District Review Report

Westfield 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

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
March 2016

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

The superintendent has transformed the district from a system of schools, operating highly independently, to a school system with centralized planning, common programs, and collaborative decision making**.** Westfield has developed a strong infrastructure for curriculum development and renewal, consisting of qualified staff with defined roles and relationships. The district's ELA and mathematics curricula are fully aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks and accessible to teachers**.** Most characteristics of high-quality instruction were prevalent in observed classes.

A balanced system of assessments and a well-developed planning and support infrastructure are in place to support the use of assessment data to plan and modify instruction and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. The district has implemented and is regularly using information gained from its educator evaluation system to support educator development. The district has a cohesive and coherent process for developing, implementing, and funding its professional development program. The district's Title I program and the ELL program at the Highland Elementary School leverage local and community resources in thoughtful and effective ways to meet students' needs. District and municipal leaders have worked collaboratively to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of payroll, personnel, technology, and purchasing through the consolidation and restructuring of functions.

Challenges and Areas of Growth

Curriculum development in certain disciplines such as science has been constrained by the loss of supervisory positions. In 2015, the district created lead-teacher positions in order to increase its capacity for curriculum development in certain disciplines at certain grade spans. The absence of district-directed teacher planning time has reduced the district's ability to create interdisciplinary units and align the curriculum vertically. Professional learning communities (PLCs) do not have a common purpose, format, and structure. Because PLCs are mostly scheduled after regular school hours, attendance is voluntary. Instructive commentary to promote professional growth was missing in most instances in administrators' and teachers' evaluations. Many administrators' and teachers' evaluations were not timely. Many of the district's students with disabilities have limited access to a standards-based curriculum taught in the least restrictive environment with appropriate supports.

Priorities identified in the district's strategic plan, the Strategy for Continuous Improvement, are not presented in the annual budget document to demonstrate how the budget is driven by and supports district priorities.

Recommendations

The district should

- continue to restore curriculum leadership positions, and provide teachers more directed time for curriculum renewal, alignment, and the development of curriculum units
- build on the current PLC structure and create additional planning time and a common protocol for PLC meetings
- revise evaluation practices so that administrators' and teachers' evaluations are timely and consistently include instructive commentary in order to promote professional growth and improve classroom instruction and student achievement
- promote and refine the ways it educates students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment
- show explicitly how the annual budget document is driven by and supports the priorities in the district's Strategy for Continuous Improvement

Westfield 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 Westfield Public Schools District was conducted from November 16-19, 2015. The site visit included 32 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 70 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups with three elementary-school teachers, two middle-school teachers, and three high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are in Appendix A, and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 70 classrooms in 11 schools. (The team did not make observations in the Fort Meadow Early Childhood Center.) 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

Westfield has a mayor-councilor form of government and the chair of the school committee is the mayor. The seven members of the school committee meet monthly and more frequently when necessary.

The current superintendent has been in the position since 2011. The district leadership team includes the superintendent, the director of curriculum and instruction, the administrator of special education and student support, the administrator of student interventions, the director of assessment and accountability, the director of technology and business services, and the director of human resources. Central office positions have been mostly stable in number, increasing slightly over the past five years. The district has 12 principals leading 12 schools. There are seven assistant principals. In 2014-2015, there were 438 teachers in the district.

In the 2015–2016 school year, 5,572 students were enrolled in the district's 12 schools:

Table 1: Westfield Public Schools
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment*, 2015–2016

School Name	School Type	Grades Served	Enrollment
Fort Meadow Early Childhood Center	EES	Pre-K	178
Abner Gibbs Elementary School	ES	K-5	214
Franklin Avenue Elementary School	ES	K-5	238
Highland Elementary School	ES	K-5	402
Russell Elementary School[1]	ES	K-5	201
Munger Hill Elementary School	ES	K-5	394
Paper Mill Elementary School	ES	K-5	450
Southampton Road Elementary School	ES	K-5	444
North Middle School	MS	6-8	677
South Middle School	MS	6-8	605
Westfield High School	HS	9-12	1,260
Westfield Technical Academy[2]	HS	9-12	509
Totals	**12 schools**	**PK-12**	**5,572**

*As of October 1, 2015

Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment decreased by 5.9 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 higher 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 total in-district per-pupil expenditures were $13,113 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.

[1] Juniper Park Elementary School was vacated in 2015-2016 when the district lease with Westfield State University was not renewed; it was succeeded in 2015-2016 by Russell Elementary School under a lease with the Town of Russell.
[2] Formerly Westfield Vocational Technical High School

Student Performance

District and Subgroup Results

Westfield is a Level 3 district because Franklin Avenue Elementary and South Middle School are in Level 3 for being among the lowest performing 20 percent of schools relative to other schools in their grade span. Munger Hill and Westfield High are in Level 3 for having a subgroup that is among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.

- Munger Hill is a focus school because its students with disabilities and high needs students are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.
- South Middle is a focus school because its students with disabilities are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups.
- Westfield High is a focus school because its students with disabilities are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups. It also has low MCAS participation (less than 95 percent) for economically disadvantaged students.

Table 2: Westfield 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: Fort Meadow ECC	All	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	High Needs	--	--	--	--	--		
ES: Franklin Ave	All	55	70	105	70	79	12	3
	High Needs	60	90	69	70	73		
ES: Gibbs	All	10	100	30	90	66	21	2
	High Needs	25	113	25	63	58		
ES: Paper Mill	All	40	50	75	75	67	28	2
	High Needs	35	50	55	65	56		
ES: Juniper Park	All	63	50	69	35	51	27	2
	High Needs	0	0	75	75	0		
ES: Highland	All	100	50	15	95	63	32	2
	High Needs	95	65	30	95	70		
ES: Munger Hill	All	60	50	10	100	59	42	3
	High Needs	31	31	6	94	49		
ES: Southampton Road	All	60	60	70	35	53	45	2
	High Needs	63	90	85	85	84		
MS: South Middle	All	85	25	40	90	62	15	3
	High Needs	90	25	50	90	65		
MS: North Middle	All	70	60	25	70	55	31	2
	High Needs	75	70	40	60	58		
HS: Westfield Vocational	All	107	96	89	89	93	22	1
	High Needs	104	104	89	89	94		
HS: Westfield High	All	82	82	79	57	71	25	3
	High Needs	82	79	75	75	76		
District	All	82	54	54	75	65	--	3
	High Needs	82	50	43	64	57		

Between 2012 and 2015, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA in the district did not improve for all students and high needs students, but did improve for ELL and former ELL students, and for students with disabilities.

Table 3: Westfield Public Schools
ELA Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2014
All students	District	67%	65%	65%	67%	0	-4
	State	69%	69%	69%	--	--	
High Needs	District	48%	48%	47%	48%	0	-3
	State	48%	49%	50%	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	54%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	41%	39%	42%	47%	6	6
	State	34%	34%	36%	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	22%	23%	21%	25%	3	-9
	State	31%	29%	30%	--	--	

Between 2012 and 2015, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in math improved for the district as a whole and for high needs students, ELL and former ELL students, and for students with disabilities.

Table 4: Westfield Public Schools
Math Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2014
All students	District	49%	54%	50%	56%	7	-10
	State	59%	61%	60%	--	--	
High Needs	District	32%	37%	33%	38%	6	-7
	State	37%	40%	40%	--	--	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	43%	--	--
	State	--	--	--	--	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	38%	39%	41%	50%	12	6
	State	32%	35%	35%	--	--	
Students with disabilities	District	11%	13%	11%	16%	5	-12
	State	21%	23%	23%	--	--	

Between 2012 and 2015, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science improved for high needs students, English language learners and former English language learners, and students with disabilities, but did not improve for the district as a whole.

Table 5: Westfield Public Schools
Science Proficiency by Subgroup 2012–2015

Group		2012	2013	2014	2015	4-Year Trend	Above/Below State 2015
All students	District	52%	46%	51%	52%	0	-2
	State	54%	53%	55%	54%	0	
High Needs	District	30%	26%	33%	34%	4	3
	State	31%	31.0%	33%	31%	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	District	--	--	--	39%	--	5
	State	--	--	--	34%	--	
ELL and former ELL students	District	18%	18%	23%	24%	6	5
	State	17%	19%	18%	19%	2	
Students with disabilities	District	13%	11%	16%	16%	3	-6
	State	20%	21%	21%	22%	2	

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. However, ELA and math CPIs did improve for all students, high needs students, ELL and former ELL students, and students with disabilities.

Table 6: Westfield Public Schools
2015 CPI and Targets by Subgroup

	ELA			Math			Science		
Group	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating	2015 CPI	2015 Target	Rating
All students	85.7	90.5	Improved Below Target	77.0	82.6	Improved Below Target	77.9	82.7	No Change
High Needs	76.4	83.1	Improved Below Target	65.3	74.2	Improved Below Target	65.8	73.2	No Change
Economically Disadvantaged[3]	79.4	--	--	68.6	--	--	68.5	--	--
ELLs	74.0	79.3	Improved Below Target	72.0	80.0	Improved Below Target	54.5	67.3	Declined
Students with disabilities	63.0	74.9	Improved Below Target	48.7	64.5	Improved Below Target	53.6	67.1	No Change

Students' growth in ELA and math was moderate compared to their academic peers statewide for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population.

[3] 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 and will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

Table 7: Westfield 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	47.0	50.0	Moderate	51.0	50.0	Moderate
High Needs	45.0	47.0	Moderate	48.0	46.0	Moderate
Econ. Disadv.	45.0	46.0	Moderate	46.0	46.0	Moderate
ELLs	45.0	54.0	Moderate	44.0	50.0	Moderate
SWD	45.0	43.0	Moderate	47.0	43.0	Moderate

Westfield's 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 except for English language learners whose out-of-school suspension rate was equal to the state rate.

Table 8: Westfield Public Schools
Out-of-School and In-School Suspensions by Subgroup 2013–2015

Group	Type of Suspension	2013	2014	2015	State 2015
High Needs	OSS	8.2%	5.9%	7.0%	4.8%
	ISS	4.6%	4.9%	2.8%	2.7%
Economically disadvantaged*	OSS	8.5%	6.1%	7.7%	5.4%
	ISS	4.7%	5.1%	3.2%	2.9%
Students with disabilities	OSS	10.5%	7.9%	7.5%	6.1%
	ISS	6.0%	6.2%	3.5%	3.4%
ELLs	OSS	6.2%	4.6%	3.8%	3.8%
	ISS	1.9%	3.5%	2.3%	1.8%
All Students	OSS	6.3%	4.2%	4.8%	2.9%
	ISS	3.7%	3.5%	2.0%	1.8%

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

Westfield reached the four-year cohort graduation target for all students but not for high needs students and students with disabilities.[4]

Table 9: Westfield 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	242	75.0%	76.5%	71.9%	74.8%	-0.2	-0.3%	2.9	4.0%	76.5%
Low income	201	72.6%	76.5%	70.3%	74.6%	2.0	2.8%	4.3	6.1%	75.5%
SWD	92	69.2%	64.8%	61.7%	59.8%	-9.4	-13.6%	-1.9	-3.1%	69.1%
ELLs	15	66.7%	94.7%	85.7%	73.3%	6.6	9.9%	-12.4	-14.5%	63.9%
All students	533	83.8%	84.3%	82.9%	85.9%	2.1	2.5%	3.0	3.6%	86.1%

Between 2010 and 2013, Westfield's five-year cohort graduation rate improved for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population, but in 2013 the rate remained below the state rate for each group except English language learners whose five-year cohort graduation rate was 18.4 percentage points higher than the state rate.

Table 10: Westfield 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	253	69.1%	79.7%	80.6%	75.1%	6.0	8.7%	-5.5	-6.8%	79.2%
Low income	202	68.3%	77.4%	80.3%	73.8%	5.5	8.1%	-6.5	-8.1%	78.3%
SWD	120	61.9%	74.0%	71.4%	65.0%	3.1	5.0%	-6.4	-9.0%	72.9%
ELLs	28	64.3%	77.8%	94.7%	89.3%	25.0	38.9%	-5.4	-5.7%	70.9%
All students	504	82.7%	86.2%	86.6%	84.7%	2.0	2.4%	-1.9	-2.2%	87.7%

Westfield's drop-out rate in 2014 was lower than the state rate for all students and for high needs students, low-income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

[4] The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2015 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure and the number of English language learners is below the number required for accountability reporting.

Table 11: Westfield Public Schools
Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2011–2014

	2011	2012	2013	2014	State 2014
High Needs	3.9%	3.5%	3.7%	2.4%	3.4%
Low income	3.7%	3.9%	4.1%	2.7%	3.6%
SWD	5.5%	4.5%	3.9%	2.4%	3.4%
ELLs	2.0%	1.9%	5.1%	3.3%	6.2%
All students	2.3%	2.0%	2.2%	1.2%	2.0%

Grade and School Results

In 2015 ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate in each tested grade by 1 to 8 percentage points, except for the 3rd grade which was 1 point above the state rate.

- ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate by 8 percentage points in the 8th grade, by 7 percentage points in the 5th and 7th grades, by 4 percentage points in the 4th and 8th grades, and by 1 percentage point in the 10th grade.
    - Between 2012 and 2015 ELA proficiency rates decreased by 6 percentage points in the 7th grade and by 4 percentage points in the 8th grade, and did not improve in the 3rd and 6th grades.

