses the 17.9 percent statewide (see Appendix B).

Haverhill is challenged by its four-year cohort graduation and drop-out rates. For example, in 2014 74.5 percent of Haverhill High School's 4-year graduation cohort graduated (86.1 percent state), ---with rates of 64.8 percent for students from low-income families (75.5 percent state), 63.7 percent for Hispanic/Latino students (69.2 percent state), and 48.8 percent for students with disabilities (69.1 percent state).

Although the overall drop-out rate for Haverhill Public Schools has declined from 6.4 percent in 2010 (2.9 percent state) to 5.1 percent in 2014 (2.0 percent state), gaps persist --- with 2014 rates of 6.9 for students from low-income families (3.6 percent state), 7.4 percent for Hispanic/Latino students (4.9 percent state), and 8.1 percent for students with disabilities (3.4 percent state). The district has worked to form two alternative placements in-district that serve some of its most severely disabled student population.

The review team found little indication of vertically articulated drop-out prevention/recovery activities across the district.

College access for some student groups is limited. While 73.9 percent of the graduating class of 2013 enrolled in post-secondary education within 16 months of graduation (76.6 percent state), only 59.3 percent of Hispanic/Latino students (65.1 percent state) and 62.2 percent students from low-income families (65.5 percent state) were so enrolled.

Although there are a number of academic supports in individual schools, particularly in the area of writing, there is little coordination or an effective system of tiered support.

There are numerous opportunities available at the high-school level for higher achieving students. From the highest levels of administration there is a district level focus on development of curriculum and strengthening core academics.

Strength Finding

1. Opportunities exist for students to access a rigorous course of study through a pathways system.

- A.** Students can earn college credits through an early college/dual enrollment program.
 - 1. Counselors inform students in the spring of freshman year of an early college partnership with Northern Essex Community College. This partnership allows Haverhill High School students, starting in their sophomore year, to take college-level courses.
- B.** Students indicated that those who avail themselves of this opportunity can graduate from Haverhill High School with a high school diploma and a substantial number of college credits.
- C.** Interviews and a document review indicated that students have access to other academically rigorous pathways at Haverhill High School.
 - 1. Programs available for high-school students include: Enterprising Business and Informational Technology (EBIT); Fine Arts; Humanities; and Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) academies.
 - 2. The Classical Academy, a traditional academic “Latin School” style pathway, exists for students who are among the highest performing in the school. Admission to this academy is based on a test given grade 8 to students. The goal of this academy is to meet the needs of the highest achieving students and prevent losing high school students to other options (parochial, private, charter, and vocational). Students told the team that the greatest proportion of students who enroll in Advanced Placement (AP) coursework come from the Classical Academy, with students beginning enrollment in AP courses in grade 10.
- D.** Accuplacer, a suite of tests, helps seniors know their readiness for college-level work.
- E.** In addition, some opportunities exist for middle-school students to take high-school courses.

Impact: Haverhill High School has a number of attractive opportunities to help students excel academically and socially. High achieving students can take a number of AP, college level, and other rigorous courses with students more likely to attend college.

Challenge Finding and Areas for Growth

2. The district has not developed an effective system of support that ensures that all students’ academic and non-academic needs are met.

- A.** Across the district, a well-defined, horizontally and vertically articulated tiered system of support has not been established.

1. District educators told the team that there is little districtwide coordination and horizontal articulation to ensure that academic interventions are allocated based on student and school data and need. Some teachers indicated that the absence of plan for targeted math intervention at the district level creates some difficulty.
 2. It is unclear whether there has been a comprehensive needs assessment districtwide.
 3. Interviews and classroom observations indicated that services for English language learners are inconsistent across the district.
 4. Teachers said that a full ESL curriculum has not been created for the district but the WIDA frameworks have been used to adapt the ELA curriculum.
- B.** The 2014-2015 Haverhill High School Improvement Plan acknowledges the “need for tier 2 and 3 remediation programs at the high school level”; principals told the team that the high school does not have additional supports for students who are scoring below grade level. Because of tracking based on ability grouping in math, all students may not be given access to the same content and provided with the supports they need to achieve at the same level as their peers.
- C.** Teachers reported that as early as middle school students are tracked based on ability grouping in mathematics. Teachers reported that they differentiated instruction by class but not necessarily within the classroom because of this grouping.
- D.** Teachers stated that there is no pre-AP programming or other programming to support students from groups that are unrepresented in Advanced Placement and other rigorous classes.
- E.** Some district administrators noted a need to address the “non-academic” issues such as absence, mobility, and home life to help address the academic issues.
- F.** Despite the existence of a Freshman Academy for several years, the proportion of students, in particular students from low-income families, passing all coursework is very low. According to 2013–2014 ESE data, only 44 percent of Haverhill High’s grade 9 students pass all their classes, compared with 79 percent of their peers statewide; just 30 percent of Haverhill High’s students from low-income families pass all courses, compared with 62 percent of students from low-income families statewide.

Impact: The absence of an effective system of supports has hampered the ability of the district to provide for students’ social, emotional, and physical well-being and improve their achievement.

Recommendation

1. District leaders, teachers, and staff should develop a well-defined, horizontally and vertically aligned tiered system of support across the district.

- A.** The district should put practices in place to ensure that all students are provided with instruction and supports that meet their needs. The district should review and extend its approach to providing additional supports to students, with the goal of establishing a coordinated, districtwide system of tiered interventions.
 - 1. It should use student performance data to determine additional interventions that are necessary in order to more directly address students' needs.
 - 2. The district should identify the staff and resources available to deliver additional interventions. In cases where insufficient resources exist, the district should consider reallocating resources in budget planning to fill these gaps.
 - 3. The district's professional development plan should include an emphasis on differentiated instruction, to ensure that core instruction addresses the learning styles and readiness levels of all students.
 - 4. The district should complete the development of its E SL curriculum based on WIDA standards to serve students across the English language development continuum.
- B.** The district should enhance preparation and interventions in the middle and high school grades to increase the opportunity for secondary and post-secondary success.
 - 1. The district should use Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS) and other data sources to identify students in need of additional academic supports and college and career readiness counseling.
 - 2. The district should provide for the development of Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) for all students as early as middle school to better inform student high school pathways and beyond.
 - 3. The district should focus on differentiation in the classroom and create flexible grouping in middle schools to prevent unintentional tracking later in each student's academic career.
 - 4. The district should create vertically articulated (middle school grades to high school grades and beyond) teams to look at and address issues around graduation rates and college access.
 - 5. The district should create programming to address social and academic transition to grade 9 (and the Freshman Academy).