- Between 2012 and 2015, ELA proficiency increased 3 percentage points in the 4th and 5th grades and 2 percentage points in the 10th grade.

Table 12: Westfield Public Schools
ELA Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012–2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	421	61.0%	50.0%	55.0%	61.0%	60.0%	0.0%	6.0%
4	394	46.0%	45.0%	50.0%	49.0%	53.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
5	410	61.0%	61.0%	60.0%	64.0%	71.0%	3.0%	4.0%
6	423	63.0%	62.0%	51.0%	63.0%	71.0%	0.0%	12.0%
7	448	69.0%	72.0%	66.0%	63.0%	70.0%	-6.0%	-3.0%
8	410	80.0%	75.0%	79.0%	76.0%	80.0%	-4.0%	-3.0%
10	411	88.0%	89.0%	92.0%	90.0%	91.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
All	2,917	67.0%	65.0%	65.0%	66.0%	--	-1.0%	1.0%

ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 3rd grade in 3 of the 7 elementary schools, in the 4th grade in 4 of the 7 elementary schools, and in the 5th grade in 6 of the 7 elementary schools. ELA proficiency rates were below the state rate in each grade at South Middle School and in the 6th and 7th grades in North Middle School. ELA proficiency in the 10th grade was 85 percent at Westfield Vocational and 93 percent at Westfield High compared with the state rate of 93 percent.

Table 13: Westfield Public Schools
ELA Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	78%	43%	48%	--	--	--	--	56%
ES: Gibbs	63%	41%	68%	--	--	--	--	57%
ES: Paper Mill	54%	56%	61%	--	--	--	--	57%
ES: Juniper	56%	45%	55%	--	--	--	--	52%
ES: Highland	70%	46%	64%	--	--	--	--	60%
ES: Munger Hill	56%	54%	80%	--	--	--	--	63%
ES: Southampton Road	62%	58%	70%	--	--	--	--	63%
MS: South Middle	--	--	--	61%	65%	71%	--	66%
MS: North Middle	--	--	--	68%	63%	84%	--	71%
HS: Westfield Vocational	--	--	--	--	--	--	85%	85%
HS: Westfield High	--	--	--	--	--	--	93%	93%
District Total	61%	49%	64%	63%	63%	76%	90%	66%
State	60%	53%	71%	71%	70%	80%	91%	--

Between 2012 and 2015, ELA proficiency rates improved by 17 and 10 percentage points at Franklin Avenue and Gibbs and by 1 to 7 percentage points at Paper Mill, Munger Hill, South Middle, Westfield Vocational, and Westfield High. ELA proficiency rates declined by 15 percentage points at Juniper Park and by 2 to 5 percentage points at Highland, Southampton Road, and North Middle.

- ELA proficiency rates for high needs students improved in 7 of the district's 11 schools with reportable data.
- ELA proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved in 8 of the district's 11 schools with reportable data.

Table 14: Westfield Public Schools
ELA Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
EES: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	39%	29%	54%	56%	17
High Needs	32%	24%	43%	47%	15
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	48%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	15%	5%	6%	22%	7
ES: Gibbs	47%	55%	59%	57%	10
High Needs	35%	51%	54%	49%	14
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	48%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	23%	35%	42%	7%	-16
ES: Paper Mill	50%	42%	48%	57%	7
High Needs	28%	24%	27%	39%	11
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	45%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	6%	5%	11%	15%	9
ES: Juniper Park	66%	57%	59%	51%	-15
High Needs	26%	28%	33%	24%	-2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	22%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	14%	13%	17%	17%	3
ES: Highland	64%	56%	52%	60%	-4
High Needs	49%	46%	42%	54%	5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	57%	--
ELL and former ELL	39%	45%	46%	56%	17
Students with disabilities	20%	14%	10%	19%	-1
ES: Munger Hill	61%	64%	56%	63%	2
High Needs	28%	30%	13%	30%	2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	41%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	18%	21%	5%	16%	-2
ES: Southampton	65%	62%	65%	63%	-2
High Needs	47%	47%	52%	43%	-4
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	48%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	9%	12%	11%	21%	12
MS: South Middle	65%	64%	61%	66%	1
High Needs	50%	49%	46%	52%	2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	55%	--
ELL and former ELL	32%	28%	30%	42%	10
Students with disabilities	14%	18%	20%	27%	13
MS: North Middle	76%	77%	71%	71%	-5
High Needs	54%	58%	48%	47%	-7
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	58%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	45%	37%	--
Students with disabilities	28%	29%	23%	21%	-7

HS: Westfield Vocational	81%	84%	90%	85%	4
High Needs	73%	81%	82%	78%	5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	83%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	45%	67%	55%	61%	16
HS: Westfield High	92%	92%	93%	93%	1
High Needs	78%	77%	85%	78%	0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	85%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	52%	57%	58%	57%	5

Between 2012 and 2015, math proficiency rates improved in each tested grade except for the 8th grade. In 2015, math proficiency rates remained below the state rate by 6 to 14 percentage points in the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 10th grades.

- Math proficiency rates improved by 15 and 14 percentage points in the 3rd and 4th grades, by 12 and 9 percentage points in the 5th and 6th grades, respectively, and by 3 and 2 percentage points in the 7th and 10th grades, respectively.

- Math proficiency rates were below the state rate by 14 and 13 percentage points in the 8th and 7th grades, respectively, by 9 percentage points in the 6th grade, and by 6 and 7 percentage points in the 5th and 10th grades, respectively.

Table 15: Westfield Public Schools
Math Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
3	421	56.0%	67.0%	65.0%	71.0%	70.0%	15.0%	6.0%
4	393	37.0%	51.0%	49.0%	51.0%	47.0%	14.0%	2.0%
5	412	49.0%	55.0%	59.0%	61.0%	67.0%	12.0%	2.0%
6	425	44.0%	43.0%	38.0%	53.0%	62.0%	9.0%	15.0%
7	452	35.0%	39.0%	34.0%	38.0%	51.0%	3.0%	4.0%
8	409	47.0%	42.0%	40.0%	46.0%	60.0%	-1.0%	6.0%
10	409	70.0%	74.0%	74.0%	72.0%	79.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
All	2921	49.0%	53.0%	51.0%	56.0%	--	7.0%	5.0%

Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in the 3rd grade in 3 of the 7 elementary schools and in the 5th grade in 4 of the 7 elementary schools. Math proficiency rates were equal to or above the state rate in the 4th grade in all 7 elementary schools. Math proficiency rates were below the state rate in each grade at the South and North Middle Schools. Math proficiency in the 10th grade was 66 percent at Westfield Vocational and 75 percent at Westfield High, compared with the state rate of 79 percent.

Table 16: Westfield Public Schools
Math Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2014-2015

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	72%	47%	41%	--	--	--	--	53%
ES: Gibbs	77%	54%	68%	--	--	--	--	65%
ES: Paper Mill	65%	51%	62%	--	--	--	--	60%

ES: Juniper	67%	49%	70%	--	--	--	--	62%
ES: Highland	78%	56%	58%	--	--	--	--	64%
ES: Munger Hill	63%	48%	73%	--	--	--	--	61%
ES: Southampton Road	82%	58%	62%	--	--	--	--	68%
MS: South Middle	--	--	--	56%	37%	41%	--	45%
MS: North Middle	--	--	--	53%	42%	55%	--	50%
HS: Westfield Vocational	--	--	--	--	--	--	66%	66%
HS: Westfield High	--	--	--	--	--	--	75%	75%
District Total	71%	51%	61%	53%	38%	46%	72%	56%
State	70%	47%	67%	62%	51%	60%	79%	--

Between 2012 and 2015, math proficiency rates improved in each of the district's schools as a whole, except for North Middle and Westfield High. And 6 of the district's 11 schools with reportable data had improvements of 10 percentage points or more.

- Math proficiency rates for high needs students improved in 8 of 11 schools with reportable data.
- Math proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved in 9 of 11 schools with reportable data.

Table 17: Westfield Public Schools
Math Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012-2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
EES: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	30%	37%	50%	53%	23
High Needs	23%	34%	38%	47%	24
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	49%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	8%	5%	0%	18%	10
ES: Gibbs	37%	57%	54%	65%	28
High Needs	26%	55%	47%	54%	28
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	54%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	15%	24%	33%	27%	12
ES: Paper Mill	46%	56%	56%	60%	14
High Needs	21%	36%	32%	38%	17
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	43%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	6%	13%	8%	13%	7
ES: Juniper Park	57%	58%	59%	62%	5
High Needs	26%	25%	36%	43%	17
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	42%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	28%	12%	20%	36%	8
ES: Highland	53%	60%	54%	64%	11
High Needs	41%	53%	48%	61%	20
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	62%	--
ELL and former ELL	54%	60%	66%	74%	20
Students with disabilities	16%	27%	12%	19%	3

ES: Munger Hill	51%	68%	60%	61%	10
High Needs	25%	22%	17%	21%	-4
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	30%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	13%	12%	13%	7%	-6
ES: Southampton	59%	64%	72%	68%	9
High Needs	41%	51%	56%	45%	4
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	53%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	17%	20%	34%	18%	1
MS: South Middle	34%	35%	31%	44%	10
High Needs	24%	24%	21%	29%	5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	32%	--
ELL and former ELL	15%	12%	12%	32%	17
Students with disabilities	4%	6%	6%	9%	5
MS: North Middle	50%	47%	44%	50%	0
High Needs	31%	25%	23%	28%	-3
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	36%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	27%	25%	--
Students with disabilities	9%	6%	7%	9%	0
HS: Westfield Vocational	62%	66%	67%	65%	3
High Needs	54%	59%	54%	63%	9
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	66%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	23%	39%	24%	46%	23
HS: Westfield High	76%	78%	78%	75%	-1
High Needs	50%	54%	55%	47%	-3
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	52%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	20%	--
Students with disabilities	19%	22%	19%	21%	2

Science proficiency rates were below the state rate in the district as a whole and in each tested grade except for the 5th grade.

- 5th grade science proficiency rates decreased 6 percentage points, from 58 percent in 2012 to 52 percent in 2015, 1 percentage point above the state rate of 51 percent.

- 8th grade science proficiency rates were 39 percent in 2012 and 40 percent in 2015, 2 percentage points below the state rate of 42 percent.

- 10th grade science proficiency rates increased 6 percentage points, from 58 percent in 2012 to 64 percent in 2015, 8 percentage points below the state rate of 72 percent.

Table 18: Westfield Public Schools
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2012-2015

Grade	Number	2012	2013	2014	2015	State	4-Year Trend	2-Year Trend
5	411	58.0%	44.0%	49.0%	52.0%	51.0%	-6.0%	3.0%
8	407	39.0%	33.0%	36.0%	40.0%	42.0%	1.0%	4.0%
10	383	58.0%	59.0%	69.0%	64.0%	72.0%	6.0%	-5.0%
All	1201	52.0%	46.0%	50.0%	52.0%	54.0%	0.0%	2.0%

In 2015, science proficiency rates in the 5th grade ranged from 29 percent at Franklin Avenue to 73 percent at Munger Hill and were above the state rate of 51 percent at Paper Mill, Munger Hill, and Southampton Road. Science proficiency in the 8th grade was 39 percent at South Middle and 43 percent at North Middle, compared with the state rate of 42 percent. Science proficiency in the 10th grade was 58 percent at Westfield Vocational and 67 percent at Westfield High, below the state rate of 72 percent.

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

School	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	Total
ESS: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	--	--	29%	--	--	--	--	29%
ES: Gibbs	--	--	38%	--	--	--	--	38%
ES: Paper Mill	--	--	59%	--	--	--	--	59%
ES: Juniper	--	--	50%	--	--	--	--	50%
ES: Highland	--	--	44%	--	--	--	--	44%
ES: Munger Hill	--	--	73%	--	--	--	--	73%
ES: Southampton Road	--	--	62%	--	--	--	--	62%
MS: South Middle	--	--	--	--	--	39%	--	39%
MS: North Middle	--	--	--	--	--	43%	--	43%
HS: Westfield Vocational	--	--	--	--	--	--	58%	58%
HS: Westfield High	--	--	--	--	--	--	67%	67%
District Total	--	--	52%	--	--	40%	64%	52%
State	--	--	51%	--	--	42%	72%	54%

Between 2012 and 2015 science proficiency rates improved by 14 percentage points at Westfield Vocational and by 5 percentage points at South Middle, and decreased by 20 percentage points at Highland Elementary and by 9 percentage points at Southampton Road Elementary.

- Science proficiency rates for high needs students improved by 21 percentage points at Gibbs, by 22 percentage points at Westfield Vocational, and by 11 percentage points at Westfield High. Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined by 11 percentage points at Munger Hill.
- Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities improved by 21 and 7 percentage points at Westfield Vocational and Westfield High, respectively, and declined by 13 percentage points at Paper Mill and by 20 and 18 percentage points at Highland and Munger Hill, respectively.

Table 20: Westfield Public Schools
Science Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2012–2015

	2012	2013	2014	2015	3- or 4-Year Trend
EES: Fort Meadow ECC	--	--	--	--	--
ES: Franklin Ave	29%	21%	52%	29%	0
High Needs	25%	17%	41%	23%	-2
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	23%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	7%	0%	--	--	--

ES: Gibbs	39%	24%	42%	38%	-1
High Needs	14%	17%	39%	35%	21
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	38%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	0%	--	--	--
ES: Paper Mill	58%	31%	40%	59%	1
High Needs	33%	18%	25%	38%	5
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	46%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	21%	15%	7%	8%	-13
ES: Juniper Park	--	--	52%	50%	--
High Needs	--	--	26%	23%	--
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	20%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	20%	--	--
ES: Highland	64%	50%	40%	44%	-20
High Needs	37%	37%	28%	36%	-1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	35%	--
ELL and former ELL	19%	33%	34%	37%	18
Students with disabilities	31%	32%	7%	11%	-20
ES: Munger Hill	71%	64%	55%	74%	3
High Needs	51%	30%	15%	40%	-11
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	60%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	39%	19%	12%	21%	-18
ES: Southampton Road	70%	57%	63%	61%	-9
High Needs	42%	35%	46%	41%	-1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	46%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	--	--	--	31%	--
MS: South Middle	35%	27%	31%	40%	5
High Needs	26%	18%	16%	25%	-1
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	28%	--
ELL and former ELL	8%	8%	11%	7%	-1
Students with disabilities	6%	3%	3%	8%	2
MS: North Middle	42%	38%	40%	42%	0
High Needs	24%	21%	21%	24%	0
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	32%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	3%	11%	15%	9%	6
HS: Westfield Vocational	45%	45%	63%	59%	14
High Needs	32%	36%	55%	54%	22
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	67%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	10%	23%	38%	31%	21
HS: Westfield High	65%	67%	71%	67%	2
High Needs	35%	32%	54%	46%	11
Economically disadvantaged	--	--	--	49%	--
ELL and former ELL	--	--	--	--	--
Students with disabilities	15%	6%	22%	22%	7

Leadership and Governance

Contextual Background

Westfield is a small residential and industrial city located in the center of western Massachusetts at the foot of the Berkshire Mountains. Education, healthcare, and social services are the largest employers followed closely by light manufacturing. It is also home to Westfield State University. The University has a number of partnerships with the district, and provides professional development opportunities for district educators.

The Westfield school district consists of 11 schools and an early childhood center for preschool children. There are 7 elementary schools (K-5); 2 middle schools (grades 6-8); and 2 high schools (grades 9 through 12). Five elementary schools, one middle school, and the vocational-technical high school are classified as Title I schools. The October 2015 enrollment was 5,572 students. Between 2012 and 2016 enrollment declined by approximately 5.9 percent.

Based on 2015 results, the district is a Level 3 district because Franklin Avenue Elementary and South Middle School are among the lowest performing 20 percent of schools, relative to other schools in their grade span. Munger Hill Elementary is Level 3 because its students with disabilities and high needs are among the lowest performing 20 percent of subgroups, and Westfield High School is Level 3 because its students with disabilities are among the lowest 20 percent of subgroups. Westfield Technical Academy advanced from Level 3 in 2014 to Level 1 in 2015.

The City recently lost its lease with Westfield State University for the Juniper Park Elementary School and relocated the students to the Russell Elementary School under a lease with the Town of Russell. The City had planned to build a 36 million dollar elementary school at Ashley and Cross Streets before the lease with Westfield State University expired, but neighborhood opposition and legal action has delayed construction. The superintendent reported that the City intends to move forward by seeking construction bids during the winter and plans to commence construction of the school “once the legal roadblocks have been resolved.”

The district has several aging facilities that are well maintained, but require attention. Abner Gibbs Elementary School is 102 years old and was last renovated 55 years ago; Southampton Road Elementary School and Highland Elementary are 60 years old and were last renovated 27 years ago; and Westfield Technical Academy is 81 years old and was last renovated 21 years ago.

The district’s transportation contract expires in 2016 and an ad-hoc subcommittee of the school committee is considering reducing transportation costs by assessing a user fee and by making route changes that may affect the opening and closing times of the schools. The subcommittee intends to survey parents about possible changes and make a recommendation to the full school committee.

The 2010 Westfield District Review of District Systems and Practices Addressing the Differentiated Needs of English Language Learners stated that “decentralized functions and systems had created

fragmentation and inconsistency in the district as it sought solutions to stagnant student achievement."[5] The current superintendent, who entered the district in 2011, has unified the district with a district strategic plan and correlated school strategic plans, a common curriculum, common assessments, common programs, and systematic and standard administrator and teacher evaluation practices. The superintendent announced in October 2015 that she would retire in July 2016. The superintendent reported that the school committee is conducting the search for a new superintendent.

Strength Finding

1. **The superintendent has transformed the district from a system of schools, operating highly independently, to a school system with centralized planning, common programs, and collaborative decision making.**

   A. The superintendent has created systems for centralized planning and goal setting.

   1. Interviews and a review of documents indicated that the district was largely decentralized before the term of the current superintendent. The separate schools were not closely associated and principals had a great deal of autonomy. The current superintendent has worked collaboratively with central office administrators and principals to develop a more coherent approach embodied in the district's strategic plan, known as the Strategy for Continuous Improvement.

   2. Principals told the review team that they developed school and professional goals aligned with the district goals set forth in the Strategy for Continuous Improvement.

      a. For example, one of the district strategic goals was to broaden the use of project-based learning. Correspondingly, the Russell Elementary School had a school goal to implement project-based learning across the grades, resulting in a culminating activity in the second and third terms, and one of the Russell principal's goals was to improve math skills and support instruction in grade 3 through project-based learning.

      b. Another district goal was to use data to differentiate instruction. Correspondingly, the North Middle School had a goal to hold data meetings with teachers to review benchmark data and "create plans to move forward." Also one of the North Middle School principal's professional goals was to increase the percentage of grade 6 students achieving proficiency on the MCAS tests through data analysis to inform instruction.

   3. The superintendent's professional goals were also aligned with the goals in the Strategy for Continuous Improvement.

      a. The superintendent submitted her professional goals to the school committee on November 2, 2015, in open session.

[5] See 2010 Westfield District Review Report, p. 16.

b. The superintendent's goals included building ability within the administrative team to analyze data to better tell the story of student successes at each school and in the district; and developing strategies to improve school climate in ways that benefit students, staff, and families.

c. At the same meeting, the superintendent noted that she would be working to help principals in their roles as instructional leaders with the expectation that all administrators would increase the number of daily classroom walkthroughs. All these were consistent with the goals set forth in the Strategy for Continuous Improvement.

4. Principals have begun to use ESE's Conditions for School Effectiveness standards and indicators to rate their schools and to discuss these ratings collaboratively in meetings with central office administrators.

a. The focus areas include effective school leadership; curriculum alignment; effective instruction; student assessment; principal's staffing authority; professional development and structures for collaboration; tiered instruction and adequate learning time; student social/emotional/health needs; family-school engagement; and strategic use of resources and adequate budget authority.

b. Before September 21, 2015, each principal completed an analysis of accomplishments related to the categories identified in each standard and submitted the document to the central office. Each category was rated on a four-point scale (sustaining; providing; developing; little evidence).

c. A review of each principal's analysis showed that progress on each standard and initiative varied by school. Most reports indicated that schools were achieving at the "providing" or "developing" levels. A few initiatives were rated as "little evidence." Similarly, a few initiatives received a rating of "sustaining."

B. The superintendent has instituted common programs and practices.

1. Principals described how the district had moved from a school centered to a cohesive districtwide approach.

a. The superintendent expanded the Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI), which had originated in one elementary school, to all the elementary schools and adopted common literacy programs in kindergarten through grade 5 and in grades 6 through 8. Similarly, the superintendent adopted common mathematics programs in kindergarten through grade 5 and in grades 6 through 8.

b. As described in detail in the Curriculum, Assessment, and Student Support sections of this report, the superintendent has instituted coordination of K-12 curriculum and assessment and has extended the scope of Title I services.

C. The superintendent has established collaborative decision-making.

1. Principals stated that they were given full authority for the daily operations of their schools. Their responsibilities included being instructional leaders. They told the review team that since her arrival in 2011 the superintendent had increased collaboration, support, and transparency in the district.

2. Principals also said that that they worked collaboratively to support initiatives needed at various schools, including horizontal, grade-level collaboration, information sharing, and ensuring that more funds from Title I and special education grants were allocated to the Level 3 schools.

3. The superintendent holds monthly meetings with the central office administrative team, elementary principals, central office administrators and principals, and new administrators. More than 108 meetings have been scheduled for the 2015-2016 school year.

    a. The superintendent reported and a review of documents confirmed that there is an agenda for each meeting and that the minutes are disseminated to all administrators.

Impact: By moving from a group of schools with administrators overseeing site-based programs to a cohesive system, the district is now more focused on and able to provide a higher-quality, consistent instructional program for all students.

Curriculum and Instruction

Contextual Background

The superintendent has formed an instructional division consisting of the administrator of student interventions, the director of curriculum and instruction, and the director of assessment and accountability. These central office leaders coordinate curriculum alignment and mapping and initiatives to improve instruction, assisted by a well-organized staff of supervisors, school administrators, lead teachers, and coaches. The quality of instruction was generally high in classes observed by the review team, but the review team did not observe many examples of differentiated instruction.

Overall student achievement in mathematics has been persistently low in the district in comparison with statewide results on the MCAS tests. The district conducted an analysis which attributed this difference to the varied content knowledge of elementary teachers, limited instructional repertoires of secondary mathematics teachers, and use of mathematics programs in the past that were not aligned to the 2011 frameworks. The district has acted to improve instruction and learning by providing content-based professional development for elementary teachers; using coaches to provide elementary and middle-school teachers with embedded professional development, including modeling; and adopting mathematics series based on the frameworks and supplementing them with other resources.

The district has strong central and school-based curriculum leadership and fully developed curricula in ELA and mathematics. The district has lost leaders in science, social studies, and other disciplines because of reductions in the budget. In 2015, the district created lead-teacher positions in order to increase its capacity for curriculum development in certain disciplines at certain grade spans.

Strength Findings

Curriculum

1. **Westfield has developed a strong infrastructure for curriculum development and renewal, consisting of qualified staff with defined roles and relationships. The district's ELA and mathematics curricula are fully aligned to the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks and accessible to teachers.**

   A. Central office administrators told the review team that the director of curriculum and instruction has primary responsibility for curriculum development and renewal in collaboration with the administrator of student interventions and the director of assessment and accountability. The individuals in these roles have worked closely under the direction of the superintendent since 2012 and constitute the instructional division of the central office.

      1. Principals and teachers identified the director of curriculum and instruction as the district's curriculum leader.

2. Central office administrators said that curriculum development was centrally directed to ensure consistency and continuity.

    a. Principals told the review team that they conduct learning walks and formal evaluations to ensure that teachers are implementing the documented curriculum with fidelity.

B. The district's literacy liaison and literacy supervisor lead the development and renewal of the ELA curriculum.

1. Central office administrators and principals told the review team that the superintendent adopted the Bay State Reading Institute (BSRI) model at the elementary level in 2012 in order to ensure a common approach.

    a. One of the elementary schools had used the BSRI model successfully since 2006; however, the other schools were using a variety of other approaches.

    b. The BSRI model provides researched-based pedagogy, ongoing coaching and support for teachers, frequent data analysis, and differentiated instruction for students.

    c. Administrators said that the district's literacy liaison coordinates with BSRI and supervises the district's five elementary literacy coaches.

2. At the middle-school level, the district's literacy supervisor directs the district's two middle-school level literacy coaches and chairs the district's literacy team consisting of grade-level representatives.

3. Administrators told the team that the district's literacy liaison and literacy supervisor work closely with teachers to develop and revise the ELA curriculum on early release and professional development days.

C. The K- 12 math supervisor is the district's mathematics curriculum leader.

1. The K-12 math supervisor directs the district's five mathematics coaches, four at the elementary level and one at the middle-school level, and chairs the math leadership team. Principals coordinated the implementation of Envisions Math at the elementary level, increased the instructional time for mathematics at the elementary- and middle-school levels, and made changes in the sequencing and content of middle-school mathematics in grades 6 and 7 and of the high school algebra and geometry programs.

2. The math supervisor also coordinates the development of the K-8 mathematics curriculum and collaborates with the mathematics department heads at Westfield High School and Westfield Technical Academy to align the mathematics curriculum vertically.

D. Administrators told the review team that the K-8 literacy and math coaches help teachers implement the curriculum in their classrooms. In addition, they attend grade-level meetings K-8 to align the ELA and mathematics curricula horizontally.

E. Interviews and a document review indicated that Westfield's curriculum documents in ELA and mathematics were developed systematically and have multiple components.

1. Teachers and administrators told the review team that the curriculum was documented using a backward design consisting of the following components: establishing standards (what students should know and be able to do); developing formative, benchmark and summative assessments to provide evidence of mastery of the standards and learning and learner needs; and developing instructional strategies and supplemental resources to ensure that all learners can achieve mastery of the standards.

2. The ELA and mathematics curricula consist of a scope and sequence and a curriculum map for each grade level or course. The maps reviewed by the team contained content standards, resources and materials, and assessments.