6. The district should review school and district data to determine student groups that are underrepresented in Advanced Placement (AP) and Early College and Honors classes and set improvement goals and design support for those groups.
7. The district should evaluate and improve programming in grade 9 to address issues around grade 9 course passing and access to academic and career opportunities.
8. The district should consider the development of “alternative pathways” (outside of the current schools which serve exclusively students with disabilities) for high school students who are not benefiting from a traditional school structure.
9. The district should improve “wrap around” services for students who may have non-academic challenges that are affecting academic performance.

Recommended resources:

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* (www.mass.gov/ease/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. The MTSS website includes links to a self-assessment and a variety of helpful resources.
- ESE’s *Conditions for School Effectiveness* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/school-effect-conditions.pdf>) identify the research-based practices that all schools, especially the state's most struggling schools, require to effectively meet the learning needs of all students. This tool also defines what each condition looks like when implemented purposefully and with fidelity.
- The *Conditions for School Effectiveness Self-Assessment* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/school-effect-self-assessment.pdf>) is a tool for conducting a scan of current practice, identifying areas of strength, and highlighting areas requiring greater focus.
- ESE’s *RETELL: Extending the Learning* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/retell/courses.html>) provides a registry of SEI-related courses which have been reviewed and approved by the Department's Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. These courses provide opportunities for educators to extend their learning and practice beyond the Sheltered English Instruction (SEI) Endorsement course.
- *Four ELL Case Studies of High Performing and Improving Boston Schools* (http://www.ccebos.org/ell_success.html) describe key themes at schools identified for their consistent, multi-year out-performance of like schools in ELL outcomes.
- The *World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Download Library* (<http://www.wida.us/downloadLibrary.aspx>) provides resources and materials for ELL educators, including standards, guiding principles, sample items, and CAN DO descriptors.

- *Useful WIDA ELD Standards Resources from the Download Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/DownloadLibrary.html>) can be used as a type of recommended reading list for educators new to the WIDA ELD standards who are interested in developing a deeper understanding of the framework's components and how to apply them into classroom instruction and assessment.
- Presentations from WIDA discussions with district leaders (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-03MathLiaisons-ELLDirectors.pdf> and <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/wida/2013-01LiteracyLeaders-ELLDirectors.pdf>) provide information about developing and using Model Performance Indicators to support instruction.
- 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.
- *The Early Warning Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/2014ImplementationGuide.pdf>) provides information on how to use early warning data, including the Massachusetts Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), to identify, diagnose, support and monitor students in grades 1-12. It offers educators an overview of EWIS and how to effectively use these data in conjunction with local data by following a six-step implementation cycle.
- The Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is a student-directed, multi-year, dynamic tool that maps academic plans, personal/social growth, and career development activities while taking into account the student's unique, self-defined interests, needs, and goals for the attainment of postsecondary success. The *Massachusetts Guide for Implementing Individual Learning Plans* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ccr/initiatives/>) describes the ILP tool and provides guidance related to the ILP process.
- *Ninth Grade Counts* (<http://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/resources/ninth-grade-counts/>) is a resource to help high schools identify weaknesses in their ninth-grade programs, and then develop a purposeful, proactive plan to strengthen this critical educational transition. The guide is divided into three areas of focus:
 - Strengthening the Transition into High School
 - Strengthening the High School Transition for English Language Learners
 - Using Summer Bridge Programs to Strengthen the High School Transition
- *The Massachusetts Model for Comprehensive School Counseling* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ssce/mscamodel.html>) is a standards-based model for school

counseling outlining how school counseling programs can support student achievement and education reform objectives.

- The *Wraparound Replication Cookbook* (<https://sites.google.com/site/masswazcookbook/>) is a practical guide focused on improving academic performance by systematically addressing students' social emotional and non-academic needs. It is based on the experience of several Massachusetts districts, and is organized according to the following key strategy areas:
 - Addressing School Culture and the Social Emotional Aspects of Learning
 - Rethinking Systems for Identifying and Addressing Academic and Social Emotional Needs
 - Creating Focused Partnerships & Coalitions
- ESE's *Alternative Education* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/alted/resources.html>) provides links to resource materials and websites with information, research, and guidance for alternative education programs.
- The *Alternative Education Resources and Other Academic Options Overview* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/2014-05AlternativeOptions.pdf>) provides brief descriptions of education options available in Massachusetts, including those that are specifically designed for students who are struggling academically, who are at-risk for dropping out, or who are interested in returning to high school.
- *Expanding Learning Opportunities for Students* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/framework/level4/LearningOpportunities.pdf>) is a compilation of research, school profiles and practical examples related to how schools have expanded learning opportunities for students. *SCALING UP: Reform Lessons for Urban Comprehensive High Schools* (<http://www.renniecenter.org/research/ScalingUp.pdf>) synthesizes the existing research and provides examples and lessons about the implementation and efficacy of three interrelated reform elements:
 - Personalizing the learning environment;
 - Building teacher capacity; and
 - Setting and meeting high expectations for all students.
- *Guiding Principles: A Resource Guide for Improving School Climate and Discipline* (<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/guiding-principles.pdf>) highlights ways in which states and school districts can promote academic excellence by creating safe and productive learning environments for all students.

Benefits: A districtwide well-defined horizontally and vertically aligned system of tiered support will ensure that all students are able to fully participate in the academic program and improve their levels of achievement.

Financial and Asset Management

Contextual Background

According to its website, the city of Haverhill was settled in 1640 on the Merrimack River. It evolved into a manufacturing center in the late 17th century with the establishment of saw and grist mills. Tanneries and boat yards appeared in the 18th century, and shoe manufacturing was the leading industry for 180 years. Currently computer technology and research industries thrive in Haverhill's seven industrial parks and its business district. The city has a population of approximately 62,088 and an average per capita income rate of \$25,010, which is below the state average. Its unemployment rate is 5.5 percent.

Department of Revenue data indicate an average residential tax bill of \$4,114 for a single-family residence. The city has excess tax levy capacity of \$523,947 and has reserves of \$8,281,084 in free cash (fiscal year 2016) and \$2,579,233 in its stabilization fund (fiscal year 2014), of which \$400,000 was reserved for the school district in 2015.

The review team addressed five indicators in the area of financial and asset management: thorough and inclusive budget development; complete and usable budget document; constructive civic relationships, fiscal health and financial management; and capital planning and facility maintenance. The district's communications and collaboration with city government were noteworthy. District and city leaders work together to ensure that the city meets its net school spending obligation, exceeding the required level by approximately 1.5 percent for most recent years. The superintendent communicates closely with the mayor, particularly during budget season, and school business office personnel work closely with the city auditor and treasurer on fiscal management and procurement matters. Their cooperation has helped ensure the approval of a recent debt exclusion vote to build a new middle school and supplementary funding for overruns in the district budget.

Financial reporting and budget documentation have been inconsistent and not always comprehensive or transparent, in part because of turnover in the district business office. There have been four business managers in the district since 2013. Their financial updates to the school committee have not been standardized or consistent, and they have not adequately predicted recent deficits. Budget documents do not provide clear information about proposed budget changes, priorities, and initiatives; such information is presented to the school committee and the public verbally and through the use of flip charts.

With MSBA and voter support the city and the district have begun a major building project for a new middle school. The district has an effective maintenance program, with an electrician, a plumber, an HVAC technician, and general craftsmen; they have been able to maintain and update infrastructure such as wiring for technology. The district has also made use of community cash and in-kind donations to improve athletic facilities and landscaping of certain schools. However, the suitability of many school buildings for education varies widely, with some over a hundred years old and not handicapped accessible, some with inadequate science labs, and some with worn and outdated learning facilities.

Strength Finding

1. School and city leaders work together to ensure that the city meets its net school spending obligation and to support a funding level that meets most educational and building needs.

A. The mayor is closely involved with the district, communicating with the school committee and the superintendent about the budget and school programs.

1. The mayor serves as chairman of the school committee.
 - a. School committee members stated that he is a liaison with the city council, particularly with regard to the school district budget.
 - b. The mayor has supported certain school programs, such as outside funding for a summer program for disadvantaged children, and he visits schools.
2. The superintendent and the mayor communicate frequently and closely, particularly during the development of the district budget.
 - a. Reviewers observed that the school administrative offices are located in city hall close to the offices of the mayor and other city officials, which both city and school officials find beneficial.
 - b. In its self-assessment, administrators rated their relationships with city officials as well described by the indicator, which reads “District and municipal leaders have positive working relationships.”
 - c. School committee members, the superintendent, and city officials alike reported that the superintendent and the mayor meet frequently about the level of funding available for the district budget and about needed programs for the schools such as special education, technology, and a new math program. They stated that the mayor tries to give the district what it needs, and the superintendent goes to him before recommending a budget to the school committee. There is no fighting over the budget.
3. The city council has in recent years approved district budgets recommended by the mayor and approved by the school committee.

B. The city has met its obligation to fund the schools at the required net school spending level.

1. From fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2015 the city exceeded its net school spending obligation by approximately 1.5 percent, with the exception of fiscal year 13 when expenditures were 5.6 percent above the requirement.
 - a. Administrators, school committee members, and city officials told the team that the budget process begins with discussions between the mayor and the superintendent on how much would be available for the school budget and what the schools need.

- b. A review of budget documents indicated that for the school committee the district budget process begins with a calculation of required net school spending and the amount left for the district budget after deducting city expenses for education.
 - i. The calculation of city charges is not based on a written document, but school and city officials indicated that they agree on the charges.
- C. City officials and school business personnel work cooperatively on fiscal management and purchasing procedures.
 - 1. The business manager and school accountant are both new in 2015. City and school administrators reported that they communicate nearly daily with the city auditor's and treasurer's staffs who have assisted new school business personnel with understanding state requirements and city financial procedures.
 - 2. Accounts payable requisitions are submitted to the city procurement office for review before being sent out as purchase orders. The city auditor reviews invoices.
 - 3. School business personnel work with the city purchasing agent to bid and prepare contracts.
- D. School and city officials also cooperate on building and maintenance issues.
 - 1. School officials submit project proposals to the city capital plan for long-range consideration and funding. They recently cooperated on an energy saving project, to be paid from savings on utility bills.
 - a. The city has supported supplementary funding for renovations for district school buildings, technology, and deficits.
 - 2. The city approved debt exclusion overrides to fund renovations for four elementary schools (1997) and a middle school (2013).
 - a. The community approved the debt exclusion for a \$61.5 million new middle school by an overwhelming (4:1) margin.
 - b. The chairman of the school committee said that the project was successful in large part because of support by the mayor and the city council as well as the school committee.
 - 3. The city also supported an \$803,000 technology bond for the high school and in 2015 an energy contract for the schools, with interest to be paid by the city.
 - 4. There was a deficit of between \$12 million in the school budget in 2013, primarily because of the cost of special education. The mayor, superintendent, and school committee worked out an agreement so that the city covered the deficit by a transfer from the city stabilization fund and by reducing the fiscal year 2014 school budget.

- a. City officials reported that after the deficit crisis the city established a school stabilization fund for unanticipated district expenses.
- b. There was another deficit of \$400,000 in 2015, which the city covered by the school district's share of the stabilization fund.

Impact: The close communications and cooperation between the mayor, the superintendent, and other school and city finance officials have meant assistance for new business office personnel and support for most educational and building needs.

Challenge Findings and Areas for Growth

2. Frequent turnover in the business office of the district has contributed to budget documentation that is not comprehensive or transparent, as well as to inconsistent financial reports and recent operating deficits.