3. The district has also begun to develop two-to six-week curriculum units. The team reviewed a number of these units which were arranged chronologically.

F. The K-5 curriculum documents are available to teachers on the district's website and the grades 6 through 12 curriculum documents are available to teachers on Google docs.

Impact: A documented curriculum ensures that all Westfield students are receiving standards-based instruction in ELA and mathematics. A fully elaborated curriculum is fundamental to improving proficiency in ELA and mathematics, closing the proficiency gap, and interpreting the results of student and programmatic assessments.

Instruction

2. Most characteristics of high-quality instruction were prevalent in observed classes.

The team observed 70 classes throughout the district: 16 at the 2 high schools, 14 at the 2 middle schools, and 40 at the 7 elementary schools. The team observed 31 ELA classes, 23 mathematics classes, and 16 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were 3 special education classes, 2 ELL classes, and 3 career/technical education 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. The review team found evidence of instructional rigor and alignment to the standards in observed classes.

1. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers providing and referring to a clear learning objective in the lesson (#2) in 50 of the 70 classes, or 71 percent overall.

    a. Although administrators and teachers said that the district did not require teachers to post objectives, in observed classes teachers usually made a verbal references to the

purpose of the learning and some asked students whether this purpose had been accomplished.

2. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers implementing a lesson that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning standards (#3) in 52 of the 70 observed classes, or 74 percent overall.

    a. Examples of practices and activities that reflected high expectations included:

    - encouraging students to discuss their reasoning and strategies
    - limiting teacher explanations and making the students do the thinking
    - discussing the meaning of the facts
    - considering the various viewpoints expressed by students
    - providing extension tasks for students who finished assigned work early

3. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers using appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective (#4) in 58 of 70 observed classes, or 83 percent overall.

B. The review team found evidence of student engagement and critical thinking in observed classes.

1. There was moderate to strong evidence that students were motivated and engaged in the lesson (#5) in 59 of the 70 classes, or 85 percent overall.

    a. Examples of practices and activities promoting student motivation and engagement included:

    - asking open-ended questions and calling on many students to broaden involvement
    - having students turn-and-talk and debrief
    - having students work with partners

2. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers facilitating tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking (#6) in 47 of 70 classes or 67 percent overall.

    a. Examples of practices and activities reflecting critical thinking included:

    - drawing conclusions and substantiating them with evidence from the text
    - explaining the mathematical reasoning used to solve a problem

- predicting the outcome of a story
- guessing what a story might be about from the cover illustration

3. There was moderate to strong evidence of students assuming responsibility for their own work (#7) in 62 of the 70 classes or 89 percent overall.

    a. Students at all levels were observed to be actively participating in whole-group instruction and working productively with each other in small groups or independently.

C. The review team found evidence of a positive classroom culture in observed classes.

1. There was moderate to strong evidence that the classroom climate was characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone and (#10) in 64 of the 70 classes, or 91 percent overall.

D. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers using appropriate resources aligned to students diverse learning needs (#9) in 45 of the 70 classes, or 65 percent overall.

E. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers conducting appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and providing feedback to students (#11)) in 41 of the 70 classes, or 58 percent overall.

a. Teachers who checked for understanding used a variety of methods including:

- asking students to position their thumbs up if they understood a concept; down if they did not; and sideways if they were uncertain
- circulating to monitor students' independent or small- group work and providing direct, in-the-moment assistance
- asking students to repeat given directions in their own words

Impact: Westfield has established a positive learning environment. In observed classrooms many characteristics of high-quality instruction were prevalent, positioning the district to move forward in closing the proficiency gap.

Challenge Findings and Areas for Growth

3. Curriculum development in certain disciplines such as science has been constrained by the loss of supervisory positions. The absence of district-directed teacher planning time has reduced the district's ability to create interdisciplinary units and align the curriculum vertically.

A. Central office administrators told the review team that budget reductions had resulted in the loss of supervisory positions in science, social studies, music, and physical education. They added that the loss of leadership positions had interrupted the cycle of curriculum development and revision in these disciplines.

1. In 2014-2015, the district created lead-teacher positions in

   - science and social studies at the middle-school level;
   - music and physical education for K-5 and for grades 6 through 12; and
   - art, tech, math, ELA, science, and social studies at Westfield Technical Academy.

2. Administrators told the review team that the lead teachers receive a stipend for work performed outside the school day. One lead teacher said that lead teachers shared a passion for their subjects, but did not replace the former supervisors who were full time in their roles.

3. Principals and teachers said that the middle-school teachers would be meeting in 2015-2016 to unpack the new science standards during common planning time.

   a. They expressed concern about the reduction of instructional time in science at the elementary- and middle-school levels resulting from the decisions to increase instructional time in both ELA and mathematics. They said that integrating mathematics into scientific content might restore some of this instructional time.

4. Administrators and teachers told the review team that the elementary science curriculum required updating, but there was no science leader at the elementary level to coordinate the work.

B. Central office administrators and principals told the review team that the development of interdisciplinary units and vertical alignment of the curriculum were constrained by limited district-directed teacher planning time.

1. Elementary teachers' personal planning periods were scheduled at the same time at each grade level. Although they were not required to do so, most elementary teachers used their personal planning time to meet with their grade-level colleagues, but this time was not typically used for curriculum work.

2. Central office administrators said that interdisciplinary planning and vertical articulation of the curriculum took place on certain professional development and early release days, but these days were often devoted to other purposes. The district occasionally engaged substitutes to allow teachers to work together, but this removed teachers from their classrooms.

C. Through collective bargaining the teachers' association and school committee agreed to a second after-school meeting (in addition to the monthly faculty meeting, known as the PLC meeting); however, teachers determined the purpose of this meeting and attendance was voluntary. Interviewees told the review team that these meetings were cancelled if many teachers notified an administrator in advance that they were unable to attend.

Impact: It is difficult to ensure that all Westfield students are receiving standards-based instruction in science because the elementary science curriculum is incomplete and requires updating. Teachers have little opportunity to align the curriculum vertically and to develop interdisciplinary units. Vertical alignment would ensure that there are no redundancies or gaps in curricular content. Interdisciplinary planning would ensure that reading, writing, speaking, and listening span the school day and are integral parts of every subject and that the disciplines are connected whenever possible to provide students a more coherent educational experience.

4. The review team did not observe many examples of differentiated instruction.

A. The review team found limited evidence of differentiated instruction in observed classes.

1. In most observed classes students engaged in the same activities using the same materials for the same amount of time, and were subject to the same expectations.

2. There was moderate to strong evidence of teachers appropriately differentiating the content so the lesson was accessible to all learners in (#8) in 27 of the 70 classes, or only 38 percent overall.

   a. There was moderate to strong evidence of the teacher appropriately differentiating instruction in 45 percent of observed classes at the elementary level, in only 14 percent of classes at the middle-school level, and in 39 percent of classes at the high-school level.

   b. Examples of practices and activities demonstrating differentiation of instruction from the review team's classroom observations included:

      - providing books on the same topic at different reading levels
      - allowing students to use pictures, numbers, or words to solve a problem
      - assigning students different lists of spelling words

Impact statement: The absence of instruction that is differentiated to all students' developmental levels and learning needs makes it difficult for the district to engage students in learning and to help them to reach their potential and achieve at high levels.

Recommendations

1. The district should continue to restore curriculum leadership positions, and provide more time for curriculum development, revision, and alignment.

A. The district should consider increasing the number of lead teachers in order to ensure curriculum leadership at all levels in all core disciplines, with an initial emphasis on science. Westfield should also consider ways of providing lead teachers with more time to work on the curriculum, including but not limited to reducing their teaching schedules.

B. The district should increase the time available for curriculum development and alignment, including interdisciplinary units.

1. Possible approaches to accomplish this include:

   a. Increasing the number of early-release days for professional development and dedicating these days to curriculum development activities;

   b. Holding curriculum development workshops after school and during the summer; or

   c. Other district-determined approaches.

C. The district may wish to consider supplementing its website and Google Docs with a database dedicated exclusively to curriculum development and revision. This would provide teachers constant ready access to curriculum documents.

Benefits: Implementing this recommendation will lead to curricular coherence and ensure that decisions about programs and initiatives serve the entire district. A fully documented, horizontally and vertically aligned curriculum with shared, rigorous expectations for student learning will help to ensure that all students have access to high-quality instruction; contribute to smoother transitions for students; and likely raise the overall level of student achievement in Westfield. A workable cycle of curriculum improvement and revision ensures that curricula are dynamic and will continuously evolve as frameworks are revised at the state level.

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=PLTuqmiQ9ssquWrLjKc9h5h2cSpDVZqe6t) is a series of videos that captures the collaboration and deep thinking by curriculum design teams over the course of a year as they worked to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units. It includes videos about developing essential questions, establishing goals, creating embedded performance assessments, designing lesson plans, selecting high-quality materials, and evaluating the curriculum unit.

- *Model Curriculum Units* (http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu) 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.

2. The district should build on its thoughtful approach to professional development (PD) by focusing on differentiated instruction.

A. The district should continue its practice of providing PD that is based on analysis and differentiated according to teachers' needs.

1. A next step is to identify specific PD related to differentiated instruction that would meaningfully improve teachers' practice at all levels.

2. This PD should be planned, delivered, and assessed using the established structures and processes in the district (see Human Resources and Professional Development strength finding above).

3. The goal of the PD should be to ensure that lessons in all classrooms are designed in a way that makes rigorous content accessible to all learners.

Benefits: When instruction is effectively differentiated to provide appropriate levels of challenge and support, students are more likely to engage in learning, reach their full potential, and achieve at high levels.

Assessment

Contextual Background

Assessment policies and practices are supported by a central office assessment and accountability department that includes staff with instructional and data management experience. This experience, in combination with the recent implementation of a data management system (warehouse), has contributed to the establishment of a data-driven, decision making culture where the timely collection, analysis, and dissemination of student assessment data to instructional staff is the rule rather than the exception.

This organized structure of using assessment data to make curriculum and instructional decisions extends beyond the central office to the schools where teacher teams meet monthly with coaches to review student assessment data. In the district it is expected that teachers use data to enhance student learning as well as their own professional growth. To that end, the district is attempting to expand the current teacher meeting structure with after-school professional learning communities. The district is challenged to define the purpose of these meetings, to standardize meeting formats, and to review ways to improve teachers' attendance.

A strength of the district is the abundance of organized assessment data that is available for use by teachers to make instructional decisions and by central office administrators to assess the effectiveness of interventions. The availability of this data results from the implementation of a balanced system of content assessments across all grade levels. Teachers use assessment data to develop interventions for struggling students and central office administrators have used data to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of interventions and to eliminate, or in some cases, continue programs.

Strength Finding

1. **A balanced system of assessments and a well-developed planning and support infrastructure supports the use of assessment data to plan and modify instruction and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions.**

    A. An assessment and accountability department supports the collection, analysis, and distribution of assessment data districtwide.

        1. The assessment and accountability department staff includes a director, a data and assessment specialist, a data coach, and a secretary.

            a. The director has overall responsibility for assessment districtwide and also serves as the district's director of English language learners.

            b. The data and assessment specialist conducts statistical analysis of student achievement data and manages and designs reports for staff.

c. The data coach is a member of the data leadership team, develops and facilitates professional development sessions that focus on data collection, and analysis, and use, and meets with principals and teachers at monthly data meetings.

d. Assessment staff told the team that the superintendent restructured curriculum, instruction, and assessment responsibilities into two departments and created new positions in the assessment department to support and strengthen the use of assessment data.

B. The district has implemented a system of formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments at all levels and has purchased and installed a data warehouse to store and manage assessment data.

1. A review of the assessment inventory indicated that at the elementary level the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is administered 3 times a year in kindergarten through grade 5; the Group Reading and Diagnostic Assessment (GRADE) is administered 2 times per year in kindergarten through grade 5; and the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) is administered 2 or 3 times a year in grades 3-5. Also, locally developed mathematic benchmark assessments are administered 2 or 3 times a year in kindergarten through grade 5and the Add+Vantage Math Recovery assessment is administered 3 times per year in kindergarten through grade 2 . The Teaching Strategies Gold Assessment is administered in kindergarten on an ongoing basis.

2. At the middle-school level, the SRI is administered 2 to 3 times a year in grades 6-8; an ELA pre-/post-assessment benchmark assessment is administered 2 times a year, and a mathematics benchmark is administered 3 times a year. In addition, ELA open-response, literary analysis, and argument writing benchmark assessments are administered 2 times per year. A science and technology assessment entitled Jog-Nog is in place at the middle schools.

3. The SRI is administered in grades 9 and 10 2 or 3 times per year, and common and mid-term and final examinations are administered at the high school. The district receives analysis of SAT scores from the College Board, but does not receive individual student scores to enter into a database.

4. MCAS practice exams are administered in grades 3-8 annually. The Access for ELLs assessment is administered to English language learners (ELLs) K-12 to measure progress in acquiring academic English. Interviewees said that ACCESS data is entered in the district's data warehouse and used to place ELLs with teachers trained in sheltering English.

5. In 2014, the district purchased and installed Illuminate, a data assessment and management system (warehouse). Interviews and a review of data reports indicated that this system has been primarily used by middle-school teachers; however, the

district is in the process of making it available to all teachers. Training was provided for coaches and some teachers last year and more are scheduled for training this year, including department heads at the high school.

a. An overview document of Illuminate provided to the review team states that Illuminate is a "web-based and longitudinal system designed to meet the assessment and data needs of all Westfield Public Schools District's staff." It allows staff to analyze trends and create individual student data dashboards, create reports to modify curriculum and instruction, and develop additional formative assessments for fast feedback.

b. The district integrates data from ESE's data warehouse (EDWIN) into the Illuminate data warehouse and is working with the City of Westfield Technology Center staff to more fully develop integration of district data with ESE's Schools Interoperability Framework.

6. The district developed and published a detailed assessment schedule which assigned dates or ranges of dates for all assessments.

C. Teachers meet monthly to review data and plan and modify curriculum and instruction.

1. A review of team meeting schedules and information provided by teachers and central office administrators indicated that schools have data teams that meet monthly to review student assessment data and adjust instruction.

a. All elementary schools participate in the Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI). BSRI-trained coaches facilitate monthly meetings with teachers to review ELA assessment data and work with teachers daily in the classroom. Mathematics benchmark data and Add+Vantage Math Recovery data is reviewed monthly at all elementary schools and used to create student interventions.

b. A review of the district's literacy plan showed that data from assessments such as GRADE and DIBELS are used to make instructional decisions and track growth year to year. In addition, that data are used to identify students at risk who need supplementary instruction and inform parents of student progress.

c. Elementary teachers said that math and literacy teams meet to review data and specifically referenced reviewing the math concept sequencing in the Envisions mathematics program. Central office administrators said that performance results from the ACCESS assessment are used to regroup ELLs.

d. Teachers at the middle schools said that ELA and mathematics data and grade-level teams meet monthly with coaches and district ELA and mathematics supervisors. Teachers said that academic departments use data to create benchmarks and district-determined measures (DDMs).

e. High-school teachers told the team that they discussed MCAS and SRI data at monthly department meetings and recently were provided information on Illuminate, which they said "had a lot of possibilities."

f. Interviewees said that data meetings are an important tool to support new and struggling teachers and supplement the district's mentoring program. They stated that principals and coaches use data to support struggling teachers and described how benchmark data were used to develop an improvement plan for a teacher that included working with a coach for three weeks.

D. District leaders use data strategically to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions. District leaders have inventoried all interventions to ensure that interventions aligned and supported core programs.

1. Interviewees told the team that district leaders, in collaboration with a local collaborative and a highly trained group of program reviewers, reviewed two years of Reading Recovery program assessment results and determined that the highly individualized Reading Recovery approach was not cost effective.

2. Interviewees said that after a review of attendance data and a survey of parents the after-school program at the middle school was discontinued and a Saturday school developed.

3. Similarly, the district reviewed data and surveyed teachers and students on the impact of the student mentoring program at the vocational high school. The district determined that the program was effective and continued the program.

4. Annually the district conducts an evaluation of the Title I program, which is an outcomes-based program. Student assessment data is reviewed to determine whether Title I services should continue or be discontinued in schools.

5. When a district inventory of tiered interventions showed that some grade levels were missing interventions and some interventions did not support core programs, the district implemented consistent tiered interventions systemwide. Interviewees said that the district wanted to strengthen interventions for ELLs and students with disabilities.

6. The district has worked with the DSAC to evaluate special education data and create an action plan. Central office administrators said that special educators are not consistently using interventions geared to individual student needs.

Impact: When the district has a balanced system of assessments aligned and supported by researched-based interventions, instructional leaders and teachers have the ability to identify student strengths and challenges and the resources to improve student achievement and enhance the ability of teachers to serve struggling students.

Challenge Finding and Area for Growth

2. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are missing a common purpose, format, and structure. Because PLCs are mostly scheduled after regular school hours, attendance is voluntary.

A. As part of the district's strategy and theory of action for continuous improvement, the district launched a strategic initiative to implement PLCs. A document review showed that a number of schools include PLC development as a strategy for continuous improvement.

B. Interviewees said that the structure of PLCs varies among schools and PLCs are not always data driven.

C. Central office administrators stated that PLCs do not have common agendas and formats and the district is working with the Pioneer Valley District and Schools Assistance Center (DSAC) to develop consistency. They also said that the PLC process needs to be formalized and that the work with the DSAC to improve PLCs will continue next year.

D. Teachers determine the content of most PLCs with lead teachers facilitating some meetings. A document review showed that PLC work also takes place during early-release staff-development days. Interviewees said that they expected that the DSAC would provide training to teachers on meeting facilitation methodologies.

E. Central office administrators said that PLCs were intended to be an extension of data and grade-level meetings that are currently scheduled during the school day.

F. Interviewees told the team that participation by teachers differs by level, with particularly low participation at the middle-school level. Interviewees told the review team that participation at monthly PLC meetings varies, because the meetings may be scheduled after regular school hours and are not supported in the Westfield Education Association (WEA) collective bargaining agreement.

1. WEA officials confirmed that a monthly meeting takes place, which teachers are not required to attend, unless the meeting is held during regular school hours. WEA officials said that although teachers are not required to attend, they are expected to be "professional" and inform the principal when they will not attend.

G. Interviewees told the team that the district hopes to address PLC structure in the next negotiations with the WEA.

Impact: Having a PLC process that is uncoordinated and does not require the participation of all teachers in this strategy for continuous improvement misallocates time and resources and adds little value to staff development and improving student achievement. Requiring meetings, but not teachers' attendance, prevents deep self-reflection among teachers on instructional practices and hinders the ability of teachers to learn from each other.

Recommendation

1. **The district should build on the current PLC structure and create more planning time and a common protocol for PLC meetings.**

   A. Central office administrators should work to maximize time for teachers to collaborate during scheduled school hours.

      1. The district should review the current professional development and common planning/teacher preparation time schedules to see where the current schedule might provide additional planning time.

      2. Since many PLCs are focused on student work and assessment data, the district should consider restructuring monthly data team meetings as PLC meetings.

   B. The district should create a common set of expectations for PLC meetings.

      1. Since different protocols are used for different kinds of PLC meetings, the district should provide a set of protocols and norms for teachers.

Benefits: Creating well-structured and focused PLCs that are integrated with other staff development opportunities leads to a culture of collaboration across the school district and builds on the district's effort to create a school system rather than a system of schools. PLCs enable teachers to work in community, which likely contributes to improved instruction and student achievement.

Recommended resources:

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

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

Human Resources and Professional Development

Contextual Background

The district has a well organized and efficient human resources department. It has a set of clearly defined administrative practices and procedures governing its hiring practices, including staff recruitment and selection that guides administrators through every step of the employment process. Principals are empowered and supported by the district in making staffing decisions based upon individual school's needs.

Perhaps the single most important factor in the district's progress in implementing and using data from an educator evaluation system aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework is the collaborative and coordinated manner in which the district's administrative leadership team has approached this task. Central office administrators were careful to engage all stakeholders in the discussion and negotiation of the language in the collective bargaining agreement about the district's educator evaluation system. Westfield's Strategy for Continuous Improvement contains strategic objectives for developing instructional practices that will promote student engagement and differentiation. In implementing the educator evaluation system, district leaders selected seven "power elements" as their initial focus to ensure a seamless implementation. Those elements include subject matter knowledge and student engagement; use of common assessments and data analysis to drive instruction; differentiating lessons; using a variety of strategies to support every family; and asking teachers to be reflective on their teaching and in interactions with students and colleagues.

Teachers' evaluations reviewed were all current and contained evidence of the components of educator evaluation including: self-assessments; SMART Goals; announced and unannounced observations; classroom learning walkthroughs; and formative and summative assessments. Evidence folders were either uploaded to TeachPoint or located in principals' office files.

Although the primary purpose of educator evaluation is to promote professional growth leading to improved educator performance, a review of evaluative documents indicated that teachers' and administrators' evaluations were largely informative and in most instances were missing instructive commentary designed to promote professional growth. Many administrators' and teachers' evaluations were not timely.

The district has a cohesive and coherent process for developing, implementing, and funding professional development (PD) through the local budget and federal and state grants. Budget-funded PD is determined and implemented by the Staff Development Committee (SDC) and the Professional Development Incentive Committee (PDIC), with budget funding being governed through teachers' collective bargaining language. The PDIC reviews and approves SDC and individual teacher/administrator requests for PD. The SDC determines the types of PD offerings for the district's Early Release Staff Development (ERSD) and topic areas for use in the district's Professional Learning Community's (PLC) meetings. Staff is surveyed to determine PD interests and *Survey Monkey* is used to evaluate program effectiveness. PD is also funded through federal and state grants, Title IIA, and/or individual school

budgets (site funds). In developing, implementing, and funding its annual PD program in a cohesive, coordinated, and inclusive manner, the district is able to more closely target its PD opportunities to meet district goals and individual teachers' needs.

Strength Findings

1. **The district has implemented and is regularly using data from an educator evaluation system aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework.**

   A. In facilitating the implementation of an educator evaluation system aligned with the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation Framework, the district's leadership selected seven specific "power elements" as a focus in evaluation. These elements include: content knowledge and student engagement; use of common assessments and data analysis to drive instruction; differentiating lessons; using a variety of strategies to support every family; and asking teachers to be reflective in their teaching and in interactions with students and colleagues.

   B. Evaluations are regularly monitored by the director of human resources who supports principals through meetings, newsletters, and periodic reminders to report the status of evaluations to him.

   C. Team members reviewed the evaluative documentation of 29 teachers randomly selected from across the district. Evaluations were all current, contained self-assessments, SMART goals and evidence of announced and unannounced observations, classroom learning walkthroughs.

      1. Formative assessments were timely in 26 of 29 files.

      2. Evidence folders were either uploaded to TeachPoint or located in principals' office files.

   D. Principals told the review team that further calibration of expectations should be the next step in improving the quality of evaluations.

Impact: In focusing on seven specific "power elements" in evaluation, the district's administrative leadership team has made progress in implementing and regularly using data from its educator evaluation system in a collaborative and coordinated manner. If the district can maintain an ongoing commitment to the educator evaluation system, then continuous and comprehensive improvements in classroom instruction and in student educational opportunities and academic outcomes can likely result.

2. **The district has a cohesive and coherent process for developing, implementing, and funding its professional development program.**

   A. Professional development (PD) in the district is funded through the budget and federal and state grants. Budget-funded PD in the district is determined and implemented by the staff development committee (SDC) and the Professional Development Incentive Committee (PDIC), with funding being primarily governed through long-standing teachers' contract language.

1. Funding is primarily determined by long-standing language (11 years) in the teachers' collective bargaining agreement in which the school committee agreed to set aside one percent of its annual personnel budget for PD and make the PDIC responsible for determining final fund expenditures consistent with district priorities.

    a. In addition to the approval of individual plans, the PDIC is responsible for the development of systemwide proposals for PD incentive activities consistent with system priorities and objectives within the one percent cap.

2. The PDIC, which meets once per month to review and approve SDC and individual teacher/administrator requests for PD, is composed of four teachers selected by the teachers' association and four principals, and is facilitated by the director of curriculum and instruction who has no vote. Once approved, PD funds are expended.

3. The Staff Development Committee (SDC), which is composed of curriculum supervisors, principals, and assistant principals, determines the types of PD offerings for the district's Early Release Staff Development (ERSD) days. Before securing service providers for the ERSD days, the SDC is required to secure funding approval from the PDIC. District administrators indicated that, although funding is usually obtained, this is a somewhat cumbersome process. ERSD topic areas are also generated by the SDC for use in the district's Professional Learning Community's (PLC) meetings and vary by discipline, grade level, and topic area. SDC members survey staff to determine PD interests and use *Survey Monkey* as a form of evaluating the effectiveness of PD offerings.

    a. Principals said that Unit B members (administrators who are represented by a union) submit proposals for PD to the SDC on a monthly basis and the PDIC approves almost all proposals.

B. PD is also funded through federal and state grants, Title IIA, and/or individual school budgets (site funds) with grant expenditures being made by district personnel assigned to individual grants and monitored by the district's grants manager, or in the case of site funds, by the principal. The superintendent cited a nine-year relationship with Bay State Reading Institute (BSRI). BSRI was implemented districtwide in the 2012-2013 school year. BSRI, which works to promote principals as instructional coaches, introduced principal training in data and learning walks as part of the process. BSRI also has trained coaches for the district who are now training teachers. Additionally, the superintendent stated that the district partners with Westfield State University and the Western Mass Collaborative.

C. In school year 2015-2016, the district has three full days and six half-days (ERSD) for PD. The full-day sessions were conducted in August, and the ERSD days are conducted once every month with the exception of September and March. ERSD days total 20 hours of PD, the first half based on administratively predetermined district- and school-level needs, the second on teacher choices from an administratively presented list of options.

Impact: In developing, implementing and funding its annual professional development program in a cohesive, coordinated, and inclusive manner including all constituents in the process, the district is able to more closely target its professional development opportunities to meet district goals and specifically identified and differentiated teacher needs.