- A.** Four persons have assumed the business manager's responsibilities since 2013, and the current school accountant is also new.
 1. After the business manager left in 2013 the district hired an interim business manager. He was assisted by a consultant during the 2014-2015 school year.
 - a. The superintendent reported that he brought in the consultant from an accounting firm to ensure that charges were made to the correct accounts and to help prepare the proposed budget.
 2. A review of school committee minutes indicated that a permanent business manager was appointed in August 2015.
 3. Administrators reported that the district accountant was also new in July 2015.
- B.** Documentation for proposed budgets has consisted only of a line item budget and an introductory letter from the superintendent (except for 2016).
 1. In their self-assessment administrators rated the district budget documentation as not well described by the following indicators:
 - a. "The budget document and related formal presentation documents have clear and useful summaries as well as financial detail."
 - b. "The budget summary includes narrative about key priorities and how they are supported financially."
 - c. "The budget document includes all funds. (Grant amounts and expenditures may be estimated.)"

2. As noted above, the school committee first receives a calculation of required net school spending, city charges, and what may be available for the school budget.
 3. A working document for administrators is a line item report of budget requests from principals and other administrators with notations for initiatives and increases such as special education programs, additional teachers, and science texts.
 4. The line item budget includes the proposed budget and personnel full-time equivalents (FTEs) for each line item grouped by school and other cost centers along with trends for two previous years. It includes offsets for some revenues, including circuit breaker, tuition, and some grants; other funds, such as most revolving funds and entitlement grants, are not included. There is no narrative for fiscal year 2016 and documents do not indicate priorities or initiatives.
 5. The superintendent's introductory letters for the fiscal year 2012, 2013, 2014 and fiscal year 2015 budgets referenced proposals such as the all-day kindergarten initiative, a security guard, negotiated salary increases, math and science textbooks, technology, new teachers and a guidance counselor, a cosmetology program, and a girls' hockey program.
 - a. The superintendent reported that he did not prepare a budget letter for fiscal year 2016.
 6. School committee members and the superintendent reported that he used flip charts to present highlights of the proposed budgets to the school committee and the public.
 7. The only public comment in school committee minutes about the proposed fiscal year 2016 budget suggested more transparency.
- C. Financial updates to the school committee have varied over the past three years.**
1. Administrators reported that the quarterly financial updates to the school committee were previously too detailed and became political.
 2. Administrators said and a review of meeting minutes indicated that in 201-2015 financial updates were presented verbally to the school committee.
 3. Administrators told the team that a financial update to the committee by the new business manager in October 2015 was well received. It highlighted projected balances for schools and other cost centers, and emphasized that unexpected special education and utility costs would affect future projected balances.
- D. The district budget ran deficits for fiscal years 2012, 2013, and 2015.**
1. Administrators said and a review of district end-of-year reports indicated the deficits as follows.

- a. For fiscal year 2012 the deficit was \$417,016.
- b. For fiscal year 2013 the deficit was between \$1.4–1.5 million, because of unexpected special education overruns. School committee members and administrators reported that the deficit was not foreseen until May or June and it was covered by the city stabilization fund. It was offset in part by a \$500,000 reduction in the next year's budget.
- c. The fiscal year 2015 deficit was approximately \$400,000, again primarily because of special education costs. It was covered by the school's share of the city stabilization fund, which for fiscal year 2015 was \$400,000.

Impact: The turnover in the business office has affected confidence in financial projections and budget development, resulting in the hiring of a consulting accountant in 2014-2015. The financial reports to the school committee by various business managers have been inconsistent, which affects how well stakeholders understand and trust the documents. Continued deficits, especially when their extent is unforeseen, could compromise the public's confidence in the financial management of the schools.

3. The district has an effective maintenance program, but the conditions of school buildings vary widely. Some spaces are outdated. The district has a five-year capital plan.

- A.** District maintenance staff have a wide variety of useful skills which enable the district to limit expenses and to keep buildings in good repair.
 1. Administrators reported that the maintenance staff includes an electrician, a plumber, an HVAC technician, and general craftsmen. They try to cover building needs in house, avoiding the expense of contracted services, although highly technical services such as boiler maintenance and repairs are contracted out.
 - a. In-house maintenance staff wired three buildings for technology last summer (2015) for a savings of \$275,000, replaced water heaters for a savings of \$15,00020,000, and installed air conditioning in two schools.
 2. The superintendent and school committee members also reported using private grants, bonded funds, donations, and services from the community for technology upgrades and other improvements to district facilities, such as landscaping for the high school and a middle school, stadium improvements, and iPads for Khan Academy studies.
- B.** The ages, condition, infrastructure, and learning environments of district schools vary widely, with some schools dating back to the 19th century.
 1. According to MSBA (Massachusetts School Building Authority) data, four of the district's school buildings were built before 1900 and only two of these have been renovated. Other buildings date from 1914 to 1997; recent improvements include district-wide green repairs, a renovation in 2000, and current construction at the Hunking School.

- a. Administrators said that some schools are not handicapped accessible and many classrooms are overcrowded.
 - b. Reviewers observed 28–30 students in many classrooms, and they found some schools were outdated, worn and shabby, and in need of educational improvements such as middle-school science labs.
- C. The district has taken some major steps to improve its school facilities.
 - 1. The district and the city have invested \$61.5 million for a new K-8 school, a project that is currently underway.
 - 2. Administrators said and ESE data confirmed that four elementary schools were built or renovated in 1997 and a middle school was renovated in 2000. Renovations to the high school were also done about three years ago.
 - 3. Administrators and city officials reported that the district has contracted for energy saving projects for its schools, such as energy efficient lighting and computerized heating controls bonded by the city and to be paid from savings.
- D. The 2010-2012 District Improvement Plan included a goal to develop a long-range district capital plan.
- E. The district annually proposes school projects to be added to the city's five-year capital plan, but long-range plans for major renovations are incomplete.
 - 1. School projects in the city's five-year capital plan include an access road, ceilings, air conditioner repairs, lockers, and a roof. The only major renovation in the plan is a \$5 million renovation of the Consentino Middle School.
 - 2. Administrators said that other schools--especially some of the older schools---need renovation to make them accessible and to update learning spaces.
 - 3. City officials pointed out that since bonds for four schools are nearly paid off the city has bonding capacity for other school renovations.
 - 4. Administrators stated that maintaining school facilities helps the district keep students in the district.