Challenge Finding and Area for Growth

3. **Instructive commentary to promote professional growth was missing in most instances in both administrators' and teacher' evaluations. Many administrators' and teachers' evaluations were not timely.**

   A. The team reviewed all administrators' evaluations and found that commentary was largely informative, with only 3 of 26 evaluations containing instructive[6] suggestions that could lead to increased professional growth.

   B. According to data that the district reported to ESE, only 30 of the 48 district administrators were evaluated in 2014-2015 (62.5 percent). The regulations require that all educators receive a formative or a summative evaluation each year.

   C. Fewer than half (14 of 29) of the teacher evaluations reviewed by the team contained instructive commentary that could potentially lead to increased professional growth. Summative assessments in fewer than half the reviewed files (14 of 29) were not timely.

Impact: The primary purpose of evaluation is to promote professional growth leading to improved educator performance. The absence of instructive commentary in evaluations diminishes the professional growth of educators and the development of their instructional practices. Untimely summative assessments decrease the likelihood that educators have an opportunity to use the feedback for their professional growth.

[6] 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.

Recommendation

1. **The district should revise its evaluation practices so that evaluations of administrators and teachers are timely and consistently include instructive commentary in order to promote professional growth and improve classroom instruction and student achievement.**

   A. The district should consider the formation of a joint committee, composed equally of administrators and teachers, which 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.

      1. All administrators should receive targeted training in contemporary supervisory and evaluative practices in order to improve their evaluation skills. 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, her 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 focused 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 will result.

Recommended resources:

- *The Transforming Educator Evaluation in Massachusetts (TEEM) Video Series* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/teem/) features educators from four districts discussing how to design and implement a meaningful evaluation system aligned to the state framework.
- *The Calibration Video Library* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/resources/calibration/) includes videos of classroom instruction and several calibration training protocols for groups of educators to practice conducting observations and giving feedback.
- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf) describe, identify, and characterize what high-quality learning experiences should look like for educators

- *Identifying Meaningful Professional Development* (https://youtu.be/zhuFioO8GbQ) is a video in which educators from three Massachusetts districts discuss the importance of targeted, meaningful professional development and the ways districts can use the evaluation process to identify the most effective PD supports for all educators.

Student Support

Contextual Background

The district has a proportion of students with disabilities that is close to the state rate (18.2 percent compared with 17.2 percent for the state) and a changing population of English language learners (ELLs), including many newcomers to this country. The team was told that in the past ELLs in the district have spoken Russian, Ukrainian, Spanish, and Nepali as their first languages; now ELLs primarily come to Westfield from Iraq, Syria, Tanzania, and Ethiopia.

The district has chosen to instruct almost all its youngest ELLs at the Highland Elementary School where administrators have reorganized the program, hired dually certified teachers, provided hours of ESL instruction, and ensured that staff are SEI certified. The BSRI format of an initial teacher presentation followed by use of learning centers provides time for interventionists, including the ELL instructors, to work with students without a loss of core instructional time. ELLs at Highland have demonstrated solid achievement on the MCAS tests. The district also provide services for ELLs at the South Middle School and at Westfield High School and Westfield Technical Academy where staff face the challenge of ELLs limited by an absence of previous formal education.

The special education department has made a recent effort to create local programs for some students with disabilities so that they can be educated within the district. This benefits both the students and the district. The district has inclusion, partial inclusion, and substantially separate programs. The district has a smaller proportion of students with disabilities in inclusion classrooms and more in partial inclusion than the statewide averages. According to the latest available ESE data, in 2013-2014 50.1 percent of students with disabilities were in full inclusion (61.1 percent, state) and 28.2 percent were in partial inclusion (17.3 percent, state). In addition, in a few programs the reasons for separating students from their peers were not clear to the review team.

Although there are some co-taught classes at the high school, the absence of such options at all levels, the scarcity of training for teachers in differentiating instruction, and the absence of training for and supervision of most paraprofessionals impede the movement of more students into inclusion classrooms.

The district has an effective, data-driven, intervention program with extended day and summer options. The program has had demonstrable success with many of its students. In addition, the director of interventions is credited with identifying options for non-Title I schools in order to create some equity in intervention services across the district. The district has supported these extended services with its own funds.

Strength Finding

1. **The district's Title I program and the ELL program at the Highland Elementary School leverage local and community resources in thoughtful and effective ways to meet students' needs.**

   A. Through Title I funds, the district has purchased software that is widely used to implement interventions and support remediation and practice.

   1. The district has purchased Read 180 and System 44 for interventions from elementary through middle school and at Westfield Technical Academy for students reading below grade level.

   2. ST MATH was purchased for the elementary schools and Math 180 was purchased for the middle schools.

   3. FASTT math has recently been added to make the recall of math facts more automatic and teachers were trained in its use.

   4. ALEKS software is used at Westfield Technical Academy and North Middle School to determine students' comprehension levels through adaptive questioning in order to provide appropriate text as the student works through a selected course.

   B. The district has used Title I funds to hire personnel to implement its literacy and math interventions in classroom groups and to measure the outcomes of these interventions.

   1. The literacy interventions follow Bay State Reading Initiative (BSRI) model implemented districtwide during the 2012-2013 school year. Teachers and reading specialists group students according to strengths and needs and monitor the efficacy of these interventions. The groups are fluid and students are re-grouped based on the results of periodic assessments. District data supplied to the team indicated that from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 students from low-income families made gains in literacy skills.

   2. Math interventions are also implemented in classroom groups. Math interventionists at South Middle School and Westfield Technical Academy work with student groups and monitor the efficacy of interventions. In addition, a math tutor at the middle schools works with students using FASTT math during the weekly long block.

   3. The district has hired a data coach to measure the outcomes of interventions.

   C. The district has used Title I funds to develop extended-day and summer-school programs.

   1. Literacy and math support are offered before or after school at the elementary level, depending on the needs of the students. The district offers a half-year of literacy and a half-year of math support. Instructors either pre-teach content or collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that the extended day content is relevant to the classroom program. The district provides transportation for students enrolled in the afternoon programs.

2. South Middle School has a Saturday morning program intended to enable students who are falling behind to catch up on their assignments.

3. The district offers a summer-school program entitled Edventure for elementary students; this is underwritten by Title I and Title 3 funds and co-sponsored by Hasbro Summer Learning Initiative (HSLI), the Boys and Girls Club, and the YMCA. EDventure operates four days per week for five weeks. Lunch is provided for the participating students.

4. The South Middle School has a summer-school program for grade 8 students; it is entitled Bridges, is based on STEM activities, and takes place at Westfield Technical Academy.

5. The district offers a student mentoring program at Westfield Technical Academy. The mentors are retired teacher volunteers who are paired with identified at-risk students and students who self-identify as needing support. Administrators credited this program with a documented increase in the retention of students at the Technical Academy. South Middle School has a similar student mentoring program.

D. Administrators at Highland Elementary School have implemented an effective, research-based program for English language learners (ELLs). This school educates nearly all elementary-age ELLs in the district.

1. After reviewing the research on English language acquisition, Highland administrators requested district permission to reorganize the ELL program. Based on the rationale provided, the district agreed to fund the hiring of additional staff.

2. The Highland Elementary School employs one dually certified teacher (elementary/ESL) for each grade. These teachers instruct integrated classes that contain students with the lowest English language proficiency. The other two classes at each grade level are immersion classes for either mid-level or high proficiency students.

3. With the enrollment of many students new to the country, the district has hired an additional ESL teacher to teach a newcomers' class, beginning in January 2016.

4. ESL teachers give students most of the required hours of ESL instruction in small pull-out groups and sometimes push into the classroom.

    a. The BSRI model of literacy instruction helps in the implementation of the ELL program, providing time when all students are working in groups either in the classroom or in pull-out for interventions.

5. Highland teachers have completed the RETELL training to assist them in supporting the academic achievement of ELLs.

6. The district has hired paraprofessional aides who speak some of the languages represented in the school such as Russian and Nepali.

7. ELLs constitute 37 percent of overall enrollment of the Highland Elementary School; according to district data supplied to the team, these students score well on the MCAS tests, in some cases even outperforming students whose first language was English.

    a. According to 2015 ESE data, 37 percent of ELLs at Highland were proficient or advanced in ELA (28 percent, state) and 74 percent of ELLs at Highland were proficient or advanced in math (28 percent, state).

Impact: When a school or district is able to implement research-based practices, provide financial support, assess the effectiveness of programs based on reliable data, it is more likely to achieve the instructional goals that it has established for its students.

Challenge Finding and Area for Growth

2. Many of the district's students with disabilities have limited access to a standards-based curriculum taught in the least restrictive environment with appropriate supports.

A. The district has 50 percent of its students with disabilities in full inclusion as compared with the statewide average of 61 percent.

B. The 2014 Westfield Coordinated Program Review (CPR) of Special Education Services stated that the removal of students with disabilities from the general education classroom with its less restrictive environment and supplementary services and corresponding placement in less inclusive settings was not consistently accompanied by a rationale for the change and documented in the IEP.

1. The superintendent reported that the district progress report for the 2014 CPR included a "comprehensive non-participation justification statement, indicated 100 percent compliance, and was approved by the state on January 13, 2015."

C. When staff members were asked how students with disabilities were included with general education students, they cited special subjects such as physical education and music; social opportunities, such as homeroom and lunch; and academic subjects, such as science and social studies.

1. Administrators and teachers told the review team that there were no regularly assigned blocks for the teaching of science and social studies at the elementary level.

2. Although interviewees said that the special education department attempted to integrate students with disabilities into literacy and mathematics classes, administrators and teachers told the review team that this option was used infrequently.

3. The superintendent reported the Developmental Learning Program (DLP) and the Essential Life Skills Program "are the only two [programs] whose students are not attending general education science and social studies."

D. Special education department members stated that few special educators held dual certification in both special education and a content area. They added that most teachers of students with disabilities were generalists.

E. In addition to special programs for students with social-emotional challenges and students on the autism spectrum, the special education department offers an Essential Life Skills program for students who are developmentally delayed and require greater support for their disability.

1. Special education department leaders told the review team that students in the Essential Life Skills Program at the elementary level received most of their academic instruction in a substantially separate environment and at the middle-school level were placed in an inclusion setting.

2. A review of the high school program of studies indicated that the special education department offers students with disabilities only separate classes, entitled "access," in ELA, math, science, and U.S. history.

3. Administrators reported that 80 to 90 percent of students with social-emotional challenges and students on the autism spectrum took the MCAS tests, although their access to a curriculum based on the standards was limited at the high school level because of the absence of a social-emotional program.

F. While many specialized programs were located within schools, a program for students with mental health challenges, entitled Russell Road after its location, operated in a non-school building where K- 8 students enrolled had no access to general education students. Administrators said that when these students reached the high school level, they remained in substantially separate classes until they chose to enter the mainstream themselves.

G. The district has limited time for special and general education teachers to collaborate on lessons and plan for appropriate support.

1. Interviewees said that special education teachers in the elementary schools could use the monthly PLC hour to meet with general education teachers; however, PLC time was often devoted to other purposes and priorities and teacher attendance was not mandatory.

2. At the middle-school level, team planning time was available daily; however, teachers told the team that the expectation for teachers with ELLs and students with disabilities in their classes was limited to "touching all of the bases to find something that works for different students."

3. Administrators said that most paraprofessionals were not specially trained to work with students with disabilities.

    i. Teachers and administrators told the team that either the classroom teacher or the special educator was responsible for directing the support provided by

paraprofessionals; however, there were no parameters for making these determinations.

H. Administrators stated that the special education department needed to actively participate with general educators in the development of instructional solutions for students with disabilities.

I. Administrators expressed the need for the special education department to provide students with disabilities greater access to the general education program by having special educators plan modifications to meet students' needs.

J. The special education department has engaged Landmark College to examine its language-based program to determine whether more inclusion is possible.

K. ELA and math proficiency rates for district students with disabilities lag behind the statewide averages.

a. In 2014, 21 percent of Westfield students with disabilities scored *proficient* or higher in the ELA MCAS compared with their statewide peers at 30 percent.

b. In 2014, 11 percent of Westfield students with disabilities scored *proficient* or higher in the math MCAS compared with their statewide peers at 23 percent.

Impact: In order to succeed, students with disabilities must have access to the mainstream curriculum. This is difficult to guarantee when students are placed in substantially separate classes instructed by special education generalists. Inclusion also confers social benefits and increases college and career readiness.

Recommendation

1. The district should promote and refine the ways it can educate students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment possible.

A. The district should seek resources for an objective study of the manner in which inclusion is practiced in the schools. It might seek DSAC resources or commission an independent outside researcher to help define areas of need and assist the district to establish priorities.

1. The district should look at the percentage of the school day that students in full and partial inclusion spend in the general education classroom, as well as time spent with the general population during periods such as homeroom and lunch.

2. The district should develop and implement entry and exit criteria for programs and services for students passing from one level of service to another in order to create a more individualized system of supports.

B. The district should provide joint planning opportunities for special educators and teachers of inclusion classes to plan strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

C. A designated person, whether the special educator or the general education teacher, should be responsible for supervising the work that the paraprofessional will be responsible for accomplishing with students with disabilities in a given room.

1. Paraprofessionals should be offered training to effectively perform their roles in the classroom.

D. The district should implement an extensive professional development program to help general education teachers understand and plan for differentiation within the classroom.

E. The district should allow students with disabilities access to all of its resources, including general education program interventions, when these interventions would help to fulfill the goals in their Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs).

Benefits: By implementing this recommendation, the district will ensure that students with disabilities have access to the full curriculum, taught by educators licensed in the academic areas, and supported by special educators. This will increase the likelihood of improved student achievement.

Recommended resources:

- The *Educator Effectiveness Guidebook for Inclusive Practice* (http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/guidebook/) is a guide for thinking about inclusion, including the rationale for inclusions, lesson and program planning, and skills teachers need for creating accessible instruction.
- The *Inclusive Practice Tool* (*www.doe.mass.edu*/edeval/guidebook/2a-rubric.pdf) is a guide for districts as administrators visit classrooms. It suggests what teaching practices to look for during observations.

Financial and Asset Management

Contextual Background

The district business office is headed by the director of technology and business services. The director provides direction and oversight for the financial services provided to the district and serves as the liaison for technology services to the Westfield Technology Center. There are supervisory positions for the functions of transportation and business support, custodial and maintenance support, and cafeteria operations. The coordinator for grant projects is also located in the business office. Business office personnel are located at the Westfield City Hall with the director having a second office and secretary located at the district office. Approximately one-half of the director's time is spent in each location.

Monthly financial reports are provided by the business office to the superintendent and the school committee. The reports provide detailed budget line item totals, transfers, encumbrances, and balances. Monthly projections are also provided on account balances. Salary accounts are not encumbered at the beginning of the year; however, a spreadsheet is prepared monthly to track salary account balances and a comparison is made to previous years to avoid deficits in accounts. The director of technology and business services is a member of the superintendent's leadership team that meets weekly. The director of technology and business services meets with the mayor monthly on financial matters.

The district exceeded required net school spending by 9.5 percent in fiscal year 2015 and by 12.6 percent in fiscal year 2014. Data for the last ten years indicates that the district has consistently exceeded required net school spending. There is an agreement between the Westfield Public Schools and the City of Westfield about the allocation of city expenditures that contribute to required net school spending.

City and school district leaders have improved operational efficiency and effectiveness by leveraging resources. The school department business office has been relocated to city hall to improve accessibility and address operational issues. Payroll personnel for the school department have been consolidated with the city payroll department. Technology purchasing and support have been consolidated under one city entity. Consideration is being given to the consolidation of facilities management for the school department and the city.

Strength Finding

1. **District and city leaders have worked collaboratively to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of payroll, personnel, technology, and purchasing through the consolidation and restructuring of functions.**

    A. The school department business office was relocated to city hall after the renovation of city hall in 2012.

1. The director of technology and business services said that he divides his time between city hall and the school department. The director meets monthly with the mayor to discuss financial matters and receives inquiries from city councilors.

    a. The director of technology and business services expressed the view that having an office at city hall enhanced his relationship with the city departments. Also, more joint projects were being done with the city facilities director because of the proximity of the offices, resulting in a more efficient use of time and talent.

2. School committee members told the review team that they supported the business office relocation.

B. The school department payroll personnel have been consolidated into the city payroll department.

1. City finance office personnel and the director of technology and business services said that the city was responsible for the personnel payroll.

2. The assistant to the director of technology and business services provides payroll disbursement information.

3. School committee members said that they supported the consolidation of payroll personnel because of their overlapping duties. They said that the mayor wanted to bring all financial personnel together.

4. City officials also said that they supported consolidation. They cited an easier, smoother and more consistent process that facilitated checking and oversight and increased opportunities for bulk purchases. No direct cost savings have been realized; however, time savings have resulted in a more efficient and effective operation.

C. The Technology Center was created to provide consolidated purchasing and support services for the city and the school department.

1. The director of technology and business services said that his role included oversight of technology in the school department, establishing technology priorities, and serving as the liaison with the technology center director.

2. The technology center director reviews justifications for computer requests in order to spend money wisely and makes bulk purchases to reduce costs. Technology center staff maintain an inventory for control and management and provide technical support.

3. City officials cited leveraging of technology funds for the school department and the city as a major advantage of the technology center. They said that while school-based purchases, such as educational software, were made by the district and other purchases, such as security devices, were made by the technology center, all technology purchases passed

through the purchasing director, enabling bulk purchasing and ensuring proper purchasing protocol.

D. Consideration was being given to consolidation of facilities management for city and school department buildings.

1. City officials told the review team that the school department and the city each had a facilities manager. The city facilities manager position has existed since the city hall renovation. The new city facilities manager and the school business manager are coordinating the purchasing of bulk paper supplies.

2. The director of technology and business services stated that the city facilities manager is currently overseeing school facilities and looking to future coordination with the maintenance of school department facilities.

Impact: The consolidation and restructuring of school department and city services and personnel addresses the duplication of resources that exists in a city school system. Leveraging existing resources eliminates redundancy and improves the efficiency and effectiveness of operations. Combining existing services and coordinating common purchases saves money. The convenient proximity of service providers improves overall coordination and collaboration in the delivery of services.

Challenge Finding and Area for Growth

2. Priorities identified in the Strategy for Continuous Improvement are not presented in the annual budget document to demonstrate how the budget supports district priorities.

A. The Strategy for Continuous Improvement provides strategic direction and the proposed fiscal year 2016 budget document presents summary and detailed financial information.

1. The Strategy for Continuous Improvement contains the district vision, theory of action, strategic objectives, and district strategic initiatives.

2. The budget contains a summary of budget versions through the development process, school-based budgets, detailed personnel and expenditure budget requests, actual fiscal year 2015 or revised appropriations, and a summary of school expenses.

3. The budget document does not identify other funding sources in addition to general funding, such as grants and revolving accounts, although some offsets to line items are made. It does not track appropriations and expenditures over several years and does not identify the district priorities that drive and are supported by the proposed budget.

B. District leaders said that significant discussion about district and school priorities takes place during the budget process; however, the budget document does not refer to district priorities.

1. The director of technology and business services told the team that the connection between district priorities and the budget is made during the budget development process and at the

presentations to the school committee by the superintendent, district administrators, and principals. Also, the principals present a rationale when a budget request is not explicitly connected to the Strategy for Continuous Improvement.

2. District administrators stated that the connection between district priorities and the budget is made during the budget development process discussions and in the budget request format used by the superintendent.

3. School committee members stated that the connection between the budget and district priorities is not always clear and the city council needs to understand why requests are being made.

Impact: The absence of a clear line between the district and school priorities identified in the Strategy for Continuous Improvement and the annual budget proposal diminishes the district's effectiveness in allocating limited resources and in advocating for its priorities. It also makes the budget process less transparent and clear.

Recommendation

1. **The annual budget document should include a clear and detailed summary of the priorities identified in the district's Strategy for Continuous Improvement and how they are supported in the budget.**

   A. The annual budget document should include a detailed summary of district priorities and the ways in which the budget is aligned to them. It should also identify the funding sources that support each priority and their specific location in the budget.

   B. The budget document should track appropriations and expenditures over several years.

Benefits: by implementing this recommendation the district will achieve a clear alignment between the identified district and school priorities and the annual budget document. This will provide a clearer picture of how resources are allocated and will allow for more informed financial decisions. A more transparent budget will also improve communication and trust and generate support for school budgets.

Recommended resources:

- *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.

- *Transforming School Funding: A Guide to Implementing Student-Based Budgeting* (https://www.erstrategies.org/cms/files/2752-student-based-budgeting-guide.pdf), from Education Resource Strategies, describes a process to help districts tie funding to specific student needs.

- In *Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets* (http://dmcouncil.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.

- *Smarter School Spending for Student Success* (http://smarterschoolspending.org/home) provides free processes and tools to help districts use their resources to improve student achievement.

- The Rennie Center's *Smart School Budgeting* (http://www.renniecenter.org/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.

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. Coral Grout, leadership and governance
2. Dr. James McAuliffe, curriculum and instruction, *review team coordinator*
3. Mr. James Hearns, assessment
4. Dr. William Contreras, human resources and professional development
5. Dr. Katherine Lopez-Natale, student support
6. Dr. Wilfrid Savoie, financial and asset management

District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: director of business services and technology, director of business support and transportation, school business administrator, head clerk of accounts payable, auditor, treasurer, and grants manager.

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

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

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: superintendent, director of curriculum and instruction, administrator of special education and student support, administrator of student intervention, director of assessment and accountability, director of technology and business services, and director of human resources.

The team visited the following schools: Franklin Avenue Elementary (K-5), Abner Gibbs Elementary (K-5), Highland Elementary (K-5), Munger Hill Elementary (K-5), Paper Mill Elementary (K-5), Russell Elementary (K-5), Southampton Road Elementary (K-5), North Middle School (6-8), South Middle School (6-8), Westfield High School (9-12), and Westfield Technical Academy (9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with 11 principals and focus groups with 3 elementary school teachers, 2 middle school teachers, and 3 high school teachers.

The team observed 70 classes in the district: 16 at the 2 high schools, 14 at the 2middle schools, and 40 at the 7 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; interview with teachers' association.	Interviews with district staff and principals; Interviews with city personnel ;review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; second interview with teachers' association, and visits to North Middle School, and Westfield High School for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; interviews with school committee members; visits to Westfield Technical Academy, Russell Elementary, Paper Mill Elementary, Southampton Road Elementary, and Abner Gibbs Elementary, for classroom observations.	Interviews with school leaders; follow-up interviews; district review team meeting; visits to Westfield High School, Abner Gibbs Elementary, South Middle School, Highland Elementary, Munger Hill Elementary, and Franklin Avenue Elementary for classroom observations; emerging themes meeting with district leaders and principals.

Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

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

Student Group	District	Percent of Total	State	Percent of Total
African-American	120	2.2%	83,481	8.8%
Asian	151	2.7%	61,584	6.5%
Hispanic	657	11.8%	176,873	18.6%
Native American	6	0.1%	2,179	0.2%
White	4,525	81.2%	597,502	62.7%
Native Hawaiian	6	0.1%	888	0.1%
Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic	107	1.9%	30,922	3.2%
All Students	5,572	100.0%	953,429	100.0%

Note: As of October 1, 2015

Table B1b: Westfield 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	1,025	40.4%	18.2%	165,559	39.4%	17.2%
Econ. Disad.	1,820	71.7%	32.7%	260,998	62.2%	27.4%
ELLs and Former ELLs	261	10.3%	4.7%	85,763	20.4%	9.0%
All high needs students	2,537	100.0%	45.0%	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 5,633; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.

Table B2a: Westfield Public Schools
English Language Arts 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
3	CPI	421	83.4	79.7	80.5	83.6	83.4	0.2	3.1
	P+	421	61.0%	50.0%	55.0%	61.0%	60.0%	0.0%	6.0%
4	CPI	394	74.1	75.1	74.9	77.7	78.5	3.6	2.8
	P+	394	46.0%	45.0%	50.0%	49.0%	53.0%	3.0%	-1.0%
	SGP	361	43.5	37	45	37	50	-6.5	-8
5	CPI	410	84	82.3	81.5	84.3	87.3	0.3	2.8
	P+	410	61.0%	61.0%	60.0%	64.0%	71.0%	3.0%	4.0%
	SGP	389	56	55	44.5	46	50	-10	1.5
6	CPI	423	83	83.4	77.8	82.4	86.6	-0.6	4.6
	P+	423	63.0%	62.0%	51.0%	63.0%	71.0%	0.0%	12.0%
	SGP	393	37	39	28	46	50	9	18
7	CPI	448	87.2	88.4	85.6	84.8	87	-2.4	-0.8
	P+	448	69.0%	72.0%	66.0%	63.0%	70.0%	-6.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	416	46	47	42	57	50	11	15
8	CPI	410	91.5	89.2	89.6	90.4	91.4	-1.1	0.8
	P+	410	80.0%	75.0%	79.0%	76.0%	80.0%	-4.0%	-3.0%
	SGP	379	47	51	44	56	50	9	12
10	CPI	411	96	96.4	97.1	96.5	96.7	0.5	-0.6
	P+	411	88.0%	89.0%	92.0%	90.0%	91.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	362	45	46	48	41	51	-4	-7
All	CPI	2,917	85.8	85.2	83.9	85.7	--	-0.1	1.8
	P+	2,917	67.0%	65.0%	65.0%	66.0%	--	-1.0%	1.0%
	SGP	2,300	45	47	41	47	50	2	6