Impact: Without a comprehensive long-range capital plan it is not clear to staff or the public what kind of schools students will attend and how suitable they will be for learning. As school buildings are scheduled for improvements, the district likely gets closer to ensuring that all school facilities are conducive to learning.

Recommendations

- 1. Special attention should be given to creating budget and financial reports that are complete, transparent, and accurate. Information about initiatives and priorities in proposed budgets and the early identification of potential deficits are particularly important.**
 - A.** Budget documentation currently consists of line item budgets for each school and cost center along with proposed staffing FTE's and previous years' expenditures and budgets. Offsets for a few grants and revolving funds are included.
 1. The inclusion of proposed initiatives and priorities in the proposed budget are essential to school committee and public understanding of the budget. An explanation of priorities and initiatives should be included in the presentation and documented. Comments about the line items can help clarify the proposed changes, and current staffing FTE's to compare to those proposed can also serve to highlight changes.
 2. Much of this information appears on working budget development spreadsheets in use by administrators during their preparation of proposed budgets and in flip charts used to present the proposed budget to the school committee; the district should consider sharing appropriate details from those spreadsheets and flip charts in a public budget document.
 3. The inclusion of offsets and staffing levels for entitlement grants and funds such as Title I and IDEA grants and the athletic revolving fund would give a more complete picture of all school programs.
 - B.** The recent written report to the committee by the new business manager was brief, highlighting balances for each school and cost center with current unencumbered balances for each. The narrative emphasized areas of potential cost overruns. The report was well received by the school committee, and could serve as a model for future standardized reports.
 - C.** The district should convene a task force of school committee members---and possibly financial experts from the community---to assist administrators by giving feedback on possible budget and financial reports and their content and by helping determine future content for the reports.

Recommended resources:

- In *Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets* (<http://dmccouncil.org/spending-money-wisely-ebook>), authors Nathan Levenson, Karla Baehr, James C. Smith, and Claire Sullivan of The District Management Council identify and discuss the top ten opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities. Drawing on the wisdom of leading thinkers, district leaders, and education researchers from across the country, the authors gathered a long list of opportunities for resource reallocation. To distill these down to the ten most high-impact opportunities, each opportunity was assessed based on its financial benefit, its impact on student achievement, its political feasibility, and its likelihood of success relative to the complexity of implementation.

- The Rennie Center's *Smart School Budgeting* (http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html; direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation.
- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

Benefits from implementing this recommendation include:

- A clearer and more consistent presentation of budget proposals, financial reports, and potential surpluses and deficits
- A better understood, more complete, and transparent picture of how resources are allocated, and how they might be reallocated to better address students' needs.

2. The district should develop a long-range facilities maintenance and capital improvements plan addressing accessibility and renovations.

- A.** The plan should identify capital needs and indicate a timetable for updating, improving, and/or renovating school buildings.
1. The plan should include all major needs, including accessibility improvements.
 2. The plan could also be used to indicate which buildings might in the future be no longer used for classroom purposes, what grade and program configurations would be appropriate for the district and each school, and where and when major renovations would result in updated facilities.

Recommended resources:

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

industry standards/guidelines related to elements on the checklist, as well as additional resources.

Benefits:

- The study and plan will clarify for stakeholders the shortcomings of various facilities and provide a timeline and estimated costs for improvements.
- The plan will help the district earmark funds and prioritize projects for consideration by the city as bonding capacity becomes available.

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

Review Team Members

The review was conducted from November 16-19, 2015, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Dr. Charles Burnett, leadership and governance
2. Suzanne Kelly, curriculum and instruction
3. Lenora Jennings, assessment and *review team coordinator*
4. Dr. Thomas Johnson, human resources and professional development
5. Nyal Fuentes, 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, supervisor of facilities, accountant, city auditor, and assistant city auditor.

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

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president, secretary, and one representative.

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

The team visited the following schools: Walnut Square (K–2), Bradford (K–5), Pentucket Lake (K–4), Tilton (1–4), Consentino (1–8), Hunking (grades 6–8), Nettle (grades 5–8), Whittier (grades 5–8), Haverhill Alternative (grades 6–12), Haverhill High School (grades 9–12), and TEACH (grades 1–12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 11 principals and 1 teacher focus group with 1 elementary and 3 middle school teachers. This meeting was re-scheduled after no teachers attended the originally scheduled elementary, middle-, and high-school focus groups sessions.

The team observed 70 classes in the district: 24 at the high schools, 23 at the middle schools, and 23 at 5 of the 10 elementary schools.

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

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

Site Visit Schedule

Monday 11/16/2015]	Tuesday 11/17/2015	Wednesday 11/18/2015	Thursday 11/19/2015
Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; and interview with the teachers' association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; review of personnel files; parent focus group; student focus group; interview with town officials and visits to Bradford, Consentino, and Haverhill High for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; teacher focus group; visits to Walnut Square, Pentucket Lake, Consentino, Tilton, Nettle, Whittier, and Hunking for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Consentino, Bradford, Tilton, Hunking, Whittier, and Haverhill High for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Haverhill Public Schools
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	241	3.3%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	132	1.8%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	2,205	30.1%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	13	0.2%	2,179	0.2%
White	4,637	63.3%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	9	0.1%	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	87	1.2%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	7,324	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

**Table B1b: Haverhill Public Schools
2015–2016 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	1,502	36.8%	20.3%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	3,027	74.2%	41.3%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	499	12.2%	6.8%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	4,081	100.0%	55.3%	419,764	100.0%	43.5%

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. 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 7,385; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B2a: Haverhill Public Schools
English Language Arts MCAS/PARCC Performance, 2012–2015

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015*	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	550	80.7	76.4	78.4	80.4	82.5	-0.3	2.0
4	CPI	482	76.1	75.2	74.2	79.0	77.8	2.9	4.8
	SGP	430	55	49	61	58	50	3	-3
5	CPI	494	73.3	78.6	80	74.2	87.0	0.9	-5.8
	SGP	423	43	42.5	46	28	50	-15	-18
6	CPI	609	78.0	76.9	79.7	78.7	86.6	0.7	-1.0
	SGP	539	49.5	47	49	33	50	-16.5	-16
7	CPI	578	82.3	83.7	81.4	77.3	86.4	-5.0	-4.1
	SGP	508	52	45	45	33	50	-19	-12
8	CPI	557	88.5	85.4	85.8	80.3	92.0	-8.2	-5.5
	SGP	492	60	61	55	30	50	-30	-25
10	CPI	473	92.3	93.6	92.3	94.6	96.7	2.3	2.3
	SGP	380	34.5	38.5	39.5	37	51	2.5	-2.5
All	CPI	3,751	81.4	81.1	81.6	80.4	86.8	-1.0	-1.2
	SGP	2,791	50	48	50	44	50	-6	-6

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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 statewide assessments for the first time.

* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

**Table B2b: Haverhill Public Schools
English Language Arts MCAS Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	P+	484	47%	53%	40%	49%	57%	2	9
4	P+	495	40%	47%	45%	46%	54%	6	1
5	P+	529	49%	41%	50%	54%	64%	5	4
6	P+	608	48%	52%	49%	54%	68%	6	5
7	P+	591	56%	56%	58%	54%	72%	-2	-4
8	P+	573	68%	71%	64%	68%	79%	0	4
10	P+	447	76%	79%	81%	78%	90%	2	-3
All	P+	3,727	54%	57%	55%	57%	69%	3	2

**Table B2c: Haverhill Public Schools
English Language Arts 2015 PARCC Performance Level**

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
3	747	47%	54%	4%	7%	44%	47%	24%	22%	18%	14%	10	10%
4	755	59%	57%	13%	15%	46%	42%	23%	25%	13%	12%	5	5%
5	740	38%	63%	3%	8%	35%	55%	30%	23%	21%	10%	11	4%
6	743	46%	60%	4%	12%	42%	48%	29%	25%	18%	11%	7	4%
7	741	41%	61%	9%	21%	32%	40%	27%	22%	22%	11%	10	6%
8	737	38%	64%	6%	16%	33%	48%	23%	20%	25%	10%	14	5%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations;
Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

**Table B2d: Haverhill Public Schools
Mathematics MCAS/PARCC Performance, 2012–2015**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015*	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	CPI	553	75.0	78.2	79.5	78.8	85.3	3.8	-0.7
4	CPI	483	72.3	77.4	73.5	70.8	77.1	-1.5	-2.7
	SGP	432	47	58	43	37	50	-10	-6
5	CPI	500	66.2	71.7	73.5	68.6	83.2	2.4	-4.9
	SGP	429	41	45	41	34	50	-7	-7
6	CPI	601	72.2	72.2	73.8	74.7	81.2	2.5	0.9
	SGP	533	54	58	48	50	50	-4	2
7	CPI	568	67.0	68.8	61.8	65.4	72.5	-1.6	3.6
	SGP	504	56	53.5	52	48	50	-8	-4
8	CPI	560	64.4	67.8	69.1	69.4	78.1	5.0	0.3
	SGP	502	45	56	61.5	59	50	14	-2.5
10	CPI	478	83.2	83.3	84.8	82.4	89.9	-0.8	-2.4
	SGP	384	43	40.5	42	40	50	-3	-2
All	CPI	3,759	70.8	73.6	73.1	72.6	80.7	1.8	-0.5
	SGP	2,791	47	53	48	44	50	-3	-4

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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 statewide assessments for the first time.

* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

**Table B2e: Haverhill Public Schools
Mathematics MCAS Performance, 2011-2014**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	P+	482	50%	50%	56%	60%	68%	10	4
4	P+	492	34%	36%	43%	42%	52%	8	-1
5	P+	530	38%	34%	46%	46%	61%	8	0
6	P+	613	43%	44%	46%	46%	60%	3	0
7	P+	594	34%	37%	40%	33%	50%	-1	-7
8	P+	576	43%	33%	41%	43%	52%	0	2
10	P+	443	69%	65%	66%	64%	79%	-5	-2
All	P+	3,730	43%	42%	47%	47%	60%	4	0

**Table B2f: Haverhill Public Schools
Math 2015 PARCC Performance Level**

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
3	742	42%	55%	7%	12%	36%	43%	27%	25%	24%	14%	7%	6%
4	741	37%	48%	5%	6%	32%	41%	31%	29%	24%	18%	8%	5%
5	735	30%	55%	6%	11%	24%	44%	33%	26%	27%	15%	10%	5%
6	743	41%	53%	7%	10%	34%	44%	32%	28%	22%	14%	5%	5%
7	739	34%	45%	4%	8%	29%	37%	36%	32%	24%	18%	7%	4%
8	741	43%	53%	10%	10%	33%	43%	20%	22%	20%	15%	17%	10%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations; Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

**Table B2g: Haverhill Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering MCAS Performance, 2012–2015**

Grade and Measure		Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year					Gains and Declines	
			2012	2013	2014	2015	State (2015)	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	CPI	516	69.6	72.5	76.9	70.5	78.2	0.9	-6.4
	P+	516	38%	39%	46%	35%	51%	-3%	-11%
8	CPI	590	63.3	64.2	65.3	63.2	72.4	-0.1	-2.1
	P+	590	27%	28%	26%	27%	42%	0%	1%
10	CPI	430	75.6	78.9	83.7	81.9	88.2	6.3	-1.8
	P+	430	46%	53%	59%	57%	72%	11%	-2%
All	CPI	1536	68.4	70.4	74.2	70.9	79.4	2.5	-3.3
	P+	1536	36%	38%	42%	38%	54%	2%	-4%

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

**Table B3a: Haverhill Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015*	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	2,129	73.1	73.5	74.7	72.3	-0.8	-2.4
		SGP	1,430	47	45	46	33	-14	-13
	State	CPI	220,963	76.5	76.8	77.1	76.3	-0.2	-0.8
		SGP	164,300	46	47	47	47	1	0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	1,669	--	--	--	73.7	--	--
		SGP	1,151	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	151,741	--	--	--	77.6	--	--
		SGP	114,505	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	825	64.1	64.9	65.0	64.6	0.5	-0.4
		SGP	502	43	41	46	29	-14	-17
	State	CPI	90,429	67.3	66.8	66.6	67.4	0.1	0.8
		SGP	65,886	43	43	43	43	0	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	382	57.1	58.3	57.5	60.6	3.5	3.1
		SGP	223	53	50	47	45	-8	-2
	State	CPI	49,639	66.2	67.4	67.8	68.9	2.7	1.1
		SGP	32,850	51	53	54	53	2	-1
All students	District	CPI	3,751	81.4	81.1	81.6	80.4	-1.0	-1.2
		SGP	2,781	50	48	50	35	-15	-15
	State	CPI	490,449	86.7	86.8	86.7	86.8	0.1	0.1
		SGP	386,631	50	51	50	50	0	0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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.

* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

**Table B3b: Haverhill Public Schools
English Language Arts (All Grades)
Percentage of Selected Subgroups Scoring Proficient or Advanced on MCAS, 2011-2014**

Group	Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	2402	36%	39%	39%	43%	7	4
Low Income	2144	39%	42%	40%	44%	5	4
Students w/ disabilities	815	16%	18%	17%	21%	5	4
ELL or Former ELLs	361	14%	17%	16%	20%	6	4
All Students	3727	54%	57%	55%	57%	3	2

**Table B3c: Haverhill Public Schools
ELA Grades 3 to 8 by Group 2015 PARCC Performance Level**

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
High Needs	1,753	29%	38%	2%	4%	27%	34%	28%	30%	28%	20%	15%	11%
Econ. Disad.	1,410	31%	41%	3%	5%	29%	36%	29%	30%	26%	19%	14%	11%
Students with disabilities	584	16%	21%	1%	2%	15%	20%	24%	30%	36%	29%	24%	20%
ELL	341	18%	31%	2%	3%	16%	28%	26%	30%	31%	24%	26%	15%
All	3,137	45%	60%	6%	13%	38%	47%	26%	23%	19%	12%	10%	6%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations; Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

**Table B3d: Haverhill Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS/PARCC Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015*	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	2,140	60.4	64.7	64.8	62.3	1.9	-2.5
		SGP	1,439	45	51	45	40	-5	-5
	State	CPI	221,202	67	68.6	68.4	67.9	0.9	-0.5
		SGP	165,003	46	46	47	46	0	-1
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	1,675	--	--	--	63.6	--	--
		SGP	1,164	--	--	--	--	--	--
	State	CPI	151,816	--	--	--	69.2	--	--
		SGP	115,029	--	--	--	--	--	--
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	831	52	55	54.8	54.2	2.2	-0.6
		SGP	502	43.5	48	41	34	-9.5	-7
	State	CPI	90,520	56.9	57.4	57.1	57.3	0.4	0.2
		SGP	66,285	43	42	43	43	0	0
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	382	46.8	53.1	54.8	54.5	7.7	-0.3
		SGP	216	52	58	45	46	-6	1
	State	CPI	49,969	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.5	2.9	0.7
		SGP	33,076	52	53	52	51	-1	-1
All students	District	CPI	3,759	70.8	73.6	73.1	72.6	1.8	-0.5
		SGP	2,791	47	53	48	44	-3	-4
	State	CPI	490,466	79.9	80.8	80.3	80.7	0.8	0.4
		SGP	387,674	50	51	50	50	0	0

Notes: The number of students included in CPI 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.

* The PARCC Assessment was given in 2015 for grades 3 through 8. The MCAS assessment was given in 2012-2014 and in grade 10 in 2015.

**Table B3e: Haverhill Public Schools
Mathematics (All Grades)**

Percentage of Selected Subgroups Scoring Proficient or Advanced on MCAS, 2011-2014

Group	Number Included (2014)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
		2011	2012	2013	2014	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	2,403	26%	25%	31%	32%	6	1
Low Income	2,144	27%	27%	33%	33%	6	0
Students w/ disabilities	815	11%	10%	12%	14%	3	2
ELL or Former ELLs	357	11%	12%	17%	20%	9	3
All Students	3,730	43%	42%	47%	47%	4	0

**Table B3f: Haverhill Public Schools
Math Grades 3 to 8 by Group 2015 PARCC Performance Level**

Grade	N	Levels 4 & 5		Level 5		Level 4		Level 3		Level 2		Level 1	
		Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State	Dist.	State
High Needs	1,753	22%	31%	2%	3%	20%	28%	31%	31%	33%	26%	14%	11%
Econ. Disad.	1,412	23%	33%	2%	3%	21%	30%	33%	31%	32%	25%	12%	11%
Students with disabilities	590	11%	17%	1%	2%	10%	16%	24%	28%	42%	35%	24%	20%
ELL	331	15%	30%	1%	4%	14%	26%	27%	30%	37%	27%	21%	13%
All	3,134	38%	52%	6%	10%	32%	43%	30%	27%	23%	16%	9%	6%

Levels 4 and 5: Met or Exceeded Expectations, Level 5: Exceeded Expectations, Level 4: Met Expectations; Level 3: Approached Expectations; Level 2: Partially Met Expectations; Level 1: Did Not Meet Expectations

**Table B3g: Haverhill Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2012–2015**

Group and Measure			Number Included (2015)	Spring MCAS Year				Gains and Declines	
				2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
High Needs	District	CPI	837	58	61.2	66.9	60.5	2.5	-6.4
		P+	837	18.0%	21.0%	28.0%	21.0%	3.0%	-7.0%
	State	CPI	91,013	65	66.4	67.3	66.3	1.3	-1
		P+	91,013	31.0%	31.0%	33.0%	32.0%	1.0%	-1.0%
Econ. Disadv.	District	CPI	669	--	--	--	61.5	61.5	61.5
		P+	669	--	--	--	24.0%	24.0%	24.0%
	State	CPI	62,345	--	--	--	67.1	67.1	67.1
		P+	62,345	--	--	--	33.0%	33.0%	33.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	324	51.7	56.4	62.3	53.2	1.5	-9.1
		P+	324	7.0%	12.0%	15.0%	8.0%	1.0%	-7.0%
	State	CPI	38,520	58.7	59.8	60.1	60.2	1.5	0.1
		P+	38,520	20.0%	20.0%	22.0%	22.0%	2.0%	0.0%
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	133	43.3	45.6	51	48.9	5.6	-2.1
		P+	133	3.0%	6.0%	10.0%	6.0%	3.0%	-4.0%
	State	CPI	17,516	51.4	54	54	53.9	2.5	-0.1
		P+	17,516	17.0%	19.0%	18.0%	18.0%	1.0%	0.0%
All students	District	CPI	1,536	68.4	70.4	74.2	70.9	2.5	-3.3
		P+	1,536	36.0%	38.0%	42.0%	38.0%	2.0%	-4.0%
	State	CPI	210,454	78.6	79	79.6	79.4	0.8	-0.2
		P+	210,454	54.0%	53.0%	55.0%	54.0%	0.0%	-1.0%