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

Table B2b: Westfield Public Schools
Mathematics 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
3	CPI	421	78.1	83.7	82.4	84.9	85.4	6.8	2.5
	P+	421	56.0%	67.0%	65.0%	71.0%	70.0%	15.0%	6.0%
4	CPI	393	70.1	77.7	74.9	79	77.2	8.9	4.1
	P+	393	37.0%	51.0%	49.0%	51.0%	47.0%	14.0%	2.0%
	SGP	362	43	57	39.5	48.5	49	5.5	9
5	CPI	412	75.1	77.2	77.9	78.5	83.6	3.4	0.6
	P+	412	49.0%	55.0%	59.0%	61.0%	67.0%	12.0%	2.0%
	SGP	391	43	63	48	54	50	11	6
6	CPI	425	69.4	68.9	67.3	76.1	81.5	6.7	8.8
	P+	425	44.0%	43.0%	38.0%	53.0%	62.0%	9.0%	15.0%
	SGP	391	29	30	27	43	50	14	16
7	CPI	452	65.7	66.1	62	64.2	73	-1.5	2.2
	P+	452	35.0%	39.0%	34.0%	38.0%	51.0%	3.0%	4.0%
	SGP	417	44	41	47	52	51	8	5
8	CPI	409	71.7	67.3	66.7	70.5	78.7	-1.2	3.8
	P+	409	47.0%	42.0%	40.0%	46.0%	60.0%	-1.0%	6.0%
	SGP	382	59	51	49	55	51	-4	6
10	CPI	409	87	88.2	88.4	87	89.9	0	-1.4
	P+	409	70.0%	74.0%	74.0%	72.0%	79.0%	2.0%	-2.0%
	SGP	363	42	48	47	54	50	12	7
All	CPI	2,921	74.2	75.7	73.9	77	--	2.8	3.1
	P+	2,921	49.0%	53.0%	51.0%	56.0%	--	7.0%	5.0%
	SGP	2,306	42	47	42	51	50	9	9

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

Table B2c: Westfield Public Schools
Science and Technology/Engineering 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	411	81.5	75.9	76.7	77.3	78.2	-4.2	0.6
	P+	411	58.0%	44.0%	49.0%	52.0%	51.0%	-6.0%	3.0%
8	CPI	407	70.8	69.8	71.1	71.1	72.4	0.3	0
	P+	407	39.0%	33.0%	36.0%	40.0%	42.0%	1.0%	4.0%
10	CPI	383	82.9	84	88	85.6	88.2	2.7	-2.4
	P+	383	58.0%	59.0%	69.0%	64.0%	72.0%	6.0%	-5.0%
All	CPI	1,201	78.6	76.7	78.2	77.9	79.4	-0.7	-0.3
	P+	1,201	52.0%	46.0%	50.0%	52.0%	54.0%	0.0%	2.0%

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: Westfield Public Schools
English Language Arts (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	1,397	76.2	75.7	74.1	76.4	0.2	2.3
		P+	1,397	48.0%	47.0%	47.0%	48.0%	0.0%	1.0%
		SGP	1,040	44	46	39	45	1	6
	State	CPI	93,277	76.5	76.8	77.1	79.5	3	2.4
		P+	93,277	48.0%	48.0%	50.0%	55.0%	7.0%	5.0%
		SGP	68,746	46	47	47	47	1	0
Econ. Disad.	District	CPI	1,070	--	--	--	79.4	79.4	79.4
		P+	1,070	--	--	--	54.0%	54.0%	54.0%
		SGP	788	--	--	--	45	45	45
	State	CPI	63,124	--	--	--	80.9	80.9	80.9
		P+	63,124	--	--	--	59.0%	59.0%	59.0%
		SGP	47,064	--	--	--	47	47	47
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	591	62	61.6	56.9	63	1	6.1
		P+	591	22.0%	24.0%	20.0%	25.0%	3.0%	5.0%
		SGP	434	41	43	34.5	45	4	10.5
	State	CPI	39,117	67.3	66.8	66.6	71.6	4.3	5
		P+	39,117	31.0%	30.0%	31.0%	39.0%	8.0%	8.0%
		SGP	28,234	43	43	43	44	1	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	175	68.9	69	69.4	74	5.1	4.6
		P+	175	41.0%	39.0%	42.0%	47.0%	6.0%	5.0%
		SGP	124	68	62.5	42	45	-23	3
	State	CPI	18,541	66.2	67.4	67.8	70.1	3.9	2.3
		P+	18,541	34.0%	35.0%	36.0%	41.0%	7.0%	5.0%
		SGP	11,589	51	53	54	54	3	0
All students	District	CPI	2,917	85.8	85.2	83.9	85.7	-0.1	1.8
		P+	2,917	67.0%	65.0%	65.0%	66.0%	-1.0%	1.0%
		SGP	2,300	45	47	41	47	2	6
	State	CPI	216,396	86.7	86.8	86.7	89.3	2.6	2.6
		P+	216,396	69.0%	69.0%	69.0%	75.0%	6.0%	6.0%
		SGP	172,652	50	51	50	50	0	0

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

Table B3b: Westfield Public Schools
Mathematics (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	1,396	62.1	64.4	62.9	65.3	3.2	2.4
		P+	1,396	31.0%	36.0%	34.0%	38.0%	7.0%	4.0%
		SGP	1,038	39	43	41.5	48	9	6.5
	State	CPI	93,295	67	68.6	68.4	70.2	3.2	1.8
		P+	93,295	37.0%	40.0%	40.0%	43.0%	6.0%	3.0%
		SGP	69,106	46	46	47	47	1	0
Economically Disadvantaged	District	CPI	1,070	--	--	--	68.6	68.6	68.6
		P+	1,070	--	--	--	43.0%	43.0%	43.0%
		SGP	786	--	--	--	46	46	46
	State	CPI	63,076	--	--	--	71.9	71.9	71.9
		P+	63,076	--	--	--	47.0%	47.0%	47.0%
		SGP	47,295	--	--	--	46	46	46
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	587	46.3	47.6	45.3	48.7	2.4	3.4
		P+	587	11.0%	13.0%	12.0%	15.0%	4.0%	3.0%
		SGP	432	41	38	42	47	6	5
	State	CPI	39,181	56.9	57.4	57.1	60	3.1	2.9
		P+	39,181	21.0%	22.0%	22.0%	27.0%	6.0%	5.0%
		SGP	28,451	43	42	43	44	1	1
English language learners or Former ELLs	District	CPI	177	66.4	65.1	67.2	72	5.6	4.8
		P+	177	38.0%	40.0%	41.0%	50.0%	12.0%	9.0%
		SGP	125	34	38	34	44	10	10
	State	CPI	18,625	61.6	63.9	63.8	64.4	2.8	0.6
		P+	18,625	32.0%	35.0%	36.0%	37.0%	5.0%	1.0%
		SGP	11,735	52	53	52	50	-2	-2
All students	District	CPI	2,921	74.2	75.7	73.9	77	2.8	3.1
		P+	2,921	49.0%	53.0%	51.0%	56.0%	7.0%	5.0%
		SGP	2,306	42	47	42	51	9	9
	State	CPI	216,363	79.9	80.8	80.3	83.1	3.2	2.8
		P+	216,363	59.0%	61.0%	60.0%	66.0%	7.0%	6.0%
		SGP	173,217	50	51	50	50	0	0

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

Table B3c: Westfield 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	524	66.6	65.1	67.3	65.8	-0.8	-1.5
		P+	524	30.0%	26.0%	33.0%	35.0%	5.0%	2.0%
	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	395	0	0	0	68.5	68.5	68.5
		P+	395	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	39.0%	39.0%	39.0%
	State	CPI	62,345	0	0	0	67.1	67.1	67.1
		P+	62,345	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.0%	33.0%	33.0%
Students w/ disabilities	District	CPI	227	54	55	53.9	53.6	-0.4	-0.3
		P+	227	13.0%	12.0%	16.0%	16.0%	3.0%	0.0%
	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	50	54.4	51.7	58.8	54.5	0.1	-4.3
		P+	50	18.0%	17.0%	23.0%	24.0%	6.0%	1.0%
	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	1,201	78.6	76.7	78.2	77.9	-0.7	-0.3
		P+	1,201	52.0%	46.0%	50.0%	52.0%	0.0%	2.0%
	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: Westfield Public Schools
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2011–2014

Group	School Year Ending				Change 2011–2014		Change 2013–2014		State (2014)
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Percentage Points	Percent Change	Percentage Points	Percent Change	
High Needs	3.9%	3.5%	3.7%	2.4%	-1.5	-38.5%	-1.3	-35.1%	3.4%
Low Income	3.7%	3.9%	4.1%	2.7%	-1.0	-27.0%	-1.4	-34.1%	3.6%
Students w/ disabilities	5.5%	4.5%	3.9%	2.4%	-3.1	-56.4%	-1.5	-38.5%	3.4%
ELL	2.0%	1.9%	5.1%	3.3%	1.3	65.0%	-1.8	-35.3%	6.2%
All students	2.3%	2.0%	2.2%	1.2%	-1.1	-47.8%	-1.0	-45.5	2.0%

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: Westfield 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	94.6%	94.3%	94.1%	94.1%	-0.5	-0.5%	0	0%	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: Westfield 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	$52,190,011	$52,605,873	$54,530,443	$54,638,638	$55,509,895	$56,943,958
By municipality	$18,422,428	$18,593,653	$19,321,461	$50,744,605	$18,404,071	$16,082,844
Total from local appropriations	$70,612,439	$71,199,526	$73,851,903	$105,383,243	$73,913,966	$73,026,802
From revolving funds and grants	--	$9,809,668	--	$9,837,360	--	$7,904,103
Total expenditures	--	$81,009,194	--	$115,220,603	--	$80,930,905
Chapter 70 aid to education program						
Chapter 70 state aid*	--	$32,546,677	--	$32,927,874	--	$33,072,499
Required local contribution	--	$24,659,576	--	$25,776,861	--	$26,817,278
Required net school spending**	--	$57,206,253	--	$58,704,735	--	$59,889,777
Actual net school spending	--	$62,503,765	--	$64,979,886	--	$67,428,768
Over/under required ($)	--	$5,297,512	--	$6,275,150	--	$7,538,990
Over/under required (%)	--	9.3	--	10.7	--	12.6

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

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

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

Data retrieved 11/20/15

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

Expenditure Category	2012	2013	2014
Administration	$252	$242	$250
Instructional leadership (district and school)	$789	$792	$895
Teachers	$4,871	$5,132	$5,048
Other teaching services	$934	$1,075	$1,088
Professional development	$59	$83	$78
Instructional materials, equipment and technology	$286	$387	$391
Guidance, counseling and testing services	$474	$499	$446
Pupil services	$1,172	$1,220	$1,314
Operations and maintenance	$841	$811	$899
Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs	$2,616	$2,538	$2,703
Total expenditures per in-district pupil	$12,293	$12,779	$13,113

Sources: Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website

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

Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction		Insufficient	Minimal	Moderate	Strong	Avg Number of points
		(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(0 to 3)
1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.	**ES**	0%	3%	50%	48%	2.5
	MS	0%	14%	50%	36%	2.2
	HS	0%	6%	31%	63%	2.6
	Total #	0	4	32	34	2.4
	Total %	0%	6%	46%	49%	
2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.	**ES**	5%	18%	58%	20%	1.9
	MS	14%	29%	57%	0%	1.4
	HS	13%	19%	69%	0%	1.6
	Total #	6	14	42	8	1.7
	Total %	9%	20%	60%	11%	
3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s).	**ES**	0%	25%	65%	10%	1.9
	MS	0%	21%	79%	0%	1.8
	HS	0%	31%	63%	6%	1.8
	Total #	0	18	47	5	1.8
	Total %	0%	26%	67%	7%	
4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).	**ES**	0%	13%	53%	35%	2.2
	MS	0%	29%	64%	7%	1.8
	HS	6%	13%	63%	19%	1.9
	Total #	1	11	40	18	2.1
	Total %	1%	16%	57%	26%	
Total Score For Focus Area #1	**ES**					**8.5**
	MS					**7.2**
	HS					**7.8**
	Total					**8.1**

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%	10%	53%	38%	2.3
	MS	0%	14%	79%	7%	1.9
	HS	0%	31%	56%	13%	1.8
	Total #	0	11	41	18	2.1
	Total %	0%	16%	59%	26%	
6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.	**ES**	3%	23%	60%	15%	1.9
	MS	7%	36%	43%	14%	1.6
	HS	19%	25%	50%	6%	1.4
	Total #	5	18	38	9	1.7
	Total %	7%	26%	54%	13%	
7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups.	**ES**	0%	15%	55%	30%	2.2
	MS	0%	7%	64%	29%	2.2
	HS	0%	6%	81%	13%	2.1
	Total #	0	8	44	18	2.1
	Total %	0%	11%	63%	26%	
Total Score For Focus Area #2	**ES**					**6.3**
	MS					**5.8**
	HS					**5.3**
	Total					**6.0**

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**	5%	50%	40%	5%	1.5
	MS	21%	64%	14%	0%	0.9
	HS	18%	41%	29%	12%	1.4
	Total #	8	36	23	4	1.3
	Total %	11%	51%	32%	6%	
9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel).	**ES**	0%	30%	65%	5%	1.8
	MS	21%	14%	64%	0%	1.4
	HS	0%	50%	38%	13%	1.6
	Total #	3	22	41	4	1.7
	Total %	4%	31%	59%	6%	
10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.	**ES**	0%	3%	43%	55%	2.5
	MS	0%	7%	79%	14%	2.1
	HS	6%	19%	31%	44%	2.1
	Total #	1	5	33	31	2.3
	Total %	1%	7%	47%	44%	
11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.	**ES**	15%	18%	45%	23%	1.8
	MS	14%	50%	29%	7%	1.3
	HS	38%	6%	25%	31%	1.5
	Total #	14	15	26	15	1.6
	Total %	20%	21%	37%	21%	
Total Score For Focus Area #3	**ES**					**7.4**
	MS					**5.7**
	HS					**6.6**
	Total					**6.9**