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

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

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High Needs	8.2%	6.4%	7.1%	8.3%	0.1	1.2%	1.2	16.9%	3.4%
Econ. Disad.	--	--	--	6.3%	--	--	--	--	3.3%
Students w/ disabilities	7.3%	6.7%	8.1%	12.2%	4.9	67.1%	4.1	50.6%	3.5%
ELL	9.1%	9.3%	8.5%	13.1%	4.0	44.0%	4.6	54.1%	5.7%
All students	5.8%	5.5%	5.1%	5.9%	0.1	1.7%	0.8	15.7%	1.9%

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

**Table B5: Haverhill Public Schools
Attendance Rates, 2012–2015**

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2012–2015		Change 2014–2015		State (2015)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
All students	93.3	93.5	93.6	93.3	0.0	0%	-0.3	3%	94.7

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 B6: Haverhill Public Schools
Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2012–2014

	FY12		FY13		FY14	
	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Expenditures						
From local appropriations for schools:						
By school committee	\$55,519,220	\$55,936,236	\$60,797,100	\$64,314,899	\$65,311,253	\$65,198,688
By municipality	\$34,774,668	\$36,047,428	\$34,679,599	\$37,208,193	\$34,626,814	\$35,859,336
Total from local appropriations	\$90,293,888	\$91,983,664	\$95,476,699	\$101,523,092	\$99,938,067	\$101,058,024
From revolving funds and grants	--	\$19,055,161	--	\$14,452,575	--	\$14,283,976
Total expenditures	--	\$111,038,825	--	\$115,975,667	--	\$115,342,000
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	\$35,966,744	--	\$40,527,259	--	\$44,126,723
Required local contribution	--	\$35,711,436	--	\$36,816,955	--	\$37,879,800
Required net school spending**	--	\$71,678,180	--	\$77,344,214	--	\$82,006,523
Actual net school spending	--	\$72,818,871	--	\$81,677,057	--	\$83,399,147
Over/under required (\$)	--	\$1,140,691	--	\$4,332,843	--	\$1,392,624
Over/under required (%)	--	1.6%	--	5.6%	--	1.7%

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

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

Sources: FY12, FY13, and FY14 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved 11/20/15

**Table B7: Haverhill Public Schools
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil
Fiscal Years 2012–2014**

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	\$357	\$350	\$362
Instructional leadership (district and school)	\$656	\$657	\$641
Teachers	\$4,219	\$4,680	\$4,617
Other teaching services	\$914	\$993	\$905
Professional development	\$192	\$166	\$115
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	\$288	\$223	\$201
Guidance, counseling and testing services	\$535	\$530	\$468
Pupil services	\$1,430	\$1,461	\$1,476
Operations and maintenance	\$752	\$749	\$734
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	\$2,471	\$2,744	\$2,734
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	\$11,815	\$12,551	\$12,254

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

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction						
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	ES	0%	13%	35%	50%	2.4
	MS	0%	17%	30%	52%	2.3
	HS	4%	17%	17%	63%	2.4
	Total #	1	11	19	39	2.4
	Total %	1%	16%	27%	56%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	ES	4%	26%	35%	35%	2.2
	MS	9%	22%	43%	26%	1.9
	HS	13%	17%	50%	21%	1.8
	Total #	6	15	30	19	1.9
	Total %	9%	21%	43%	27%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	ES	4%	26%	17%	52%	2.2
	MS	0%	22%	52%	26%	2.0
	HS	4%	33%	50%	13%	1.7
	Total #	2	19	28	21	2.0
	Total %	3%	27%	40%	30%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	ES	4%	30%	22%	43%	2.0
	MS	9%	17%	48%	26%	1.9
	HS	4%	21%	50%	25%	2.0
	Total #	4	16	28	22	2.0
	Total %	6%	23%	40%	31%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	ES					8.6
	MS					8.2
	HS					7.8
	Total					8.2

Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.	ES	0%	17%	35%	48%	2.3
	MS	0%	22%	52%	26%	2.0
	HS	8%	25%	29%	38%	2.0
	Total #	2	15	27	26	2.1
	Total %	3%	21%	39%	37%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	ES	4%	52%	22%	22%	1.6
	MS	0%	30%	43%	26%	2.0
	HS	13%	38%	29%	21%	1.6
	Total #	4	28	22	16	1.7
	Total %	6%	40%	31%	23%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	ES	0%	17%	48%	35%	2.2
	MS	4%	9%	52%	35%	2.2
	HS	4%	33%	42%	21%	1.8
	Total #	2	14	33	21	2.0
	Total %	3%	20%	47%	30%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	ES					6.1
	MS					6.2
	HS					5.3
	Total					5.9

Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.	ES	4%	48%	26%	22%	1.7
	MS	9%	48%	26%	17%	1.5
	HS	13%	50%	29%	8%	1.3
	Total #	6	34	19	11	1.5
	Total %	9%	49%	27%	16%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	ES	9%	26%	35%	30%	1.9
	MS	4%	43%	39%	13%	1.6
	HS	13%	38%	38%	13%	1.5
	Total #	6	25	26	13	1.7
	Total %	9%	36	37%	19%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	ES	0%	0%	22%	78%	2.8
	MS	0%	13%	26%	61%	2.5
	HS	4%	17%	29%	50%	2.3
	Total #	1	7	18	44	2.5
	Total %	1%	10%	26%	63%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	ES	0%	48%	17%	35%	1.9
	MS	0%	30%	35%	35%	2.0
	HS	8%	17%	54%	21%	1.9
	Total #	2	22	25	21	1.9
	Total %	3%	31%	36%	30%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	ES					8.2
	MS					7.7
	HS					7.0
	Total					7.6